Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Mooney</td>
<td>Mr T East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Foulger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that item numbers 5-40 will not be heard by the Committee before 3.00 pm

Pool of Substitutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leslie Dale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Legg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Riches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 27 February 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

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

Please note that the order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 - 4, and arrive at 3.00 pm if you intend to speak on items 5 – 40.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance.
Large print version can be made available
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
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 8)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 30 January 2013; (attached – page 11)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters; (attached – page 29)
   To consider the applications as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011/0026/F</td>
<td>HALES</td>
<td>Land At Yarmouth Road</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/1012/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Area 'A' Land North Of Heath Loke</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/1201/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land South Of London Road Chestnut Drive Suton Norfolk NR18 9SB</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012/1434/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land At Chapel Lane</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/1644/O</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land West Of School Cantley Lane</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/1713/F</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land At School Cantley Lane</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/1714/CA</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land At School Cantley Lane</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/1716/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Barkers Mill Bocm Pauls Ltd Right Up Lane Silfield</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/1883/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Wymondham Rugby Club Tuttles Lane East</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/2080/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Church Of St Mary &amp; St Thomas Church Street</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/1394/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Barn Hales Green</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/1395/LB</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2010/2223/F</td>
<td>HALE</td>
<td>Land At Filling Station Beccles Road</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2012/1429/F</td>
<td>KESWICK AND INTWOOD</td>
<td>Land At Low Road</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Planning Ref No.</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2012/1757/F</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>Land Between 113 And 115 Shelfanger Road</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2012/1843/RVC</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Tesco Superstore Victoria Road</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2012/1998/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Adj To Elm Lodge Downham Grove</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2012/2151/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Kings Head Yard Car Park Mere Street</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2012/2040/A</td>
<td>KESWICK AND INTWOOD</td>
<td>Site 49 Norwich Southern Bypass Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2012/2051/A</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Site 65 Newmarket Road</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2012/2052/A</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Site 68 Colney Lane</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2012/2050/A</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Site 64 Watton Road</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2012/2049/A</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Site 63 Watton Road</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2012/2061/A</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Site 84 Dereham Road</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2012/2063/A</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Site 85 Dereham Road</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2012/2064/A</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Site 86 Alex Moorhouse Way</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2012/2065/A</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Site 87 Alex Moorhouse Way</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2012/2059/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Site 81 Harts Farm Road</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2012/2056/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Site 77 Tuttles Lane East</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2012/2066/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Site 90 Browick Road</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2012/2060/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Site 82 Browick Road</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2012/2058/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Site 80 London Road</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2012/2054/A</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Site 75 Ipswich Road</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2012/2053/A</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Site 69 Norwich Road</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2012/2048/A</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Site 49 Norwich Southern Bypass Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2012/2067/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Site 92 Park Road</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2012/2045/A</td>
<td>DITCHINGHAM</td>
<td>Site 50 Norwich Road</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2012/2046/A</td>
<td>GILLINGHAM</td>
<td>Site 53 Norwich Road</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2012/2068/A</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Site 57 The Street</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2012/2047/A</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Site 56 The Street</td>
<td>255</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 261)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)**
   (attached – page 267)

9. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 27 March 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;
  - Objection(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><strong>A</strong></th>
<th>Advert</th>
<th><strong>G</strong></th>
<th>Proposal by Government Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>S.P</strong></th>
<th>Structure Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.N.L.P</strong></td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.D</strong></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><strong>J.C.S</strong></td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.P.P.F</strong></td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting, Members are asked to indicate whether their interest in the matter is pecuniary, or if the matter relates to, or affects a pecuniary interest they have, or if it is another type of interest. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote. If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed. If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF. PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE.
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?
OR
B Does it directly affect me, my partner or spouse’s financial position, in particular:
  - employment, employers or businesses;
  - companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value or more than 1% of nominal share holding
  - land or leases they own or hold
  - contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

YES

The interest is pecuniary – disclose the interest, withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room. Do not try to improperly influence the decision

NO

Pecuniary Interest

The interest is related to a pecuniary interest. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may make representations as a member of the public, but then withdraw from the room

YES

No

Related pecuniary interest

NO

The Interest is not pecuniary nor affects your pecuniary interests. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may participate in the meeting and vote

YES

Have I declared the interest as an other interest on my declaration of interest form? OR

Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate? OR

Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of? OR

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?

YES

NO

Related pecuniary interest

Does the matter indirectly affects or relates to a pecuniary interest I have declared, or a matter noted at B above?

NO

Other Interest

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
### PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

#### Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Key to letters included within application reference to identify application type – e.g. 2013/0001/A – Application for consent to display and 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 (Details 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 Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to abbreviations used in recommendations**

- **S.P** Structure Plan
- **S.N.L.P** South Norfolk Local Plan
- **P.D** Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings or works specified).
- **J.C.S** Joint Core Strategy
- **N.P.P.F** National Planning Policy Framework.
- **DGL** Director of Growth & Localism
Major Applications

1. **Appl. No** : 2011/0026/F  
   **Parish** : HALES

   Applicants Name : Badger Building (E Anglia) Ltd  
   Site Address : Land At Yarmouth Road Hales NR14 6SR  
   Proposal : Redevelopment of the site for the erection of 10 dwellings and 291 sqm B1 Business Unit (amended proposal)

   **Recommendation** : Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions
   - 1 Full Planning permission time limit
   - 2 In accordance with amendments
   - 3 External materials to be agreed
   - 4 Slab level to be agreed
   - 5 Water Efficiency
   - 6 Visibility splay dimension
   - 7 Provision of parking, service
   - 8 Construction Traffic (Parking)
   - 9 Wheel Cleaning Facilities
   - 10 Stopping Up of Highway Rights
   - 11 Highway Improvements - Offsite
   - 12 Traffic Regulation Orders
   - 13 Site investigation/Risk assessment
   - 14 Reporting of unexpected contamination
   - 15 Surface Water
   - 16 No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
   - 17 No alterations to lose garage
   - 18 Boundary treatment to be agreed
   - 19 Restriction of B1 use
   - 20 Ecology mitigation

   Subject to S106 agreement for claw back clause for affordable housing

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   - 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 4: Housing delivery
   - Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   - IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   - IMP 9: Residential amenity
   - EMP 7: The retention of rural employment and services (Part
   - HOU 6: Development within the defined Development Limits of specified large villages (Non Consistent)
   - ENV 15: Species protection
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0910 Demolition of workshop, cottage and former store
Prior approval not required

2.2 2008/1779 Erection of 8 terraced properties (7 houses and 1 flat), erection of 7 garages and construction of new access
Refused Dismissed on appeal

2.3 2006/1560 Erection of new chalet style bungalow
Approved

2.4 2006/0689 Erection of new chalet style bungalow
Withdrawn

2.5 2001/1924 Variation of condition (hours) on 2001/0737
Approved

2.6 2001/0737 Erection of new workshop
Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Original scheme
Objections and issues as follows:
- size and design of business plots 12 - out of keeping in streetscene and imposing on junction of Yarmouth Road and A146
- feel access in centre of terrace, dangerous and should move further down Yarmouth Road
- parking Ok for residents, but insufficient for visitors, would not like to see double yellow lines
- parking for plots 9-11 on private land

Amended scheme
- remain concerned about size and design of business units on Plot 12, replaces single storey unit with high double storey - out of keeping with streetscene and imposing on junction of Yarmouth Road and A146
- would like to see lower height development, suggest bigger footprint
- consider access in centre of row of properties facing Yarmouth Road is dangerous on this busy road, opposite showroom and suggest moved further down Yarmouth Road -if plots 1-4 moved towards plot 5 there would be room
- parking provided is sufficient for residents facing Yarmouth Road but feel that insufficient visitor parking is available even with slight widening of Yarmouth Road, would not like to see double yellow lines
- concerned about footway, as shown on Yarmouth Road, will lead to pedestrians to cross at very dangerous point where they cannot really be seen nor see fully the A146, could highways confirm they are happy
- plans do not show whole picture i.e. views of Cottages on opposite side of road and do not show full junction with A146
- business units will seriously overlook

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate
Development Management Committee  
27 February 2013

3.3 Ecologist - NCC
- Original scheme
  - no information submitted
- Amended scheme
  - Approve
  - bat boxes to be provided

3.4 Planning Policy
- Original scheme
  - mixed use issues re design, access and associated impacts on residential amenity
  - lack of affordable housing

3.5 Economic Development Manager
- No objection
- Original scheme
  - welcomes construction of new B1 buildings but has some concerns about proximity to unit 10 - may need controls over B1 use

3.6 Design Officer
- Original scheme
  - Refuse
  - standard of design unacceptable
- Amended scheme
  - Approve, in accordance with JCS Policy 2 and SN Place making Guide
  - following on-going negotiations consider the layout and design of scheme now helps to create an attractive development that responds well to its local context and setting
  - the elevations and house types proposed have been designed to respond to the adjacent Tayler and Green homes and create a design specific to the scheme

3.7 Conservation Officer
- Original scheme
  - assessment of significance of building to be demolished should be undertaken
  - the building layout and form of buildings also creates a strong frontage along Yarmouth Road and relates well to the corner of the site where it turns the corner at junction of Beccles Road and Yarmouth Road
  - thought been given to boundary treatments including curtilage parking, parking courts and off-street parking which helps to support the streetscene
  - a public footpath is proposed along Yarmouth Road frontage that links into existing footpath network

3.8 Historic Environment Service
- Original scheme
  - heritage statement needs to be submitted as the development proposal will result in total loss of significant heritage asset and this needs to be justified
  - building should be retained

3.9 NCC Highways
- Original scheme
  - Refuse
  - inadequate parking and manoeuvring facilities
Amended scheme
Conditional support, conditions to include:
- visibility
- access/parking arrangements
- scheme for on site parking for construction workers
- wheel cleaning facilities
- Stopping Up Order to remove all highway rights to provide required parking spaces to plots 9 and 10
- details of off-site highway works and completion of
- no works until Traffic Regulation Order for waiting restrictions

3.10 Property Consultant
Stuart Bizley
- satisfied viability of proposed development does not currently justify the delivery of affordable housing in addition to the employment space proposed
- you may wish to consider a 'claw back' clause

3.11 Local Residents
Original scheme
5 letters of objection raising the following concerns:
- concerns re contents in D_ A  Statement re existing cottage to be demolished
- land swap with highways based on unpublished plan and widely used area removed from public use
- sustainability of the location
- highway boundary does not reflect current situation
- whilst development on Beccles Road acceptable, the plan for Beccles Road is not
- parking used by CJ Ball and residents living on Yarmouth Road - access to that parking is via entrance opposite my house - all access should be from eastern side of site
- historically used (CJ Ball) for staff and company vehicles - loss of parking will effect business, need an alternative
- loss of parking will force parking onto Yarmouth Road which is unable to take busy congestion of traffic
- no objection on dwellings and business units but concerns re increase in volume of traffic

2 letters of support with following views:
- desperate housing shortage in this County where are the younger generation going to live
- good luck to this project

Amended scheme
1 further letter received with following concerns:
- previous comments not meaningfully addressed e.g. comments on less standard design solution, increased traffic joining the A146
- one thing we think has been addressed is provision for and retention of parking on old Beccles Road for 1 and 2 Yarmouth - think addressed but not clear
- understand highways to request clarification and needs to be formally shown
- plans do not allow a clear understanding of height or visual impact of proposed Business Units, crucial to evaluating this aspect and raises concerns
Assessment

4.1 The site is a relatively open piece of land situated within the development limits for Hales. The site is sloping and has an irregular shape part fronting Yarmouth Road (and close to junction with the A146) and part fronting the old Beccles Road, a dead end. The site previously housed the workshop, office and store of the former Fairhead Wones motor engineering business, in addition to a small cottage in the midst of the business premises. The cottage was allowed to be demolished under a prior approval application, last year, (2012/0910) and together with other buildings on the site have now been demolished. There are residential dwellings adjacent to the site to the south and east, with residential properties and former C J Ball motorcycles opposite.

4.2 Planning permission was refused and dismissed on appeal (2008/1779) for the part re-development of this site for residential use. Whilst the Planning Inspector did not share the Council's view that the proposed development (two storey terrace of houses) would be out of keeping with other residential development in the locality, he did share our views there would be an impact on residential amenity (to future residents); whether satisfactory visibility splays could be achieved and the retention of the site for employment purposes had not been fully explored in accordance with policy EMP7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 (SNLP).

4.3 The application as originally submitted has been amended and a full re-consultation carried out. The amended proposal is for the erection of 10 dwellings with associated garaging and parking, 8 accessed from Yarmouth Road and two from old Beccles Road together with new Business units (291 sqm) with access and parking from old Beccles Road. The applicant has agreed with the principle of a Stopping Up Order to old Beccles Road, which would enable them to take ownership of the parking to the front of their units. Off-street parking, as already exists and used by residents in Yarmouth Road would also be maintained on the old part of this road.

4.4 The application and subsequent amendments have been subject to lengthy negotiations following the previous appeal decision and this mixed use scheme relates to the redevelopment of the whole site, a material change in the previous refused scheme.

4.5 The main issues in considering this proposal are as follows:-

- Policy context and loss of employment
- Highway Issues
- Character, Scale and appearance
- Viability and affordable housing
- Residential amenity

Policy context and loss of employment

4.6 As the site is located within the development limits for Hales, there is a presumption in favour of development in accordance with policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and policy HOU6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), subject to considerations relating to design, character, access and amenity, to be discussed later in this assessment. It should be noted that due weight and consideration can be given to the SNLP polices quoted above as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the SNLP.
4.7 In addition and parallel to this application is a second application (2010/2223) to relocate the car repair aspect of John Wones' business on to his nearby car sales site and is to be considered at Item 13 on this Agenda. Unlike the appeal decision, this application as a whole, does retain an employment element, therefore, it meets the requirements of policy EMP7 and the retention of this site as whole, as an employment site, does not need to be explored further. Also, unlike the previous application, a potential solution for the workshop relocation has been submitted and will be considered on its own merits.

Highway Issues

4.8 As originally submitted the proposal did raise a Highway objection, but the amended scheme has addressed these concerns in particular relating to off-street parking, access and parking arrangements. The conditions detailed above, including the need for a Stopping Up Order, will ensure the development will not have an undue impact on highway safety and accords with policy IMP8 of the SNLP. The views of the Parish Council and local residents are noted, especially in relation to highway safety concerns with respect to the proposed access point on Yarmouth Road and proximity to the junction with the A146, but without a highway objection a refusal on these grounds cannot be substantiated.

Character, Scale and appearance

4.9 In considering the form of development, due weight and consideration had to be given to the Planning Inspector’s view that a row of terrace of properties could be accommodated within the locality without affecting the character of the area. After lengthy negotiations, the layout and design of the scheme now helps to create an attractive development that responds well to its local context and setting and takes into account the South Norfolk Place Making Guide and also accords with policy 2 of the JCS.

4.10 The scheme incorporates attractive boundary treatment, including a crinkle-crankle wall, and different forms of car parking, such as curtilage parking, parking courts and off-street, which all help to support the street scene. A public footpath is also proposed along the Yarmouth Road, which links to the business units’ car parking on old Beccles Road.

4.11 The concerns raised by the Parish Council and local resident with respect to the scale of the business units have been taken into account, including the fact that a single storey element was previously located near the boundary. However, the distinct character and design of this building, although dominant, satisfactorily integrates within the street scene.

Viability and affordable housing

4.12 Since the application was originally submitted there has been a policy change within the JCS relating to the provision of affordable housing. The applicant was requested to provide affordable housing provision within their mix of houses as required by policy 4. Members will be aware that in accordance with this policy it is recognised that affordable housing provision is dependent upon the overall viability of development.

4.13 The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal and the Council’s property consultant has confirmed he is satisfied the viability of the proposed development does not currently justify the delivery of affordable housing in addition to the employment space proposed. He has suggested we may wish to consider a ‘claw back’ clause as part of a S106 agreement, which I am proposing to recommend.
4.14 Members could consider the affordable housing in lieu of the employment use but given the priority of retaining employment sites, especially in service villages such as this, unfortunately both can not be achieved on the redevelopment of this site.

**Residential amenity**

4.15 Unlike the previous scheme the layout of the dwellings and especially plot 8 have been designed to ensure they will not be overlooked by existing dwellings to a material degree. The layout also ensures that existing residential properties will not be affected, including the location of the business units which although there will be windows towards the houses on the opposite of the road these have been orientated to reduce potential overlooking and given the distances involved will not cause an undue impact. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy IMP9 of the SNLP.

4.16 All other considerations and issues raised have been taken into account although not specifically addressed in the above assessment.

5 **Reasons for approval**

5.1 With the conditions outlined above the amended proposal is considered to accord with section 1, 6, and 7 of the NPPF, policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 15 of the JCS and the following SNLP polices IMP8, IMP9, EMP7, HOU6 and ENV15.

5.2 The amended proposal accords with the above policies as the design, scale and layout is acceptable and will enhance the character and appearance of the area. The Highway Authority are satisfied with the proposed access and parking arrangements which will not be detrimental to highway safety. The layout and orientation of the dwellings will not have an impact on the amenity of existing or future residential properties. An Ecological Survey has been submitted and mitigation put forward and will be conditioned to any permission.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors 01508 533789
and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2012/1012/O  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: Norfolk Homes Ltd  
Site Address: Area 'A' Land North Of Heath Loke Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JU  
Proposal: Proposed Residential Development

Recommendation: Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

1. Outline permission time limit  
2. Required RM  
3. Masterplan/Design Code to be submitted and agreed prior to submission of reserved matters  
4. Materials  
5. Surface water drainage scheme  
6. Details of foul water disposal  
7. Details of roads and footways etc.  
8. Estate roads in accordance with approved drawings  
9. Estate roads to binder course before occupation  
10. Footways and cycleways in accordance with phasing plan to be approved  
11. Construction Traffic Management plan to be agreed and adhered to during the construction of the development  
12. No development until off-site highway works approved under 2010/1332 have been completed to the satisfaction of the LPA  
13. No occupation of any dwelling until the estate link road between Stoke Road and Area C has been constructed  
14. Landscaping  
15. Tree protection  
16. Fire hydrants

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards education and libraries, and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type, tenure and mix of the 33% affordable housing, including its affordability in perpetuity.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity
2. **Planning History**

2.1 SNLP 2003  
Site allocated for new school as part of delivery of 24 hectares of residential development.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse - development of this land would result in community land being privatised. This land should be scheduled for a care home.

3.2 District Member  
To planning committee.

3.3 Planning Policy  
The preferred option is to allocate this site for use as a care home, specialising in dementia care. Policy 7 of the JCS is applicable, which states the need for the expansion of care home provision specialising in dementia care in Poringland.

3.4 Landscape Officer  
No comments received

3.5 Ecologist  
No objection.

3.6 Design Officer  
A number of concerns have been raised in respect of a lack of supporting information that shows how the site can be developed to a high standard of design in accordance with JCS Policy 2 and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objection.

3.8 NCC - Planning Obligations  
No objection - developer contributions towards primary school education and early years provision, and libraries.

3.9 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
Raise issues with proposed courtyards and access via under crofts.

3.10 SNC - Housing Strategy Manager  
No objection provided that the proposal would provide for 33% affordable housing.

3.11 NCC - Historic Environment Service  
No comments received.

3.12 Environment Agency  
No objection.

3.13 NCC Highways  
No objection subject to conditions.

3.14 Local Residents  
2 letters of support received (no reasons given)

1 letter of objection received
- Public accessible car parks adjacent neighbouring property ‘Beverly’ will cause disturbance.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application site is located within the northern area of the 24 hectares of land allocated for housing development in the 2003 Local Plan, and is currently being built out by Norfolk Homes. The site comprises 1 hectare of land previously reserved for use as a school and
is surrounded to the north, east and west by existing and proposed development and to the south by the private drive known as Heath Loke. The west boundary of the site also has the main spine road connecting the north and south development areas running alongside it. A location plan is attached as appendix 1 to this report.

4.2 The proposal is for the use of the site for a residential development of approximately 30 dwellings and associated infrastructure. This alternative use of the site is proposed as the County Council have indicated that a new primary school is no longer required on this site as it is felt that the predicted growth in pupil population taking into account preferred JCS housing allocations can be accommodated at upgraded existing facilities. Access to the site would be from the main spine road. The application is in outline form only with all matters reserved. An indicative site layout plan is attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.3 No concerns have been raised by statutory consultees in respect of drainage, ecology, the historic environment, or highways, and the main issues for consideration are the

- Principle of housing development on the site
- Impact on residential amenity
- Indicative design and layout

4.4 The land in question was previously allocated in the South Norfolk Local Plan (Adopted 2003) under policies POR 1 and POR 2, which required provision of a site for a primary school, at no cost to the local education authority (LEA). As Norfolk County Council have now confirmed that the site is no longer required for a school, and taking into account its previous allocation as a community use, its sustainable location and good access to services, the site has been selected as a preferred location for residential care (with specialist dementia care provision). Joint Core Strategy Policy 7 states that there is a need for this type of care in Poringland, and so consideration needs to be given to the acceptability in principle of this alternative use of the site, having regard to the requirements of the JCS and the NPPF.

**Principle of development**

4.5 Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 7 articulates a need for a care home with dementia specialist care, in either Loddon/Chedgrave or Poringland/Framingham Earl. The need for such a use was examined by a Planning Inspector at the JCS Examination in Public. At JCS adoption, there was a need for 60 beds of dementia care in either Loddon/Chedgrave or Poringland/Framingham Earl. Although the survey underpinning this policy was undertaken in 2008, the Community Health and Social Care Integrated Commissioning Team has confirmed that there is still a need for 60 beds of dementia care in the Loddon Area (which covers Poringland, Framingham Earl, Loddon, Chedgrave).

4.6 The applicants have submitted a Savills marketing report that argues an economic downturn is driving a lack of interest in the site from potential care operators, and nor will there be any interest in the medium-term future. However, the Savills report also indicates that there could be future demand from care/retirement operators once the sector recovers and the surrounding residential development is at a more advanced stage. The applicants have also stated that a care home would return a significantly enhanced land value compared to normal residential development, and that should market conditions change, Norfolk Homes would be interested in pursuing this option. This indicates that in the short to medium-term future, the site could be viable for a care home use. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the site has not been advertised on the open market, so a true gauge as to interest in the site from potential operators is not known.

4.7 The applicants also argue that the use of this site for residential development will bring advantages in terms of housing supply, having regard to the requirement for a 5-year supply of housing land (+5%) as set out in the NPPF.
4.8 As members will be aware, there is an acknowledged lack of housing supply in the Norwich Policy Area, and this carries significant weight in the consideration of this application. The NPPF is clear in its requirements that development should be approved unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Having taken legal advice, the preferred site allocation document carries little or no weight, and the identified need for a Care Home in the Loddon/Chedgrave or Poringland/Framingham Earl area does not mean that it necessarily needs to be developed at this site. A full comparative assessment of alternative sites would have to be undertaken before a robust and defensible argument can be made that this site is the best site for a Care Home. Furthermore, the legal opinion is that following the County Council’s decision not to require the site for a school, the fall back allocation is that of housing, and not a community use.

Impact on residential amenity

4.9 The site adjoins existing residential development on its east boundary, and houses under construction on its north and west boundary. The indicative site layout indicates that houses can be positioned in a way that will not result in harm the residential amenity of these properties. The scale of the houses is also in proportion with those surrounding the site. Although detailed aspects of design are reserved for future submission, I am satisfied that the development can accord with the requirements of saved local plan policy IMP9.

Indicative design and layout

4.10 Although matters of design are reserved at this stage, the application should provide enough information with the application to indicate how the site can be developed to a high standard of design in accordance with JCS Policy 2, and South Norfolk’s Place Making Guide. The Design & Access statement sets out some basic information on the wider context of Poringland and the adjoining development, although the design concept and vision for the site do not demonstrate how the proposals will help to create a place with a distinctive character. Information should be provided that creates a set of specific design principles that could translate into a proposal that is purpose designed for the site in terms of layout, building types and landscape that creates a distinctive character.

4.11 I therefore consider it appropriate that a Masterplan/Design Code for the site is submitted and agreed prior to the submission of reserved matters. This can be required by condition.

5. Conclusions

5.1 The main thrust of the applicant's argument for residential development can be summarised as follows:

- There is no demand by operators or developers at this current time, or within the medium term future
- The site allocations DPD is at a very early stage in the process and cannot attract any significant weight
- There are better sites in Poringland for a care home
- The residential development of the site will contribute towards the housing supply shortfall

5.2 The argument for the use of the site as a care home (specialising in dementia), and therefore against the proposed use of the site for housing, can be summarised as follows:

- Notwithstanding the economic downturn and possible deficiency in commercial appetite for developing a care home, there is a proven need for care home provision, specialising in dementia care, in Poringland/Framingham Earl. This is articulated in JCS Policy 7. South Norfolk Council's preferred planning policy option is to allocate this site for such a use, with the aim of providing a care home in the period to 2026.
As no alternative sites for a care home facility have been indentified, the ability to enable the care home facility required by JCS Policy 7 within the local plan period would be prejudiced by allowing housing on this site.

However, the preferred allocation for this site can only carry limited weight, and although there is a proven need for care home provision in the area, set out in JCS Policy 7, without a full assessment of sites for use as a Care Home within the Loddon/Chedegrave or Poringland/Framingham Earl area, the argument for this site in Poringland being allocated for a care home is not robust and would be open to challenge.

In conclusion, the requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the development of the site for housing can be approved.

5. Reason for Approval

5.1 It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of housing within the Norwich Policy Area, and that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The preferred allocation for a care home on this site can only carry limited weight, and does not outweigh the benefits of providing additional sustainable housing development that will help address the deficit in housing supply. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with sections 6, 7, 10, and 11 of the NPPF, and the relevant policies of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan (which are given due weight as they remain consistent/partly consistent with the NPPF).

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Gary Hancox 01508 533841 and E-mail: ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2012/1201/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Plantdrive Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land South Of London Road Chestnut Drive Suton Norfolk NR18 9SB  
**Proposal**: FULL planning permission for B1, B2, B8 category office industrial units on Wymondham Business Park with OUTLINE approvals sought for residential development of approx. 20 dwellings on land adjacent to London Road and additional B1,B2,B8 category industrial use for land adjacent to Chestnut Drive to further extend Wymondham Business Park

**Recommendation**: Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

**Outline**
1. Outline Permission Time Limit (C)
2. Standard outline requiring RM (C/e)
3. In accordance with the approved details
4. Surface Water Drainage
5. Fire Hydrants
6. Standard Estate Road (C)
7. Standard Estate Road (C)
8. Standard Estate Road (C/e)
9. Highways in accordance with phasing
10. Foul sewerage
11. Tree Planting
12. Boundary Treatment
13. Implementation of Boundary Treatment
14. Details of Earthworks
15. Hedge Planting
16. Use Class and No of dwellings

**Full**
17. Full Planning permission time limit (C)
18. In accordance with approved details
19. Use class
20. Hours of operation
21. External materials
22. Surface Water
23. Foul sewerage
24. Standard Estate Road (C)
25. Standard Estate Road (C)
26. Standard Estate Road (C/e)
27. Provision of parking etc

**General**
28. Landscaping scheme to be submitted (C/e)
29. Implement planting scheme
30. Tree protection (C/e)
31. Retention trees and hedges (C)
32. Landscaping management plan (C)
33. Archaeological work to be agreed (C)
34. Lighting Plan
35. Provision of 10% of energy from renewable/low carbon sources

Subject to the agreement of a Section 106 to secure affordable housing provision and education payments.
1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
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 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
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
EMP 2: Distribution, nature and scale of employment development
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village
Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)
WYM 5: Employment allocations in Wymondham

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD Adopted Sep 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2009/1557 - Land At Erection of 2no industrial units with Approved
    Chestnut Drive associated external works, car parking, hard
    Suton standings and landscaping

2.2 2003/0591 - Land At Erection of 73 dwellings Approved
    London Road
    Wymondham

2.3 1995/0483 - Land Adj Industrial development Approved
    London Road
    Suton Lane
    Wymondham

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Application should be refused as it is outside the development Council limits.
3.2 **District Members:**
   - Cllr T Gurney: To be reported if appropriate
   - Cllr N Ward: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **Anglian Water Services Ltd**
   - No objection. Conditions recommended.

3.4 **Environment Agency**
   - No objection. Conditions recommended.

3.5 **NCC Highways**
   - No objection. Conditions recommended.

3.6 **Historic Environment Service**
   - No objection. Conditions recommended.

3.7 **Ecologist**
   - Concerns raised regarding the wider landscape/biodiversity impacts in the Wymondham area from cumulative development. Recommend that the ecology report recommendations be secured by condition.

3.8 **Environmental Services (Protection)**
   - No objections. Design improvement suggestions provided.

3.9 **Landscape Officer**
   - No objections raised

3.10 **Planning Policy**

   **Housing element**

   Policy 10 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) refers to at least 2,200 new homes being built in the town to 2026 located on a number of sites providing easy access to local jobs, service and facilities and the town centre, whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and north east and the historic setting of the town and abbey. A Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) is currently being prepared to implement the policies for Wymondham in the JCS. The emerging WAAP identifies land for 2,200 new homes but does not include the application site as a ‘preferred site’ for housing. The Council is working towards a plan led system but until the WAAP is adopted there are 2 distinct (but related) processes to follow; the determination of planning applications and the preparation of planning policy.

   Planning applications must be determined in the context of national, regional and local policy, also having regard to material considerations. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and emerging policy are material considerations. The degree of weight that can be given to emerging policy relates to the stage reached in the local plan process and whether there are outstanding objections to the emerging policy. Whilst Cabinet have agreed a consultation version of the WAAP it has not been published for consultation and therefore can currently carry little weight in planning decisions.

   This planning application must therefore be considered in the context of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development meaning that proposals that accord with the development plan should be
approved without delay or where development plan policies are out of date (as in the case of the 2003 SNLP) permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or if specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.

The NPPF is clear that policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if local authorities cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. South Norfolk Council does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply so we must therefore give a presumption in favour of sustainable development when considering planning applications for housing. We evaluated the application site in the preparation of the preferred options for housing growth in the WAAP. The site performed well in the site assessment exercise, however we concluded that there were other sites that had the potential to contribute more towards meeting the vision and aims for Wymondham. The housing numbers issue will have to be addressed in the WAAP and is not an issue that falls within the scope of Development Management so therefore this application must be determined on its own merits.

Employment element

As with the housing element of this application although policies in the 2003 adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) are clearly now dated the site in question is currently outside the Development Limit for the town.

Policy 9 of the JCS refers to the provision of around 20 hectares of employment land in Wymondham to 2026, including a new allocation of around 15 hectares. The emerging WAAP reflects this requirement and following a process of site assessment proposes a large employment allocation at Browick Road and then a couple of smaller allocations at other locations around the town, including the application site. As discussed above the WAAP policy is still emerging and can carry very little weight in decisions on planning applications but in policy terms we would be broadly supportive of employment development in this location as it fits with the vision and aims for Wymondham.

The NPPF is very supportive of sustainable economic growth but is clear that sites should not be identified for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose. As part of the next stage of public consultation on the WAAP we will be sending out a ‘viability letter’ to all those people with ‘preferred’ sites to ensure that they are still happy to proceed with the site in the WAAP and that it is available and deliverable. The key therefore in determining this application seems to be whether the Case Officer can be satisfied that the site is deliverable to meet the employment requirement in the JCS in advance of the WAAP policy being progressed.

3.11 Local Residents

There have been 3 letters of objection received which raise the following issues:

- The application is premature of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) and should not be considered until this is approved
• The loss of agricultural land should be resisted until all brownfield sites have been utilised
• The increased traffic will cause highway safety issues
• Ecology factors need to be considered with increased planting required.
• The development operations should be limited to the same hours which the park has
• The density of the residential development would lead to parking allocation problems
• Increased pollution and noise levels
• Straining existing public services and utilities to service the development
• The development will devalue property
• Loss of views
• Loss of residential amenity

4 Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site is located to the south west of Wymondham and outside of the established development limits for the town, there are no existing structures or buildings on site.

4.2 The application site is located to the south of London Road and the existing Abbey Road/Preston Road developments. The Abbey Road development is distinctive by its high density design principles.

4.3 The site is divided into three distinct elements by the highway network of Suton Lane and Chestnut Drive. To the north east of the site is the existing Wymondham Business Park with commercial/industrial units, this is served by Chestnut Drive which links directly onto Suton Lane. Suton Lane meets with London Road to the north at a roundabout junction.

4.4 As previously stated the site is divided into three distinct parcels of land by the road network. To the west of Suton Lane is a triangular area of land with frontage onto London Road and Suton Lane, the land area is 5,630 sq m. To the south of the triangular area of land are open fields.

4.5 An open area of land forms the middle section of the application site, this land has Chestnut Drive on its southern and eastern boundary. To the north is Ivygreen Villa a Grade II listed residential property and the existing business park.

4.6 The southern section of the site are open fields which border a county wildlife site on their eastern and southern edge.

Proposal

4.7 The planning application is a hybrid of a full and outline proposal. The western triangular section of land is proposed in outline form for 20 dwellings, with all matters reserved apart from access.

4.8 The middle section of land is divided into two sections with the eastern section being proposed in outline for employment provision (B1/B2/B8 use). The remainder of this middle section is identified as a green buffer zone and would have no development upon it which is associated with this application.
4.9 The third section is also split into two elements, with the eastern side proposed in a full application to provide for six B1/B2/B8 use units. The western side of the third section is proposed to also be a green buffer zone.

4.10 The detailed application proposes single and two storey buildings with an access road off Chestnut Drive and dedicated parking around the buildings to allow for a buffer zone on the eastern side between the development and the county wildlife site to be established. The detailed application also shows areas of landscaping and materials which would be the same as those used on the existing northern units.

Principle of Development

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

4.12 JCS Policy 9 advises that 2,200 dwellings will be required in the Wymondham area within sustainable sites. Furthermore the NPPF directs that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing land cannot be considered up to date where a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites does not exist. Currently there is not a 5 year land supply for housing in the NPA. NPPF Section 6 also directs that for development to be considered within the aspect of the 5 year land supply issue it must be deliverable and viable.

4.13 The application site is considered to be a sustainable location as it is within walking and cycling distance of several key services and facilities and the proposal would not prejudice the supply of land for other purposes. The applicant is the owner of the land and it is therefore considered to be deliverable within the 5 year timescale.

4.14 JCS Policy 9 also dictates new general employment opportunities should be generated in Wymondham within a 20ha target of appropriate land. To consider an area of open countryside to provide general employment land the main issue for consideration regarding the principle of development would be whether the land is deliverable to meet an identified need. Failure to deliver the proposal would prejudice the development of other sites which may be suitable to provide for this use.

4.15 The applicant owns all of the land which forms those areas, both full and outline, which would provide for the employment land. We have also been party to discussions with potential end users for the elements which are under full detailed consideration. There is no evidence to suggest that the land owner will not bring forward these sites as the existing business park is reaching capacity. Long term investment has also been made in the form of infrastructure and an indicative plan is provided that shows how the areas marked as buffer zones could be developed if the owner of that land wishes to pursue development.

4.16 The sustainable location of the application site, the confidence which has been provided regarding the deliverability of the proposals and the need as detailed in JCS Policy 9 establish the principle of development as acceptable.

Highways

4.17 The outline application for the residential development details that access would be taken from the site directly onto Suton Lane. The elements of the application which are related to the employment sections will take their access directly onto Chestnut Drive.
4.18 Saved Policy TRA19 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development unless provision is made for parking, loading and turning areas in accordance with the County Council's adopted car parking standards. Should approval be forthcoming, these standards will form one of the main factors in the design of the overall layout at reserved matters for the outline elements of the application. The full application element details the provision of parking and access/turning areas which have not been objected to by the Highway Authority, and are therefore considered to comply with TRA 19.

4.19 Saved Policy IMP8 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.20 The Highway Authority have not objected to the access arrangements and the application is therefore considered to comply with Saved Policy IMP8.

**Design and Landscape**

4.21 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.

4.22 The residential element of the proposal would result in a density of 35 dwellings per hectare, which is considered to be less intensive than the existing development on the opposite northern side of the roundabout. The scale of development is detailed as being between two and three storey with the provision of landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular access, open space and car parking. However, the housing application is in outline form only and should the application be approved these precise design and layout details will be subject to reserved matters applications.

4.23 With regard to the housing element of the application Building for Life criteria have been addressed through the planning application details in accordance with JCS Policy 2. The application is in outline form and the layout is indicative. It is considered that from the details submitted that the application at the detailed reserved matter stage will be capable of meeting the Building for Life criteria in accordance with JCS Policy 2.

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

4.25 The detailed matters regarding the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques will also be addressed at the reserved matter/condition stage and there is nothing within the current application which would indicate that these requirements cannot be successfully incorporated into the development.

4.26 The design and layout of the employment units proposed as the full element of the application are considered to be in keeping with the existing business park units.

4.27 All elements of the application are considered to comply with the requirements of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 by virtue of the scale, density and appearance of the built form proposals.

4.28 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.

4.29 The housing element of the application is at a density which could provide for quality landscaping to be incorporated within the site and allow for the built form edge to be softened with landscaping so as not replicate the design outcome of the housing development on the opposite side of the road.

4.30 As detailed in the application a large section of existing open land between the housing and the employment site is to be retained as open land. This open land has on its northern boundary existing vegetation which would act as a visual buffer to the further employment units proposed.

4.31 The detailed application for the employment units shows the introduction of planting to break up the visual appearance of the car park and the creation of a buffer zone between the buildings and the county wildlife site.

4.32 The outline application elements provide for enough opportunities at reserved matters stages for quality landscaping to be introduced, which will supplement the retention of the open land and existing vegetation on the middle section of land. The level of planting proposed for the detailed planning application is considered sufficient to ensure that the proposed units retain the level of landscaping within the previously developed land and that car parking areas are not over dominant on the landscape. The application is considered to accord with Saved Policy IMP 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Ecology

4.33 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.

4.34 There are no statutory designated sites within the immediate locality of the application site. However, there is a County Wildlife Site abutting the site on the eastern edge of the detailed employment application area. The application details the creation of a buffer zone which reflects the strategy encompassed within the approvals for the existing business park. Should the application be approved a landscaping condition will be imposed and the buffer zone will be planted to the specification of the ecologist in order to maximise habitat protection and provision. All lighting will also need consideration through conditions to ensure that habitats are not disturbed.

4.35 The ecology report submitted with the application will also form part of any approved documents and as such the recommendation from that report will require to be implemented these include the installation of bat and bird boxes.

4.36 It is considered that by provision of the buffer zone and the use of appropriate conditions the application is in accordance with the intent of Saved Policies ENV14 and ENV15 and NPPF Section 11 and JCS Policy 1.
Residential amenity

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

4.38 The residential application is only in outline form but the density proposed is considered to be less than the development opposite. It is considered that the future site layout can be designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or impact in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms on the residential properties to the north or any other loss of privacy and amenity of these properties. The indicative site layout is considered to demonstrate this appropriately.

4.39 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 the B1/B2/B8 employment use and its hours of operation. The application has been considered by the Council’s Environmental Protection Unit and they have not objected. The hours of opening for the new development will be the same as those imposed on the remainder of the employment site.

4.40 As previously discussed any proposed lighting will be subject to conditions to ensure that light pollution is not an issue.

Affordable housing

4.41 JCS Policy 4 dictates that sites providing for 16 or more dwellings would have to provide for 33% affordable housing within their yield.

4.42 The application details that there would be seven dwellings for rent and one for shared ownership. The Housing Strategy Team has commented on the application and agrees that the mix and tenure proposed is suitable to the local needs and this will be secured through a Section 106.

Historical Assets

4.43 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.

4.44 Ivy Green Villa is an existing dwelling situated to the north of the site, it is a Grade II listed property. The dwelling benefits from existing mature vegetation on its boundaries which act as a visual and noise buffer from the surrounding commercial and residential developments. The development proposed contains a large area of open space to remain directly adjacent the listed dwelling which will provide direct protection.

4.45 The proposal by virtue of the separation distance, the green buffer zone/retained vegetation and the scale of development is not considered to impact negatively upon the integrity of the Grade II listed dwelling.

4.46 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 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. This work was undertaken and no objections to the development have subsequently been raised. A condition will be stipulated on any grant of approval requiring for watching brief to be commissioned and agreed.

Conclusion

The development would provide for housing and employment opportunities in accordance with the demonstrated need for the area. The dwellings and the employment use are considered to be deliverable and viable within a 5 year period and also within a sustainable location.

The provision of the housing and employment units could be achieved without impacting negatively on residential amenity, historic asset protection or highway safety. This is by virtue of the density of development being acceptable, the separation distance available between the existing and proposed developments and the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The development would result in a large area of the site being retained for a green buffer zone, enhanced landscaping and ecological benefits.

The employment section of the application is consistent with the Draft Wymondham Area Action Plan and the housing element is not of a scale that would undermine the plans delivery.

Reasons for Approval

The residential element of the application site is considered to be deliverable within 5 years and in a sustainable location in accordance with the direction of NPPF Section 6 and within a growth area as required by JCS Policy 9. The proposed employment provision is considered to comply with the requirements of JCS Policy 9 by virtue of its location, scale and deliverability. These factors allow for a departure from the local plan to be taken.

The residential development by virtue of its location, scale and density will not impact negatively on residential amenity or the general character of the locality in accordance with of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policies 2 and SNLP Saved Policy IMP9.

The employment uses proposed are considered acceptable as they are compatible with the existing business park, their operation will be controlled through conditions and they are separated from residential properties by planting and open space in accordance with requirements of SNLP Saved Policy IMP9.

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

The development provides for a 33% affordable housing provision to be supplied in accordance with JCS Policy 4.

Through the use of mitigation methods, habitat provision ad the creation of a buffer zone to the CWS the application is considered to comply with the intent of Saved Polices ENV14 and ENV15 and NPPF Section 11 and JCS Policy 1.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Ian Reilly 01508 533674 and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No** : 2012/1434/O  
**Parish** : WYMONDHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr S Biart  
Site Address : Land At Chapel Lane Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Residential development of up to 70 new dwellings, including associated access and parking, utilities and service infrastructure, amenity space, play area, open space and landscaping  

Recommendation : Refuse  

1. The development is outside the development limits, contrary to policies ENV3 and ENV8 and have a substantial harmful impact on the setting of Wymondham Abbey, contrary to local plan policy WYM12 and WYM13 and the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.  

2. Insufficient information on foul sewage odours.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
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 4 : Housing delivery  
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 20 : Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 3: River valleys
   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 2: Landscaping
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
   WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey Towers
   WYM 13: Protecting the setting of Wymondham Abbey

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0454 Screening opinion for residential development of up to 100 dwellings, associated garaging, parking, public open space, landscaping, highway, drainage and infrastructure works. EIA not required

2.2 1988/4598 Residential development of 320 dwellings. Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council Refuse - the application is contrary to policies ENV3, ENV13, ENV8, WYM12 and WYM13. It is also outside the current development boundary.

3.2 District Member Mr R J Savage To Committee - scale of development, contravention of policies WYM 12 and 13.

3.3 Shirley Bishop No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.4 Play And Amenities Area Officer No comments received

3.5 GNDP No comments received

3.6 Ecologist Despite my reservations about the report, I broadly agree with its conclusions; the area in which building is proposed is of relatively low ecological value. I also support the mitigation proposed but would suggest it needs to go further. The report recommends:

- The ditch and wetland habitats should be protected during construction and pollution prevention measures should be in place (paragraph 4.21);
- A detailed enhancement scheme should be conditioned (4.23) to produce real enhancements for biodiversity in line with the aim of the NPPF to move to achieving net gains for nature;
- New footpaths should be created in the meadows (4.24) to form/maintain a coherent usable network in perpetuity.
In addition, I would also wish to see:

- Some enhancement for water voles and reptiles given the probable use of the site by these species;
- Integration between the land outlined in blue and the county wildlife sites as part of a landscape-scale ecological network in line with local and national policies. **A joint biodiversity management plan is strongly recommended.**

3.7 Planning Policy  
The Senior Planning Policy Officer comments: - I am unable to support this application from a policy perspective. It is my view that the application should be refused as it is contrary to policies in the 2003 adopted SNLP and the JCS. Although the Council does not have a 5 year housing supply as required by the NPPF I consider that the adverse environmental impact that this proposal will have on the valued landscape setting of the town, abbey and river valley outweighs the potential social and economic benefits of building new houses in this location. Although emerging policies in the WAAP carry little weight in decision making at the current time this proposal is not a preferred site in the WAAP and would be contrary to the vision and objectives of the plan. In my view this is a sensitive site and there are other more suitable, available and deliverable sites that can accommodate new housing in Wymondham. I would be concerned that permitting this application could lead to pressure for further development in the valley in the future.

3.8 Landscape Officer  
See comments of the Council’s Landscape Consultant referenced in this report.

3.9 Conservation Officer  
I feel the site is not appropriate for development as concluded by the site specific assessment carried out earlier this year. I feel strongly that the development would harm the setting of the Abbey, the appreciation of the asset and the experience enjoyed along this approach to it. The lack of detail in the outline application makes a more detailed analysis difficult, but on the basis of the information submitted I feel the proposal would cause substantial harm on the setting of the Abbey as per paragraph 133 of the NPPF. I do not feel the public benefits outweigh the harm it would cause.

"In considering whether to grant planning permission which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Having concluded in my previous comments that the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the setting of the Abbey, a grade 1 listed building, it follows that the proposal would not preserve the setting of the Abbey and as such would be contrary to section 66 (1) of the Act.

3.10 Norfolk Wildlife Trust  
(Wymondham)  
No comments received
This Service still stands by its considerations that a very poor standard of information has been submitted by the applicant, with regard to potential land contamination, air quality impacts, noise, and foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works. These considerations are not unreasonable, as such information is normally provided with similar outline applications in South Norfolk, as has been the case with other recent major outline applications in Wymondham.

However, it is conceded that a development could potentially take place with appropriate mitigation for potential land contamination (on the supposition that a ‘greenfield’ site will not have gross contamination), air quality impacts, and noise. Therefore, if the Local Planning Authority is of this opinion, these aspects could be dealt with at a detailed application stage by appropriate conditions.

Separately from these aspects, this Service still believes that there is still insufficient information to determine whether foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works will cause detriment to the amenity of future residents that may not be satisfactorily mitigated by Anglian Water, or at least without entailing excessive cost. The submission of a wind rose and stating that the application site is outside of a 400 m Anglian Water buffer zone does not change this. The 400 m buffer zone is arbitrary, not an absolute zone where odour nuisance cannot occur. Whilst this Service maintains its objection on these grounds, we would withdraw them should some reasonable odour dispersion modelling demonstrate that there will not be significant adverse odours when the proposed residences are built and the additional flows from new development have been taken into account.

This Service still stands by it’s considerations that a very poor standard of information has been submitted by the applicant, with regard to potential land contamination, air quality impacts, noise, and foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works. These considerations are not unreasonable, as such information is normally provided with similar outline applications in South Norfolk, as has been the case with other recent major outline applications in Wymondham.

However, it is conceded that a development could potentially take place with appropriate mitigation for potential land contamination (on the supposition that a ‘greenfield’ site will not have gross contamination), air quality impacts, and noise. Therefore, if the Local Planning Authority is of this opinion, these aspects could be dealt with at a detailed application stage by appropriate conditions.

Separately from these aspects, this Service still believes that there is still insufficient information to determine whether foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works will cause detriment to the amenity of future residents that may not be satisfactorily mitigated by Anglian Water, or at least without entailing excessive cost. The submission of a wind rose and stating that the application site is outside of a 400 m Anglian Water buffer zone does not change this. The 400 m buffer zone is arbitrary, not an absolute zone where odour nuisance cannot occur. Whilst this Service maintains its objection on these grounds, we would withdraw them should some reasonable odour dispersion modelling demonstrate that there will not be significant adverse odours when the proposed residences are built and the additional flows from new development have been taken into account.

Will require financial contributions towards primary, secondary and sixth form provision. A contribution towards enhanced library provision will also be required.

No objection to the principle of providing 33% affordable housing. Require a higher proportion of the housing to be for rent in accordance with policy.

Application should be withdrawn to allow for the submission of an archaeological desk based assessment that fully considers the buried environment.

Additional information received from applicants – comments from Norfolk HES awaited.

The development of the site will erode the agrarian setting of the Abbey Church and result in harm to its significance. However, it is felt that the harm to the significance of the Abbey Church will be less than 'substantial harm' as defined in the NPPF. The degree of harm will therefore need to be weighed against the wider public benefits arising from the development.
Later correspondence received explains that “In this instance we have identified that the provision of affordable housing would be a public benefit, but consider there to be sufficient land available elsewhere in Wymondham where development would not result in harm to the Abbey, and conclude that it would not therefore outweigh the harm. In simple, general terms this amounts to an EH objection to the scheme.”

3.16 Natural England - EMAIL
   No objection - offer standing advice.

3.17 Anglian Water Services Ltd
   Require a site specific assessment to be submitted to determine the likely dispersion and intensity of odours generated by the STW.

3.18 Environment Agency
   No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.19 NCC Highways
   No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.20 Wymondham Heritage Society
   No comments received

3.21 Norfolk Police
   Holding objection - request developer contributions towards policing.

3.22 CPRE Norfolk
   Generally, we feel that the housing targets within the JCS are incompatible with our core objectives of protecting and enhancing the rural environment in the NPA and further a field.

Wymondham has already been overwhelmed by housing expansion leaving an historic centre that is full of character surrounded by homogenous unappealing suburbs.

The Tiffey valley is an historic and much loved area of ecological importance and should be protected from urbanisation.

3.23 Local Residents
   274 individual letters of objection received.

Several letters and reports received from Friends of the Tiffey Valley, objecting to the development.

Letter received from George Freeman - MP, objecting to the development.

The main points of concern raised are as follows:

- the detrimental impact of the development on the setting of Wymondham Abbey
- flooding issues
- detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Tiffey Valley
- loss of valued amenity land
- loss of valued wildlife habitat
- additional traffic impact on the local road network
- contrary to the development plan
- contrary to local plan policy, in particular river valley policy ENV3
4 Assessment

The Site and Proposal

4.1 The application site is located on the western side of Wymondham and comprises 3.6 hectares of agricultural field adjacent Chapel Lane. The site is located on the edge of the Tiffey Valley, with the River Tiffey running close to its southern boundary. The site is located wholly outside the development limits and partly within the River Valley policy area, which is protected under saved local plan policy ENV3 where inappropriate development will not be permitted. Existing residential development lies to the east of the site, as well as opposite the site to the north.

4.2 The application site is part of a wider area of land, also in the control of the applicant, which extends north-east between the railway and Chapel Lane, as far as its junction with Tuttles Lane West. The Mid-Norfolk Railway passes the site to the west, running alongside the river, and there are several permissive paths running across the wider site. The path along Frogshall Lane runs directly adjacent to the south of the development site. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1 to this report.

4.3 The application is in outline form only, and proposes the development of 70 dwellings, associated roads and open space. All matters other than access are reserved for future determination. An indicative layout plan has been submitted with the application, and the applicants have stated that they can offer 33% affordable housing in accordance with policy. The indicative layout is attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.4 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 Wymondham for further development of at least 2200 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 Wymondham 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.

- The landscape sensitivity of the site in respect of its river valley location, and its impact on the setting of Wymondham Abbey, a Grade 1 listed building.

- Other relevant sections of the NPPF.
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, particularly in respect of the sensitivity of the site and the potential harm to the character and appearance of the Tiffey valley and the setting of the Abbey. 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 requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability and the impact on the character and appearance of the Tiffey Valley (policy ENV3).
- The impact on the setting of Wymondham Abbey, required to be considered by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- Recent appeal decision at Townhouse Road, Costessey.
- Ecology
- Drainage & flood risk
- Air quality
- Highway Impact
- Indicative layout and design

The applicants have submitted a Heritage Statement, a Landscape and Visual Assessment, along with a planning statement in support of the application. The Council also commissioned a consultant to undertake an independent review of the landscape and visual assessment, and I have taken the findings of these reports into account in assessing the application.

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

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'.

Wymondham has been selected as a growth location because in general terms it provides for easy access to strategic employment opportunities and high quality transport routes.

Many residents feel that the site should not be considered ahead of specific sites being allocated for development through the Local Development Framework process. However, taking the above into account, the development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and the demonstrable lack of a housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

**Impact on the character and appearance of the Tiffey Valley (Local Plan Policy ENV3)**

The rural Tiffey Valley is highly important to the visual and land use setting of Wymondham Abbey. It provides a physical and historical expression of the synergy between the Abbey and its historic agricultural surroundings. It defines the character of the western edge of Wymondham, and provides for an attractive rural setting as you approach the town along Chapel Lane, adding to its local distinctiveness. This character is defined by the relatively steep slopes of the valley, set against a backdrop of trees in many parts. The importance of this valley is further supported by the creation of the Tiffey Trail, a succession of footpaths that has allowed the open surroundings to be enjoyed by visitors and local people.
4.11 Any erosion of this rural setting is highly undesirable in landscape and visual terms, and whilst the developer proposals only intrude into part of the valley, it clearly is undesirable and certainly inappropriate to develop this sensitive site when there are other more suitable and desirable sites in Wymondham that could accommodate the required housing growth. This point of view is reinforced by the fact that the following a site assessment and a significant amount of local objection, the site was not included within the list of preferred housing sites in the Wymondham Area Action, as there were better sites suited to housing development that could bring greater benefits to the town. In addition, alternative sites that could contribute to the 5 year under supply of housing are located in landscape areas of a much lower order of quality and sensitivity.

4.12 The views across the valley to the distinctive landmark of the Abbey towers are noted as being important within local plan policy ENV3, and this is acknowledged by the applicant in their own landscape visual impact assessment. (The impact on the setting of the Abbey is discussed in the following section.) However, notwithstanding the relationship of the valley with the Abbey, the strong rural character of views obtained from Chapel Lane into and across the river valley, the well-treed skyline, the absence of built development on the valley side of Chapel Lane, the visual contrast between the river valley and the built-up edge of Wymondham north of Chapel Lane, contribute to the visual experience associated with travelling on this approach road to the town.

4.13 Any new built development on the southern side of Chapel Lane would have a significantly more urbanising effect on views and local landscape character, and so the development of this site would be inappropriate and harmful to the character and appearance of the River Valley. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of local plan policy ENV 3.

**The impact on the setting of Wymondham Abbey**

4.14 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is clear in its requirement for Local Planning Authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to give special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Local Plan policies WYM12 and WYM13 also require the views of the abbey towers to be taken into account and the setting of the abbey to be preserved. Policy WYM13 is clear in its statement that development that is detrimental to the setting of the Abbey will be refused.

4.15 As already established above, the Tiffey Valley forms an important part of the setting of Grade 1 listed Wymondham Church Abbey. English Heritage have commented that historically the Abbey would have been closely associated with the open countryside from where the abbey would have acquired much of its wealth. This rural setting survives remarkably intact in an arc to the west of the church and this agrarian outlook is of high importance to the setting of the Abbey Church, which in turn makes a major contribution to the significance of the Abbey Church. Any erosion of this arc is likely to have a negative impact in the setting of the Abbey Church and result in harm to its significance.

4.16 The Council’s landscape consultant also agrees that the rural Tiffey Valley is highly important to the visual and land use setting of the Abbey. It provides a physical and historical expression of the synergy between the Abbey and its historic agricultural surroundings. Any erosion of this rural setting is highly undesirable in landscape terms and conservation of this rural setting is not dependent on any requirement for the two towers and roof of the Abbey to be seen together from a particular viewpoint.
The application proposes residential development on the edge of a ‘view cone’ that has been identified through an assessment of various viewpoints as you travel along Chapel Lane. It is also suggested that the development will create a new secondary gateway to Wymondham at the northwestern corner of the site. It is also proposed to create a “sensitively designed green edge/open space to ensure that the rural character of the valley is retained”, and an area of new residential development that would be designed “to respect views of the Abbey”.

The conservation of valued views towards the Abbey must address not only any potential obstruction of direct views but also protection of the space to the front and side of the Abbey (i.e. its setting space), which allows this historic building to be clearly seen and appreciated. This setting space is important to protect the integrity of the Abbey as a local landmark. Any development located in this setting space has the potential to detract from both the historic focus provided by the Abbey, and it’s setting in this protected rural valley.

The Wymondham Conservation Area Appraisal makes reference to how, on some approach roads to the town, “the Abbey is glimpsed periodically through hedges and trees which line the approach roads.” The periodic disappearance and reappearance of the Abbey in rural views and the changing foreground of those views contribute to the visual experience of approaching the town. The proposed development would remove the contribution that the section of Chapel Lane opposite the site makes to this visual experience.

The Council’s landscape consultant considers the applicant’s argument, that the revised development concept would retain the ‘best views’ of Wymondham Abbey, is not robust and does not recognise the importance of views from the section of the lane opposite the site. This high quality view of the Abbey is likely to be completely obstructed by the development. Whilst other existing views obtained from the section of Chapel Lane opposite the site are partially enclosed in some places by intermittent low roadside vegetation, the Abbey may still be appreciated as a local landmark that provides an important contribution to the distinctiveness of both Wymondham and the Tiffey Valley.

The detrimental effect on the setting of the Abbey and the character of views towards the Abbey is not restricted to the section of Chapel Lane near the site. In views from other sections of Chapel Lane located northwest of the site, the proposed housing would be a prominent new feature in the view and would intrude into the setting space of the Abbey. It would visually compete with the existing historic focus provided by the Abbey and would detract from the valued views out towards the rural Tiffey Valley.

English Heritage has concluded that the development of the site will erode the agrarian setting of the Abbey Church and result in harm to its significance. However, they also feel that the harm to the significance of the Abbey Church will be “less than 'substantial harm' as defined in the NPPF. The degree of harm will therefore need to be weighed against the wider public benefits arising from the development”. Further correspondence received from them has clarified this point and states that in their view the public benefits from the development “would not therefore outweigh the harm. In simple, general terms this amounts to an EH objection to the scheme.”

The NPPF sets out the weight that should be given to the protection of heritage assets in paras. 132, 133 & 134 of Section 12:

“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification…. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably……grade I and II* listed buildings should be wholly exceptional.”
“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss….”

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

4.24 The applicants suggest that through limiting numbers and arranging houses so that green spaces are located in more sensitive positions, the impact on the setting of the listed building can be outweighed by the public benefit of the scheme. However, the Council’s Conservation Officer states that the view of the Abbey across Chapel Meadows is a unique one, and that the development would substantially harm the special rural association of the setting of the Abbey at the western edge of Wymondham. This harm is not outweighed by the potential public benefits. The provision of affordable housing will be delivered across all major housing sites, and is not dependent on the delivery of this scheme.

4.25 For the above reasons, the development would have a substantial detrimental impact on the setting of a heritage asset (Wymondham Abbey) and is therefore contrary to the requirements of local plan policies WYM12, WYM13, Section 12 of the NPPF and the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Recent appeal decision at Townhouse Road, Costessey

4.26 It is acknowledged that previous planning decisions, particularly those taken at appeal, are material considerations that can carry significant weight. I am conscious therefore of the Counsel’s opinion submitted by the applicant in support of the application. This considers that the two of the main issues in the Costessey appeal are materially identical to the issues in this application, namely whether the proposal is necessary to meet the housing needs of the area, and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Incidentally, the two developments also happen to be similar in scale. Using the applicant’s conclusion that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, the QC has concluded that it would be unlawful for the Council to refuse the development on the grounds of landscape impact. (Members will note that in the Costessey appeal in spite of the Inspector’s conclusion that there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, such harm, did not, in her assessment, outweigh the need to address the 5-year land supply shortfall, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.)

4.27 The presumption in favour of sustainable development and the lack of a 5-year housing supply are clearly strong considerations in favour of approving this application. However, the two sites are completely different in landscape character and quality, with the Wymondham site being much more sensitive, and the proposed development sited within an open valley area, that forms an important element of the setting of a grade 1 listed building, none of which applied to the site at Townhouse Rd, Costessey. Furthermore, officers had concluded that the landscape setting of the Costessey site was not sensitive, although the Inspector differed in her opinion that the impacts of the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the landscape. Taking this approach and reasoning, it must surely be undeniable that in a much more sensitive location at Wymondham, the impacts of the development would be even more significant. Taken together with the clear harm to the setting of the Abbey, the Council would be perfectly entitled to reach the conclusion that this harm outweighs the public benefits of housing supply, in spite of the acknowledged shortfall in 5-year land supply. In this case the harm to the Tiffey Valley and the setting of the Abbey render development of the site unsustainable.
4.28 I have concluded that the two sites are substantially different in terms of landscape setting and potential impacts, and that the Chapel Lane site can be assessed on its own merits, and should members decide that the landscape impact is harmful enough to warrant a refusal of permission, they would not be acting unreasonably.

Ecology

4.29 The site is described as being an area of intensively managed grazing land. I am aware of concern locally about the disturbance to the ecology of the area, and I am also mindful that the wider site becomes a wetland habitat for a temporary period during times of flooding. However, the District Ecologist has concluded that the site itself is in an area of relatively low ecological value, and with appropriate mitigation to protect and enhance the wider area beyond the application site, there is no objection to the application. I note however that the Ecologist makes reference to the importance of the Tiffey Valley as an ecological network, adding further weight to the fact that it should be protected from inappropriate development both now and into the future.

Drainage and Flood Risk

4.30 Local residents commented upon perceived additional flood risk attributable to the development. However, the site is outside flood zones 2 and 3, and is therefore at low risk of flooding from existing watercourses. The applicants have submitted a drainage scheme and flood risk assessment (FRA) that proposes a combination of SUDS and attenuation to restrict surface water flows to existing Greenfield levels. It is not intended to connect drainage directly into existing watercourses. The Environment Agency has been consulted and is satisfied that the FRA has adequately considered the drainage implications of the development, and that the detailed design can be considered by condition.

4.31 In terms of foul water, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate flows from the development.

4.32 Taking the above into account the development is considered to accord with the requirements of Section 10 of the NPPF.

Air quality

4.33 Anglian Water have raised concern in respect of there being a lack of an adequate air quality assessment in respect of the potential for foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works to cause detriment to the amenity of future residents that may not be satisfactorily mitigated against. This concern is echoed by the Council’s Area Environmental Health Officer, who is of the opinion that there is still insufficient information to determine whether foul sewage odours from the sewage treatment works will cause detriment to the amenity of future residents that may not be satisfactorily mitigated by Anglian Water, or at least without entailing excessive cost. An objection is maintained on these grounds.

Highway impact

4.34 The application proposes a new 5.5 metre wide access directly onto Chapel Lane, and would be designed to accommodate 35mph visibility splays. The location of the access has been located as far south as possible to maximise pedestrian opportunities for travel to the town centre. I note concern has been expressed locally about the additional impact on the existing road network, however NCC: Highways raise no objection to the scheme, which is considered to accord with local plan policy IMP8 in this regard.
Indicative layout and design

4.35 The applicants have submitted an indicative masterplan / layout that shows how the site could be developed taking account of its context and to minimise its impact on the existing views of Wymondham Abbey, and the design Officer has assessed the scheme against the requirements set out in the Building for Life guidance (as required by JCS Policy 2).

4.36 Whilst internally the scheme does show potential for creating good areas of public open space, there is limited information that explains how the development will create well-designed streets and homes with a legible layout. The site is also sustainable in terms of proximity to local services. Where the scheme is considered to significantly fail is where it attempts to integrate into its surroundings. As already explained, the development will change the character of the area by interrupting views into the river valley and of the Abbey from Chapel Lane when approaching Wymondham from the northwest.

4.37 The South Norfolk Place Making Guide (adopted SPD) identifies the importance of these views and the need to protect them to ensure that the distinctive settlement pattern is respected at plateau edge locations. The SPD also highlights the requirement to carefully consider the impact of the development on skyline views and the sense of ‘openness’, particularly views from the lower tributary farmland. It is felt that the introduction of development into the river valley would significantly harm this character and fail to respect the existing boundaries of the development site.

4.38 I have therefore concluded that the proposal has not met the requirements of Section 7 of the NPPF, and JCS Policy 2 (Promoting Good Design), and the relevant sections of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. Furthermore, given the above conclusion that this site is inappropriate for development due to its harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Abbey, a development on this site is unlikely ever to be acceptable in respect of the requirements and aims of the Place Making Guide and JCS Policy 2.

5 Conclusions

5.1 The application site, lies outside the development boundary and is sensitive in landscape and visual terms. It is located on the northern side of the Tiffey Valley, which has protected status under Policy ENV3 (River Valleys). Views may be obtained across the site towards Wymondham Abbey, the setting of which is protected under Policy WYM13 (Protecting the Setting of Wymondham Abbey). Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is clear in its requirement for Local Planning Authorities in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

5.2 The rural Tiffey Valley is highly important to the visual and land use setting of Wymondham Abbey. It provides a physical and historical expression of the synergy between the Abbey and its historic agricultural surroundings. Any erosion of this rural setting is highly undesirable in landscape and visual terms.

5.3 The conservation of valued views towards the Abbey must address not only any potential obstruction of direct views but also protection of the space to the front and side of the Abbey (i.e. its setting space), which allows this historic building to be clearly seen and appreciated. This setting space is important to protect the integrity of the Abbey as a local landmark. Any development located in this setting space has the potential to detract from both the historic focus provided by the Abbey and its setting in this protected rural valley.
5.4 The applicant’s argument that the revised development concept would retain the ‘best views’ of Wymondham Abbey is not robust and does not recognise the importance of views from the section of the lane opposite the site.

5.5 The detrimental effect on the setting of the Abbey and the character of views towards the Abbey is not restricted to the section of Chapel Lane near the site. In views from other sections of Chapel Lane located northwest of the site, the proposed housing would be a prominent new feature in the view and would intrude into the setting space of the Abbey. It would visually compete with the existing historic focus provided by the Abbey and would detract from the valued views out towards the rural Tiffey Valley.

5.6 The introduction of new built form on the upper and mid slopes of the valley would, with or without the proposed ‘pull-back’ illustrated by the Illustrative Masterplan, detract from the rural, predominantly open character of the valley. This proposed built form would significantly intrude into the valley and have an urbanising effect on the rural character of the designated valley.

5.7 The development proposal would have significant adverse effects on the character and views of the Tiffey Valley and on the landscape and visual setting Wymondham Abbey. Access and green infrastructure improvements in the Tiffey Valley should be encouraged but their delivery, along with a policy required percentage of affordable housing, should not be dependent upon approval of new built development that would result in the significant adverse effects identified above.

6 Reasons for refusal

6.1 The development is outside the development limits of Wymondham and would significantly harm the landscape character and appearance of the area, and represents inappropriate development in the sensitive Tiffey Valley, contrary to local plan policies ENV3 and ENV8. The development would have a substantial harmful impact on the setting of Wymondham Abbey (a grade 1 listed building), contrary to local plan policy WYM12 and WYM13 and the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6.2 Due to the substantial harm to the setting of a grade 1 listed building, the development is not sustainable and does not accord with the requirements for sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

6.3 Insufficient information has been received to adequately determine the whether foul sewage odours from the nearby sewage treatment works will cause detriment to the amenity of future residents that may not be satisfactorily mitigated by Anglian Water. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of par. 9 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee

27 February 2013

5. **Appl. No**: 2012/1644/O  
   **Parish**: CRINGLEFORD  
   **Applicants Name**: Norfolk County Council  
   **Site Address**: Land West Of School Cantley Lane Cringleford Norfolk NR4 6UG  
   **Proposal**: Outline Planning application for residential development and associated works including new access

   **Recommendation**: Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   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 4: Housing delivery  
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area

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 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise  
   LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land

1.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance  
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD

Subject to a Sec 106 regarding affordable housing provision, library and education payments.
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1713 FULL Planning Permission and conservation area consent for 2 no dwellings along with OUTLINE permission for 12 no dwellings

2.2 2012/1714 Conservation area consent for demolition of temporary classrooms and prefabricated lightweight structures

4. **Consultations**

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council Recommends approval. Concerns raised regarding the pattern and density of development shown on the indicative site layout.

3.2 District Member: Cllr Christopher Kemp There is considerable local feeling about these applications. The existing school premises and site are seen as cherished community assets. In the interests of transparent and accountable democratic decision-making, all three applications ought to be decided in Public by the elected members of the Development Management Committee.

3.3 NCC Highways No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.4 Sport England No objections.

3.5 Design Officer A Building for Life assessment has been carried out and the application scored moderately. The main areas of concern are related to the indicative layout plans and its relationship with the existing settlement pattern.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections subject to conditions

3.7 Environment Agency No objections subject to conditions

3.8 Housing Strategy Manager No objections

3.9 NCC- Planning Contributions required for education.

3.10 Planning Policy No objections raised. The following comments have been provided: The application site is partly within the adopted development boundary for Cringleford within the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, but with a large portion of the site outside the development boundary. Residential development would not normally be permitted on those parts of the site outside the development boundary unless material considerations dictated otherwise.

Cringeford Parish Council are currently preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan which will supersede elements of the Local Plan for Cringleford. Whilst at the time of writing a new development...
boundary has not been identified, the draft Plan does identify land to the south west of the application site as a potential allocation for residential development.

Cringleford falls within the Norwich Policy Area where there is a significant shortfall in providing a five-year land supply as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is a significant material consideration in considering planning applications for new residential development as recent appeal decisions have suggested applications for residential development should be approved unless there are fundamental reasons why the site is not suitable for development.

The site falls within the Norwich Southern By-pass Protection Zone and therefore needs to be considered under policy ENV6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. However, the site is already enclosed by existing development on three sides and should the proposals in the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan be adopted the site would become entirely enclosed by development. It would effectively therefore be severed from other land covered by this designation and as a consequence have little value in the context of a landscape protection zone for the Norwich Southern By-pass or its successor policy in the emerging Development Management policies DPD.

Finally, the proposed development involves the loss of a playing field and therefore policy LEI8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan is relevant though clearly replacement amenity land will be provided as part of the new school development.

3.11 Local Residents

Eight letters of objection have been received and raise the following issues:

- There is a lack of parking/garages which will lead to on street parking
- The Listed Building will not be maintained properly if used for affordable housing
- There should be an increase in the affordable housing provision
- Drainage needs to be properly controlled to ensure that Cantley Lane does not flood.
- The layout is not reflective of the set backs which the existing houses on Cantley Lane have
- The development will damage the Yare Valley characteristics
- Cringleford is an expanding community and may need this site for a future school
- The noise survey is not fit for purpose and the recommendations are not sufficient to achieve their aims
- The density of housing is too high and not in keeping with Cringleford area
- The trees and hedgerows should be retained as much as possible
- The roads and footpaths on Cantley Lane all need to be improved and upgraded
- The traffic movements will increase around the locality
4. **Assessment**

**Site Context**

4.1 The application site is located within the village of Cringleford and bounded by the A11 Newmarket Road to the north and Cantley Lane to the south. The western boundary adjoins the school buildings and hardstanding area which is subject to planning applications 2012/1713 and 2012/1714. To the west of the application site is a doctor's surgery and veterinary clinic.

4.2 The application site is currently used as school playing fields with a mature tree belt on the northern boundary, south western boundary and a line of tress in the eastern portion of the playing field which creates a natural separation within the field. Levels are uneven within the site, with levels falling away to the south west.

4.3 The site is at a significantly lower level than the A11 Newmarket Road to the north, which together with the existing landscaping along the northern boundary limit views of the site.

4.4 The surrounding pattern of development includes a mix of single and two storey houses/bungalows to the south of Cantley Lane and single storey veterinary building and doctors surgery to the south west.

4.5 To the east of the site lies the remainder of the school site, which includes a number of buildings of varying styles and ages, with the most eastern buildings falling within the Cringleford Conservation Area.

4.6 Planning permission has recently been granted for a new replacement 420 place primary school within the Roundhouse Park development to the north of the A11 Newmarket Road (County Council Planning Permission Y/7/2011/7010). Work is currently underway, with the new primary school scheduled to open in September 2013. As part of the reorganised school programme, it has been agreed that any funding obtained through the sale of the land will be used to help finance the new school building programme.

**Proposal**

4.7 The application seeks outline approval for the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. The application seeks approval for the erection of 24 dwellings on 1.10 ha of land, with the indicative layout making provision for six bungalows.

4.8 The application proposes detailed access arrangements with all other matters reserved. The access is proposed to be taken onto Cantley Lane at a central point within the southern boundary of the site.

4.9 The application details the provision of affordable housing units at a level of 33%, which equates to eight dwellings. Seven for rent and one for intermediate tenure.

4.10 The application is supported by parameter plans which detail that the site can accommodate 24 single and two storey dwellings with off street parking, a central children’s play area, retention of the majority of the mature vegetation and vehicular access point with footpaths. The application is in outline form only and the site layout plans are indicative.

**Principle of development**

4.11 The majority of the application site is located outside of the development boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan; therefore the application should be refused unless there are other development plan policies and/or material considerations which would dictate otherwise. It should be noted that the site abuts the development boundary on its eastern boundary.
4.12 Saved policy HOU4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) states that residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements will be permitted subject to it not prejudicing the supply of land for other purposes.

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

4.14 The application site is considered to be a sustainable location as it is within walking and cycling distance of several key services and facilities and the proposal would not prejudice the supply of land for other purposes.

4.15 NPPF Section 6 also directs that for development to be considered within the aspect of the 5 year land supply issue it must be deliverable and viable. The application site is programmed to cease functioning as a school by September 2013 and is entirely in the ownership of the applicant. It also considered that there are no known constraints associated with the site in relation to its physical development.

4.16 Therefore by virtue of the sustainable location and deliverability of the site the principle of development is considered to be established due to the lack of a 5 year land supply for housing. The acceptability of the application should be determined on its merits as detailed below.

**Design and Landscape**

4.17 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.

4.18 The application proposes a mix of dwelling types at a density of approximately 21 dwellings per hectare. This density and the mix of single and two storey dwellings is considered to be appropriate when examined against the existing development pattern and the potential impacts on the conservation area to the east. The layout provided is indicative and would be subject to reserved matter approval. Any future application to address the reserved matters would be expected to show dwellings with a distinct setback from Cantley Lane, as is the pattern of development in the locality.

4.19 The application is in outline form and should approval be forthcoming the use of materials and the design and layout of the dwellings will be subject to reserved matters applications.

4.20 The planning application indicative site layout plan recognises the importance of the existing vegetation on site and the plan demonstrates that the dwelling yield proposed can be achieved with a high level of tree retention, however this is only a strategic approach and until the reserved matters application would be submitted precise details of vegetation retention cannot be provided. This approach coupled with the introduction of new planting would ensure that the development is capable of complying with the requirements of Saved Policy IMP2.

4.21 The application site is also currently within the SNLP Policy ENV2 - Areas of open land that maintain physical separation and Policy ENV6 - Areas which contribute to maintaining landscape setting areas.
4.22 The site is located between the existing doctors and vets surgeries to the west and the school buildings to the east. The purpose of Saved Policies ENV2 and ENV6 would be to resist inappropriate isolated development which would impact on the strategic aims of these policies. The development of the application site is considered to be an infill proposal within an urban setting which would not undermine the wider landscape protection aims of policies ENV2 and ENV6.

4.23 From the details submitted the application at the detailed reserved matter stage will be capable of meeting the Building for Life criteria in accordance with JCS Policy 2 and that the planning application is in accordance with the main aims of the Place making SPD.

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

4.25 The detailed matters regarding the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques will also be addressed at the reserved matter stage and there is nothing within the current application which would indicate that these requirements cannot be successfully incorporated into the development.

Highways

4.26 Saved Policy TRA19 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development unless provision is made for parking, loading and turning areas in accordance with the County Council's adopted car parking standards. Should approval be forthcoming, these standards will form one of the main factors in the design of the layout at reserved matters.

4.27 Saved Policy IMP8 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.28 The application proposes to create a single vehicular access to serve the 24 dwellings from the mid point on the southern boundary; this access would be directly onto Cantley Lane.

4.29 The Highway Authority have not objected to the access arrangements and have also taken into consideration the access arrangements proposed through the adjoining application 2012/1713. The application is therefore considered to comply with Saved Policy IMP8.

Affordable housing

4.30 JCS Policy 4 dictates that sites providing for 16 or more dwellings would have to provide for 33% affordable housing within their yield.

4.31 The application indicates seven dwellings for rent and one for intermediate tenure. These dwellings could include the provision of bungalows. The Housing Strategy Team has commented on the application and agrees that the mix and tenure proposed is suitable to the local needs and this will be secured through a Section 106.

Residential amenity

4.32 Saved Policy IMP9 - Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents through overlooking and/or overshadowing of habitable rooms, damage to the setting of existing buildings or damaging impacts on the privacy or amenity of nearby dwellings.
4.33 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors, this policy obviously links with the protection of residential amenity.

4.34 The indicative site layout plan demonstrates that 24 dwellings can be accommodated for without detriment to residential amenity in the form of overlooking or over shadowing on existing properties.

4.35 The site is also acknowledged to be close to the A11 and as such the developer has produced a noise assessment report which recommends that some of the dwellings within the application site should have 1.8m high close boarded fencing and specialised glazing.

4.36 Due to the application being in outline form it is accepted that the site layout may alter with further planning applications. Therefore it is considered necessary that conditions related to noise control measures be attached to any grant of approval and to ensure that the development is in accordance with Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

**Loss of Playing Field**

4.37 The application has come forward due to the relocation of the school and the new provision of playing fields and sports facilities within the new school site. The application has been referred to Sport England who have advised that the application site provides for playing fields which are not considered to be of a high level of quality and that due to the new provision of playing fields they have no objection to the site being developed for residential purposes.

**Conclusion**

4.38 The application site although located mainly outside of the development limits is in a sustainable location for development and would represent a form of infill development when the existing and surrounding planned developments are taken into account.

4.39 The parameter plans accompanying the application are sufficient to demonstrate that 24 dwellings can be accommodated on site whilst retaining mature vegetation and providing for open play space.

4.40 The provision of a new school will ensure that the locality has adequate playing pitch provision at a higher quality than the application site could offer.

4.41 The access arrangements proposed have been recommended for approval by the Highway Authority and all other matters are reserved.

5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application. The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and the application can be accepted as a departure from Saved Policies ENV 2 and ENV6.
5.2 The masterplan and supporting documents have demonstrated that the site can be developed with regard to the existing design principles of the locality and therefore subject to appropriate conditions the application is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2.

5.3 The development would provide for 33% of the units being for affordable housing. The mix of house type and tenure is considered to comply with aims and objectives of NPPF Section 6 and JCS Policy 4.

5.4 The local highway network can accommodate the increased level of traffic which would result from the development and the access is considered acceptable therefore the application is considered to accord with SNLP Saved Policy IMP8.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail:       ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2012/1713/F  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD  
Applicants Name: Diocese Of Norwich  
Site Address: Land At School Cantley Lane Cringleford Norfolk NR 4 6UG  
Proposal: FULL Planning Permission and conservation area consent for 2 no dwellings along with OUTLINE permission for 12 no dwellings  
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions  
1. Outline Permission Time Limit (C)  
2. Standard outline requiring RM (C/e)  
3. In accordance with approved details  
4. Surface Water Drainage  
5. Contaminated Land  
6. Remediation scheme  
7. Contaminated land during construction  
8. Noise reduction/protection  
9. Fire Hydrants  
10. Standard Estate Road (C)  
11. Standard Estate Road (C)  
12. Standard Estate Road (C/e)  
13. Garages, Size and Retain for parking (C)  
14. Provision of parking, not on plan (C/e)  
15. Access, turning areas and parking for plots 1 and 2 to be provided  
16. Archaeological work to be agreed (C)  
17. Foul sewage scheme  

7. **Appl. No**: 2012/1714/CA  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD  
Applicants Name: Diocese Of Norwich  
Site Address: Land At School Cantley Lane Cringleford Norfolk  
Proposal: Conservation area consent for demolition of temporary classrooms and prefabricated lightweight structures  
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions  
1. Conservation Area Consent Time Limit  
2. In accordance with the approved plans  

1. **Planning Policies**  
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
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 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD  

2. Planning History  

2.1 2012/1644 Outline Planning application for residential development and associated works including new access  
Pending  

2.2 2002/1867 Erection of flat roof extension to house new changing facilities  
Approved  

2.3 1995/1573 Extension of Cringleford CEVA First and Middle School playing field  
Approved  

3. Consultations  

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council  
Recommend approval. Concerns raised regarding the layout.  

3.2 District Member – Cllr Christopher Kemp  
There is considerable local feeling about these applications. The existing school premises and site are seen as cherished community assets. In the interests of transparent and accountable democratic decision-making, all three applications ought to be decided in Public by the elected members of the Development Management Committee.  

3.3 Sport England  
No objections  

3.4 Historic Environment Service  
No objections, condition recommended  

3.5 NCC Highways  
No objections. Conditions recommended.  

3.6 Ecologist  
No objections  

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objections subject to conditions  

3.8 Consideration Officer  
No objections. The following comments have been provided: Part of the school buildings are within the Conservation Area boundary. The earlier 19th century building at the east end is a significant one in the context of the Conservation Area closing the view at that end of the green, while being of interest in its own right.
This part of the school building is being retained and converted to two units alongside some later buildings at the rear, this would have a positive impact on the area.

There are some modern extensions and temporary classrooms at this end of the site whose removal would not be objectionable, but the majority of the school, part of which is outside the Conservation Area, was designed by local architects Tayler and Green in 1968. It has a distinctive T&G character and while the present form and appearance has changed from the design on the approved plans, it remains essentially intact.

3.9 English Heritage  No objections to the demolition works as the Tayler and Green elements of the school buildings have been altered over time and are not being considered for listing or of such significance that demolition should be resisted.

3.10 Housing Strategy Manager  No objections

3.11 Environment Agency  No objections

3.12 Local Residents  One letter of objection has been received regarding the proposed developments. However, a further eight were received for the neighbouring application which raise issues associated with the development of both sites. The objections are summarised below:

- There is a lack of parking/garages which will lead to on street parking
- The Listed Building will not be maintained properly if used for affordable housing
- There should be an increase in the affordable housing provision
- Drainage needs to be properly controlled to ensure that Cantley Lane does not flood.
- The layout is not reflective of the set backs which the existing houses on Cantley Lane have
- The development will damage the Yare Valley characteristics
- Cringleford is an expanding community and may need this site for a future school
- The noise survey is not fit for purpose and the recommendations are not sufficient to achieve their aims
- The density of housing is too high and not in keeping with Cringleford area
- The trees and hedgerows should be retained as much as possible
- The roads and footpaths on Cantley Lane all need to be improved and upgraded
- The traffic movements will increase around the locality

4  Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site is located within the development limits of Cringleford and the eastern part of the site is also within the Cringleford Conservation Area. To the north of the site is the A11 and to the west is the school playing fields which are subject to planning application 2012/1644. The site is bound on its southern side by Cantley Lane and residential properties. The eastern portion of the site contains a two storey Georgian building with a principle elevation which faces east towards Keswick Road and a village green area.
4.2 To the rear of the Georgian building is a single storey pitched roof extension and further detached school buildings and play areas. The applicant has submitted a conservation area consent application to demolish the buildings to the rear which are not attached to the main Georgian school house.

4.3 The northern boundary towards the A11/Newmarket Road is well vegetated, with the south and eastern boundaries containing lower level fencing and planting. Vehicular access to the site is gained on the southern boundary.

4.4 The site is at a significantly lower level than the A11 Newmarket Road to the north, which together with the existing landscaping along the northern boundary limit views of the site.

4.5 The surrounding pattern of development includes a mix of single and two storey houses/bungalows to the south of Cantley Lane and single storey veterinary building and doctors surgery to the west.

4.6 Planning permission has recently been granted for a new replacement 420 place primary school within the Roundhouse Park development to the north of the A11 Newmarket Road (County Council Planning Permission Y/7/2011/7010). Work is currently underway, with the new primary school scheduled to open in September 2013. As part of the reorganised school programme, it has been agreed that any funding obtained through the sale of the land will be used to help finance the new school building programme.

Proposal

4.7 The application proposes to demolish all of the school buildings on site apart from the Georgian house and its attached rear single storey extension.

4.8 The development application submitted is a hybrid for both outline and full planning consent to develop the site for residential purposes.

4.9 Full planning permission has been sought for the conversion of the Georgian building into two dwellings. The internal layout of the building would be completely altered apart from the staircase, externally the development would add two doors and a window. The application details the creation of two vehicular access points on the southern boundary directly onto Cantley Lane.

4.10 The outline element of the application proposes residential development which would consist of up to twelve dwellings, four of which would be for affordable housing.

4.11 The application is in outline form only and the site layout plans are indicative, however they demonstrate that two vehicular entrances and 14 dwellings of up to two storeys can be accommodated whilst retaining the majority of the mature vegetation.

Demolition works

4.12 Saved Policy IMP16 directs that the demolition of buildings in the conservation area should only take place if the building is beyond repair; or is incapable of reasonably beneficial use or it is of an inappropriate design which its removal will allow for the immediate replacement with a development more in keeping with the conservation area.

4.13 The buildings to be demolished were designed by Tayler and Green, however over time these have been added to and altered. English Heritage were consulted on whether they considered the Tayler and Green buildings to be worthy of listing. English Heritage advised that they had previously considered this issue and had decided that due to the alterations and amendments to the Tayler and Green school extensions that they did not proceed with any listing for the structures.
It is considered that the school buildings proposed to be removed have no heritage merits in being retained and that the demolition of the structures will actually enhance the appearance of the site. Their reuse within a residential scheme is not considered to be appropriate due to the impacts on delivering/viability of the site, especially when the buildings are not considered to be of any significant heritage value.

Their demolition will allow for a residential scheme to be delivered and will ensure that the site is not left abandoned and derelict in the conservation area. The application is considered to comply with Saved Policy IMP16.

Principle of Development

The application site is located entirely within the development boundary of Cringleford. Policies 9 and 10 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets clear targets for growth in the Norwich Policy Area. It is expected that Cringleford will provide at least 1,200 new dwellings in the period up to 2026. As such the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the growth objectives of JCS Policies 9 and 10.

Saved policy HOU4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) states that residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements will be permitted subject to it not prejudicing the supply of land for other purposes. The use of the site for a residential use will not prejudice the supply of land for other uses. The principle of a residential use on the site is therefore considered to be in accordance with Saved Policy HOU4 of the SNLP.

Conservation Area Impacts

The eastern portion of the application site containing the Georgian building and the single storey rear extension are located within the Cringleford Conservation Area. There are other buildings within this area of the site which have been programmed to be demolished and removed, these works are subject to a separate conservation area consent application.

Saved Policy IMP18 – Development in Conservation Areas, directs that development proposals in conservation areas or adjacent will not be approved unless the proposals blend with the area in terms of scale, height, form and massing, with emphasis on the pattern of frontages, design detailing and the spaces between buildings.

The full application is associated only with the conservation of the existing building it does not propose any further floorspace provision and the conservation area consent to demolish will declutter the appearance of the rear of the school area when viewed from the street frontage.

The use of the retained buildings as residential and the introduction of further residential to the west would not conflict with the integrity of the conservation area. Furthermore the limited amount of external alterations proposed to these buildings to be retained will protect the built elements of the conservation area within the application site.

Sustainable Development

The NPPF requires a presumption in favour of sustainable development identified that by its economic, social and environmental dimensions. Furthermore the NPPF clearly directs that should be approved without delay where there is no conflict with planning policy.

The location of the site within the development limits ensures that the site is considered to have good access to services and transport links and in regard to those factors is considered to be sustainable and in accordance with the direction of the NPPF and JCS Policy 7.
The application is accompanied by ecological documentation which demonstrates that the demolition works and development could be carried out without any significant negative impact to biodiversity and therefore the intent of JCS Policy 1 can be successfully adhered to.

**Design and Landscape**

Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS and NPPF Section 7 require for all new development to be built to the highest possible standards creating a strong sense of place, located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and be adapted to a changing climate and more extreme weather. Additionally design guidance is also provided through the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD.

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

The application is in outline form but is however accompanied by parameter plans and an indicative layout which show that 14 dwellings can be accommodated on site in a density not dissimilar to that surrounding, which will therefore allow for a high level of design standards including site layout to be implemented at the reserved matter stage in accordance with the main aims of the Place making SPD.

The detailed matters regarding the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques will also be addressed at the reserved matter stage and there is nothing within the current application which would indicate that these requirements cannot be successfully incorporated into the development.

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

Precise details of landscaping for the outline element are reserved for later consideration and by virtue of the strategy of retention and supplementary planting proposed there is not considered to be any conflict with Saved Policy IMP2 of the SNLP.

**Highways**

Saved Policy TRA19 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development unless provision is made for parking, loading and turning areas in accordance with the County Council’s adopted car parking standards. Should approval be forthcoming, these standards will form one of the main factors in the design of the overall layout at reserved matters stage and the full application is considered to be acceptable.

Saved Policy IMP8 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

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

4.35 JCS Policy 4 dictates that sites providing for 10-15 dwellings would have to provide for 30% affordable housing within their yield.

4.36 The application details that there would be 4 dwellings for affordable provision. The Housing Strategy Team has commented on the application and agrees that the mix and tenure proposed is suitable to the local needs and this will be secured through a Section 106.

Residential amenity

4.37 Saved Policy IMP9 - Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents through overlooking and/or overshadowing of habitable rooms, damage to the setting of existing buildings or damaging impacts on the privacy or amenity of nearby dwellings.

4.38 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors, this policy obviously links with the protection of residential amenity

4.39 The indicative site layout plan demonstrates that 14 dwellings can be accommodated for without detriment to residential amenity in the form of overlooking or over shadowing on existing properties.

4.40 The site is also acknowledged to be close to the A11 and as such the developer has produced a noise assessment report which recommends that some of the dwellings within the application site should have 1.8m high close boarded fencing and specialised glazing/ventilation.

4.41 Due to the main part of the application being in outline form it is accepted that the site layout may alter with further planning applications. Therefore it is considered necessary that conditions related to noise control measures be attached to any grant of approval and to ensure that the development is in accordance with Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Conclusion

4.42 The demolition of the Tayler and Green Buildings is considered acceptable given how they have been unsympathetically altered by the school and that their retention is not justified. The demolition of the buildings will allow for the development of the site within an acceptable timescale that would benefit the appearance of the conservation area.

4.43 The site is in the ownership of the applicant and is considered to be deliverable and therefore beneficial to the current 5 year land supply position.

4.44 The principle of the residential development is considered to acceptable by virtue of the site being located within the development limits.

4.45 The development density proposed is of a scale which is in keeping with the characteristics of the locality and the indicative layout plan demonstrates that the development could be established without eroding the existing residential amenity.

4.46 The access arrangements proposed have been recommended for approval by the Highway Authority and all other matters are reserved on the outline elements of the application.
5. **Reasons for approval**

**2012/1713 – FULL Planning Permission and conservation area consent for 2 no dwellings along with OUTLINE permission for 12 no dwellings**

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

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

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

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

5.5 The development would not undermine the integrity of the conservation area and the proposed residential development could enhance the appearance of the conservation area in accordance with Saved Policy IMP 18.

6. **2012/1714 - Conservation area consent for demolition of temporary classrooms and prefabricated lightweight structures**

6.1 The demolition works would result in the removal of buildings which are not considered suitable for retention within a residential development and which hold no historical merits which would warrant refusal of the application in accordance with the SNLP Saved Policy IMP16.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/1716/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Three Swans Property Management Ltd  
Site Address: Barkers Mill Bocm Pauls Ltd Right Up Lane Silfield Wymondham NR18 9ND

Proposal: Outline application for construction of 14 dwellings

Recommendation: Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

- Outline Permission Time Limit
- Standard outline requiring
- In accordance with submitted drawings
- External materials
- Slab level to be agreed
- Ecology mitigation
- Landscaping details
- Contaminated land
- Water efficiency
- Surface water drainage
- Renewable energy
- Detailed plans of roads
- Roads in accordance with approved plans
- Construction roads prior to occupation
- Visibility splay
- Widen road and Provide footpath
- Foul water drainage
- Arboricultural details

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for a commuted sum for affordable housing provision in the event that is it is viable to provide the required affordable housing or part thereof at the time of implementation of the planning permission.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 13: Main Towns  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside  
Policy 20: Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV 15: Species protection
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1544 Screening opinion for residential development of 14 dwellings Environmental Impact Assessment not required

2.2 2012/1256 Replacement permission to extend time limit for implementation of development-demolition of redundant mill buildings and associated structures and construction of 14 dwellings Withdrawn

2.3 2012/1250 Request for Screening Opinion in respect of demolition of mill buildings and erection of 14 dwellings Environmental Statement not required

2.4 2009/0531 Demolition of redundant mill buildings and associated structures and construction of 14 dwellings Approved

2.5 2008/1568 Demolition of redundant mill buildings and associated structures and construction of 14no. dwellings Refused

2.6 2007/2613 Demolition of redundant mill buildings and associated structures and construction of 14no dwellings Withdrawn

2.7 2001/2086 Residential development Approved

2.8 Prior to 1993 Applications relating to development as part of the former mill use.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Should be approved.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Shirley Bishop Request conditions regarding soil investigation and percolation tests, sustainable drainage system and water conservation.
3.4 Nick Bolton - NCC  
Site likely to be used by protected species.  
Recommends conditions regarding site clearance, retention of vegetation and enhancements in section 6.4.2 of the ecology report June 2012 with the exception of proposed hibernacular to the southwest of the site.  
Recommends condition to require a mitigation method statement and timetable to be submitted at the time of implementation.

3.5 NCC Highways  
Recommends refusal.  
Does not provide adequate off site pedestrian provision to link with existing provision and local services.  
Does not have adequate access to appropriate public transport provision.  
Road serving site is inadequate to serve the development.

3.6 Planning Policy  
Outside Development Limit defined in South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.  
Brownfield site  
Principle of development accepted as permission for housing previously granted on site.  
14 unit proposed already included in housing land supply calculations as it had planning permission prior to 2008 base date of Joint Core Strategy.  
Not a preferred option in the Area Action Plan due to its inclusion in JCS base date.  
Surrounded by land proposed in the Area Action Plan for up to 1,200 houses.  
Application should have regard to JCS policies 1, 2, 3 and 4.

3.7 Landscape Officer  
No objection.  
Suggests conditions requiring arboricultural assessments and landscape details.

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Agree with recommendations for remediation work set out in the submitted application.  
Recommend conditions regarding contaminated land remediation

3.9 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager  
Under JCS Policy 4, 30% affordable housing is sought. This equates to 4 affordable homes.  
Would like 2 x two bedroom house; 1 x three bedroom house; and 1 x four bedroom house.  
Agree the development does not currently support the delivery of affordable housing.  
No objection subject to a commuted claw back sum being payable in the event that viability improves.

3.10 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
To be reported.

3.11 Environment Agency  
Recommend condition regarding land contamination.  
Request Anglian water consulted re waste water. Reconsult EA if AW does not have capacity.
3.12 Design Officer - Chris Watts
Building For Life evaluation scores 10 greens and two ambers, thus satisfying Policy 2 of the JCS.

3.13 Norfolk Police
Comments regarding parking layout. May require financial contribution towards delivering Police services to address community safety, tackle fear of crime and crime reduction.

3.14 Local Residents
I letter of support making the following comments:
- Road outside site is cracking and breaking up and causing flooding
- Residential dwelling will improve our outlook
- Potential access to additional amenities like mains drainage and water
- No objection to a small community of 14 dwellings

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is in outline with all matters reserved and seeks planning permission for 14 dwellings. Outline planning permission was previously granted under application ref 2009/0531 for demolition of redundant mill buildings and associated structures and construction of 14 dwellings in July 2009. Since this time the buildings have been removed from the site and that permission has lapsed. The site is currently hard surfaced with some piles of rubble and is partly overgrown by vegetation. The site fence is partly overgrown with vegetation and there are solid metal gates across the entrance to the site.

4.2 The main issues in this case are: the principle of development in this location; impact on the character and appearance of the area; highways; residential amenity; biodiversity; contaminated land; and servicing.

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.

Principle of development

4.4 Outline planning permission was granted in 2004 for 14 dwellings under application ref 2001/1086 on the front part of the site. In 2009 under application ref 2009/0531 outline planning permission was granted for 14 dwellings on the same site area as the current application. The reasons for approving these proposals as a departure from Local Plan Policy were the benefits to be derived from the removal of the buildings and the commercial use. The schemes were also considered to be a more sustainable form of development than the use of a greenfield field site because it would utilise a brownfield site in reasonable proximity to Wymondham. These applications have expired. Therefore, the site does not currently benefit from planning permission for residential development. All the buildings on the site were demolished in 2009. These historic approvals are a material consideration in the assessment of the current application.

4.5 The site is located outside the Development Limit for Wymondham. The JCS identified Wymondham as a location for 2200 dwellings. Wymondham is the subject of an emerging Area Action Plan (AAP). The preferred Options are currently out to consultation until 22 March 2013. The 14 units that previously had planning permission on this site are included in the housing land supply calculations for the District because the site had planning permission prior to the 2008 base date of the JCS. The site is not a preferred option in the AAP because it is already included in the JCS land supply calculations. However, the site is surrounded by land proposed in the AAP for up to 1200 houses, this is the preferred option for the majority of residential growth identified in the JCS that still needs to be
accommodated in Wymondham. Therefore, development of the site would fit with the Vision and Objectives of the emerging Wymondham AAP. It should be noted that whilst the SNLP and JCS form part of the adopted Development Plan, the Wymondham AAP is emerging policy and is therefore not adopted Policy. Applications for planning permission should normally be determined in accordance with adopted Development Plan Policy unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The emerging policy context is a material consideration.

4.6 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires that local planning authorities maintain a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide at least 5 years worth of housing. Wymondham is within the Norwich Policy Area as defined in the JCS. Within the Norwich Policy Area the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF are not met. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

4.7 There are existing undetermined applications for residential development under application refs 2011/0505 and 2012/0371 on land surrounding the application site for 500 and 730 dwellings and associated facilities respectively. However, the application proposal for 14 dwellings could be implemented independently of these neighbouring proposals. These neighbouring proposals are currently contrary to adopted Development Plan Policy and the applications remain undetermined at the time of writing. Applications for planning permission should be determined on the basis of the situation at the time of determination. In this case the site is surrounded by countryside and is outside the built up area of Wymondham.

4.8 For the reasons set out above the refusal of the application purely on the basis that the site falls outside the currently adopted Development Limit would be difficult to justify.

4.9 Policy 4 of the JCS expects 30% affordable housing be provided. This would equate to four affordable dwellings. The submitted application seeks to demonstrate that it is not financially viable to provide affordable housing on this site because of the costs associated with the re-development of a brownfield former mill site. The applicant has submitted a development appraisal which has been assessed by the Councils Property Consultant. It has been concluded that the submitted visibility appraisal substantiates the case that the proposed development does not currently support the delivery of affordable housing. However, it is possible that the viability of the development will improve by the time of implementation. Therefore, a S106 agreement is proposed to secure a commuted sum in lieu of on site affordable housing in the event that the viability/ profitability of the scheme changes at the time of implementation.

**Character and appearance of area**

4.10 The site occupies a prominent position set in open fields. The former mill buildings had an adverse visual impact on the area. A development of 14 dwellings on part of the former mill site would have less of an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area than the former mill development did. The proposed density of development has regard for the existing neighbouring residential development to the southeast. The retention and enhancement of existing landscaping around the boundaries of the site could provide continuity with existing landscape features and provide a sympathetic transition into the countryside.

4.11 At the time of determination of the applications for development of neighbouring land the assessment of those applications will need to take into account any permissions already given on the application site.

4.12 The Building for Life evaluation scored 10 greens and two ambers and therefore satisfies the relevant requirement of Joint Core Strategy Policy 2.
Highways

4.13 Norfolk County Council Highways consider the unclassified road serving the site to be inadequate to serve the proposed development because of the restricted width of the road and the lack of passing provision and consequently consider the proposal would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety. In addition they have advised that the proposal does not adequately provide off site facilities for pedestrians and people with disabilities to link with existing provision and the development would not have adequate access to public transport provision.

4.14 At the time application ref 2009/0531 was approved, Norfolk County Council Highways objected to that development for the same reasons set out in the above paragraph. However, the application was approved on the following grounds relating to the issue of highway safety: a) permission had recently been granted without such requirements; b) the applicants did not control the land required to secure the improvements; c) the extent and cost of improvements were disproportionate to the scale of development; d) Right-Up Lane is a cul-de-sac serving agricultural land, the former mill and a small number of dwellings; e) the proposal would remove the mill traffic from the lane; and f) some matters could be resolved at reserved matters stage.

4.15 Since that decision was taken the site has been cleared and it is therefore unlikely that the site as it currently stands would generate the level of traffic that the former mill use did. Consequently reason ‘e’ from the above paragraph no longer carries the weight it did at the time of determination of application ref 2009/0531. However, the remainder of the reasons for departing from Highways advice at that time are still applicable to the current application. The fact that planning permission has previously been granted on two occasions for 14 dwellings in this location is a material consideration.

Residential amenity

4.16 The use proposed is unlikely to impact adversely on nearby residential property. The details of the relationship between the proposed and existing properties can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

Biodiversity

4.17 The Distinct Councils Ecologist has confirmed that subject to the conditions the proposal should not have an adverse impact on protected species or their habitat.

Contaminated land

4.18 The former use of the site results in the potential for contamination of the site. The application is accompanied by reports regarding potential contamination on the site. Adequate remediation could be carried out to ensue that the land is fit for the proposed use. This can be secured by condition.

Servicing

4.19 The provision for car and cycle parking and refuse storage will form part of the reserved matters stage, as will the requirements of Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy. Relevant conditions are proposed to cover these matters.

Drainage

4.20 The provision of surface water drainage facility will form part of the reserved matters stage. A relevant condition is proposed to cover this matter.

Surface water drainage

4.21 Foul water drainage – Comments from Anglian Water to be reported.
Conclusion

4.22 For the reasons set out above there are other material planning considerations that warrant departing from the presumption of determining applications in accordance with currently adopted policy as well as departing from the advice of the local highway authority. The assessment of the application has established that aside from the policy and highway implications the development should not cause significant or unreasonable harm to identified interests.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies 15 and 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. In this case there are other material planning considerations that warrant departing from the presumption of determining the application in accordance with currently adopted policy as well as departing from the advice of the local highway authority. The assessment of the application has established that aside from the policy and highway implications the development should not cause significant or unreasonable harm to identified interests. Outline planning permission was granted in 2004 for 14 dwellings on the front part of the site and in 2009 outline planning permission was granted for 14 dwellings on the site. It is a more sustainable form of development than the use of a greenfield field site because it would utilise a brownfield site in reasonable proximity to Wymondham. The development of the site would fit with the Vision and Objectives of the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan. Within the Norwich Policy Area the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF are not met. A S106 agreement secures payment of a commuted sum in lieu of on site affordable housing in the event that it is viable to provide the affordable housing. Dwellings would have less of an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area than the former mill development did. The density of development has regard for the existing neighbouring residential development. The site could provide continuity with existing landscape features and provide a sympathetic transition into the countryside. The Building for Life evaluation scored 10 greens and two ambers. The use proposed is unlikely to impact adversely on nearby residential property. Subject to the conditions the proposal should not have an adverse impact on protected species or their habitat. Adequate remediation could be carried out to ensue that the land is fit for the proposed use.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/1883/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Mr M Crook  
**Site Address**: Wymondham Rugby Club Tuttles Lane East Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0EP

**Proposal**: Extension of time limit to planning permission 2008/2092/F- Relocation of Wymondham Rugby Football Club from land at Tuttles Lane East to land north of Norwich Common (B1172), between Carpenters Farm and Elm Farm (FULL) and the redevelopment of existing rugby club ground site for a C2 retirement care community, once the rugby club has been relocated (OUTLINE). Proposals for the C2 retirement care community will be submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for access which is to be determined.

**Recommendation**: Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

**Rugby Ground**
1. Full permission time limit  
2. Amended plans  
3. Materials to be agreed  
4. Programme of archaeological evaluation  
5. Landscaping scheme  
6. Retention of trees and hedges  
7. Hours of use of clubhouse  
8. Lighting as submitted details  
9. Detailed plans of road/footways to be submitted  
10. Works to agreed specification  
11. Visibility splays  
12. Drainage of access  
13. Provision of parking area  
14. Off-site highway improvements  
15. Foul drainage  
16. Surface water drainage rates as Flood Risk Assessment  
17. Phasing

**Retirement Care Community**
1. Outline permission time limit  
2. Submission of reserved matters  
3. Materials  
4. No development until new rugby ground developed to an agreed level  
5. Landscaping scheme  
6. Retention of trees and hedges  
7. Travel Plan  
8. Surface water drainage rates as Flood Risk Assessment  
9. Foul drainage

Subject to Section 106 Agreement limiting occupation to those in need of intimate personal care.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- 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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
LEI 1: Extensive and noisy leisure uses (Part Consistent)
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Design Guide SPD

2. Planning History

2.1 2008/2092
Relocation of Wymondham Rugby Football Club from land at Tuttles Lane East to land north of Norwich Common (B1172), between Carpenters Farm and Elm Farm (FULL) and the redevelopment of existing rugby club ground site for a C2 retirement care community, once the rugby club has been relocated (OUTLINE). Proposals for the C2 retirement care community will be submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for access which is to be determined.

2.2 2008/1375
Proposed relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club and proposals for C2-LED Development

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council
No objections

3.2 District Members:
Cllr D Bills
Cllr L G P Dale
To be reported if appropriate
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation, Design and Landscape
No objections

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)
No objections

3.5 Highways Agency
No objections
Development Management Committee

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager
   No objections

3.7 Sport England
   No objections.

3.8 Environment Agency
   No objections

3.9 NCC Highways
   No objections

3.10 Economic Development Manager
   No objections

3.11 Local Residents
   Seven letters of representation have been received. Six of these letters are objections and raise the following issues:
   - The rate of development in Wymondham is not at the same pace as improvements to infrastructure and services
   - Access arrangements for the retirement care home are not sufficient as this should be directly off Tutles Lane and not through the Whispering Oaks development.
   - Access through the residential estate will lead to accidents due to the streets being used for parked cars and playing children
   - Construction traffic management

   One letter of support has been received however, this also raises the issue of access to the retirement care home.

4 Assessment

Proposal

4.1 The application submitted is for the extension of time for a previously approved proposal, 2008/2092. The proposal was a hybrid of an outline application and a full application. The full application detailed the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club with an outline consent granted for a retirement care home to be located on the rugby ground.

4.2 The report which accompanied the application and detailed the development is attached as appendix 2.

4.3 The application under consideration does not propose to alter any of the previously approved details.

Considerations

4.4 In considering an application for an extension of time government guidance (Greater flexibility for planning permissions, Communities and Local Government) advises the following:

   ......local planning authorities should, in making their decisions, focus their attention on development plan policies and other material considerations which may have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.

4.5 In this instance the development plan policies which have been introduced are those contained in the NPPF and JCS.
4.6 Although further developments have been obtained in the locality and Whispering Oaks has continued to be built out, they do not significantly alter the context of the proposal and so are not new material considerations. This development itself would have been a material consideration within any subsequent neighbouring application decisions and so its impacts will have been fully considered within the cumulative effect of development in the area.

4.7 The development would provide for increased and enhanced sporting facilities within the Wymondham community this is in accordance with NPPF Policy 8 and JCS Policies 7 and 8.

4.8 The increased provision of care home facilities in the Wymondham area is supported directly by JCS Policy 7.

4.9 In terms of the overall proposal the impacts on residential amenity, highway safety, design and ecological issues have not changed and the new policy provisions of the NPPF and JCS are considered to be consistent with the aims and objectives of the policies which the application was assessed against previously.

4.10 Issues raised by the objections are not considered to raise any issues which have not been considered within the previous decision making process and it should be noted that neither the Highway Authority or Highways Agency have objected to the proposal during this consultation period.

Conclusion

4.11 The application has not altered in form or in terms of its proposed outcome from that previously approved by planning committee. New planning policy introduced, in the form of the NPPF and JCS, since that approval have added weight to the decision through strategic advice that Wymondham requires an increased level of care home provision and that sports and recreation facilities should be improved, especially in areas of growth.

4.12 It is also considered that there are no new material considerations which would warrant refusal of the application.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposed development has not altered and the application is considered to comply with the new policy provisions of the NPPF and JCS, furthermore there have been no new material considerations raised or noted which would warrant refusal of the application.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major Applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. Appl. No : 2008/2092/F
   Parish : WYMONDHAM
   Applicants Name : Mr N Sharp
   Site Address : Wymondham Rugby Club, Tuttles Lane East and Norwich Common, Wymondham
   Proposal : Relocation of Wymondham Rugby Football Club from land at Tuttles Lane East to land north of Norwich Common (B1172), between Carpenters Farm and Elm Farm (FULL) and the redevelopment of existing rugby club ground site for a C2 retirement care community, once the rugby club has been relocated (OUTLINE). Proposals for the C2 retirement care community will be submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for access which is to be determined.

Recommendation : Authorise Director of PHBE to approve

Rugby Ground
Full permission time limit
Amended plans
Materials to be agreed
Programme of archaeological evaluation
Landscaping scheme
Retention of trees and hedges
Hours of use of clubhouse
Lighting as submitted details
Detailed plans of road/footways to be submitted
Works to agreed specification
Visibility splay
Drainage of access
Provision of parking area
Off-site highway improvements
Foul drainage
Surface water drainage rates as Flood Risk Assessment
Phasing
Retirement Care Community
Outline permission time limit
Submission of reserved matters
Materials
No development until new rugby ground developed to an agreed level
Landscaping scheme
Retention of trees and hedges
Travel Plan
Surface water drainage rates as Flood Risk Assessment
Foul drainage

Subject to Section 106 Agreement limiting occupation to those in need of intimate personal care and satisfactory ecology details and referral to government office
Main Planning Committee

1. Assessment

1.1 Introduction

The proposal is a hybrid application containing two elements and seeks

Full planning permission for the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club from their current site to the north of Tuttes Lane East to land north of Norwich Common and

Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the existing rugby ground site for a retirement care community once the rugby club has been relocated

1.2 The current rugby site is located to the north of Tuttes Lane East and has an area of 3.88 hectares. It contains a brick clubhouse, two pitches and a car park. Access to the site is currently obtained from Tuttes Lane East but it is proposed to close the existing access and gain access through the Whispering Oaks development. The site is bounded by residential properties to the south and west with the new Whispering Oaks development to the east. There are open fields to the north. Good natural screening exists on all boundaries.

1.3 The proposed site for the relocated rugby ground has an area of 10.9 hectares and is located between Carpenters Farm and Elm Farm to the north of the B1172 (Norwich Common). The site is currently in an area of mainly open countryside but there are dwellings to the south of the site and immediately opposite the proposed access to the B1172. There are hedgerows and trees on the boundaries of the site. The site would provide six new pitches, mini pitches, training areas, a two-storey clubhouse, 240 car parking spaces and floodlighting.

1.4 Once the rugby club has been relocated the existing ground would be redeveloped as a retirement care community containing an 80 bed care home, 66 two bedroom apartments, 25 elderly mentally infirm beds and an on site administration block, surgery, pharmacy and shop. It is also proposed to have on site communal facilities including a restaurant, bar and social and leisure facilities.

1.5 The application has been submitted with a wide range of supporting documentation including transport assessment, noise report, flood risk assessment, lighting report and an elderly needs assessment.

1.6 A plan showing the location of the sites is attached as appendix 1. Layout plans of the new rugby ground and the proposed retirement care community area are attached as appendix 2 and 3 respectively.

2. Planning Policy

2.1 There are a number of saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan which relate to this development the most relevant of which are

SP 4 – Impact on infrastructure
SP 9 – Main objectives for recreation and leisure
LEI 1 – Extensive and noisy leisure uses
LEI 8 – Loss of recreational or amenity land
ENV 1 – Protection of landscape
ENV 2 – Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area
ENV 8 – Development in the open countryside
3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council
: No objection to new rugby ground but object to retirement care community
  - Outside development boundary
  - Contrary to policy ENV 8
  - Traffic impact on B1172 and B1135

3.2 Hethersett Parish Council
: No objections
  - Welcomes retirement care community
  - Opportunity for Hethersett residents to access sports facilities
  - Important that ongoing protection is given to the land between Hethersett and Wymondham and that rugby ground does not act as precursor for other development
  - Consideration should be given for right turn facility into rugby ground

3.3 District Members
Mr D Cox
: To be determined by Committee
  - Outside development boundary

Mr I Dale
: To be determined by Committee
  - Outside development boundary

3.4 Wymondham Heritage Society
: No response received

3.5 Wymondham Community Partnership
: No response received

3.6 NCC: Planning Obligations
: Commuted sum would be required for landscaping and maintenance if on land adopted as part of highway

3.7 NCC Highways
: No objections subject to conditions

3.8 NCC: Adult Social Services
: Support in principle the retirement care community
  Full response attached as appendix 4

3.9 Highways Agency
: No objections subject to condition in respect of travel plan

3.10 Norfolk Landscape Archaeology
: No objections subject to condition re
  - Programme of archaeological evaluation
3.11 Sports England

: No objections as complies with exception E4 of playing fields policy. Requests conditions in respect of:
  - New rugby ground to be provided prior to any commencement on retirement care community
  - Assessment of ground conditions
  - Lighting to be agreed

3.12 Natural England

: No comments to make

3.13 Environment Agency

: Original Comments
Retirement Care Community Objects
  - Within flood zone 3b - at high risk of flooding in the 1 in 20, 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year flood events
  - Development proposed is classed as 'more vulnerable' in PPS25
  - No sequential test

Rugby Club
Objected to original flood risk assessment
  - Flood Risk Assessment does not provide suitable basis for assessment
  - Surface water management

Following receipt of revised Flood Risk Assessment

No objections to retirement care community or rugby ground subject to conditions

3.14 Anglian Water Services Ltd

: No objections subject to
  - Grampian condition preventing development until existing system upgraded to provide further capacity

3.15 Environmental Services (Protection)

: Original comments
Further information required - in its absence object
  - No capacity in existing foul sewer system
  - Lack of clarification re ownership of watercourses
  - Inadequate noise information
  - Inadequate lighting information
  - No information on emissions from biomass boilers

Following receipt of additional information
No objections subject to conditions

3.16 Ecologist

: Further information required

3.17 CABE

: No comments
3.18 Sports Development Officer

Supports the application

3.19 Local Residents

Rugby Club
2 letters of support
- Continuation of rural character
- Clubhouse should be re-sited
- 40 mph speed limit should be extended as far as Elm Farm
- Full access along public footpath should be retained
14 letters of objection
- Access road appears positioned to open up potential for developing adjoining field
- Access road should be sited some 10 metres from eastern boundary
- Planting strip required
- Noise – both from rugby use and possible social events
- More suitable alternative sites
- Erosion of rural character and habitat
- Visual intrusion
- Additional traffic on already busy road

Amended Plans

7 further letters of objection
Rugby Club
- Horrified at scale of proposal
- 3 times as large as current ground

Retirement care community
- Should be no building on filled in ditch
- Whispering Oaks unsuitable to accommodate additional traffic
- Danger to children using play area
- Access from Tuttles Lane should be provided
- Just another attempt at overdevelopment in the Norwich Common area

4. Assessment

Rugby Ground

4.1 The applicants state that the catalyst for the development is the needs of the rugby club whose membership has risen from 70 in 1980 to 1060 in 2008. As a result their current facilities are inadequate and cannot cope with the current volume of players and matches. There are inadequate changing facilities and car-parking problems have arisen.

4.2 The proposed site is outside of the development boundary but supporting information has been provided that no other alternative sites within the area are available. It is also within the “Countryside Gap” where Policy ENV 2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to protect from inappropriate development, which would undermine the openness of the area.
4.3 Leisure and recreation facilities are not defined as inappropriate development. Notwithstanding the club house that is proposed the proposal would generally maintain the openness of the area and would not erode the essentially rural character of the area. Consequently I consider that the proposal would not be contrary to Policy ENV 2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.4 The proposal would result in the loss of an existing recreational facility. Policy LEI 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to resist the loss of existing recreational facilities unless there is an overprovision in the area or where enhanced facilities are being provided. The proposal clearly provides an enhanced facility for the area and is in accordance with Policy LEI 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Sport England does not object to the proposal and the Town Council and Hethersett Parish Council also support the relocation.

4.5 Objections to the relocation have however been received from nearby residents. These objections primarily relate to visual intrusion, impact on residential amenity and traffic generation.

4.6 With regard to visual intrusion the site does have some good existing screening, which can be enhanced by the imposition of appropriate conditions. The clubhouse is likely to be visible from public vantage points but has been well designed and will not be overly intrusive in the landscape. A revised lighting report provides for a much improved scheme which will not result in light pollution and Environmental Services have no objections to this aspect of the scheme. Overall I am satisfied that the proposal would not be overly detrimental to the visual amenities of the area or have an adverse impact on the general open nature of the area. I consequently consider that the proposal would accord with Policies ENV 1 and IMP 25 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.7 Concerns regarding the impact on residential amenities relate primarily to noise both from activities on the site and from the additional traffic likely to be generated by the scheme. A noise report has been provided and Environmental Services are satisfied that there is sufficient distance between the rugby games to domestic residences to allow noise reduction to a reasonable level of noise and they do not raise any objections on this basis. There is a match day car park in relatively close proximity to houses but this is unlikely to be used at unsociable hours. There is also ample parking next to the clubhouse, which is likely to be the most heavily used area for parking. This is some distance away from houses and its use will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the nearby occupiers. There will be additional traffic generation but given the volume of traffic that already uses the B1172 I do not consider that this would result in conditions that would adversely affect residential amenities to such a degree that a refusal could be justified. The proposal consequently complies with Policies IMP 8 and 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.8 A number of residents have also expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed rugby ground on highway safety. A full traffic assessment has been provided and neither the Highway Agency nor Norfolk County Council Highways raise any objection to the proposal. I consequently do not consider that an objection on highway safety grounds could be sustained and the proposal consequently complies with Policy IMP 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Retirement Care Community

4.9 As stated above outline consent only is sought for the retirement care community.
All matters are reserved for future approval except for the new access to the site, which is proposed to be via the new Whispering Oaks development.

4.10 The site of the current rugby ground is outside of the settlement limit for Wymondham. Policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to resist development outside of the settlement limit except in certain circumstances, which are not relevant in this case. The Town Council and some local residents object to the proposal on this basis. As it is contrary to policy the retirement care community aspect of the proposal should be refused unless Members consider that there material considerations of sufficient weight to justify approval.

4.11 The retirement care community would have the facilities as described in Section 1 above. It should be noted that the proposal is not normal housing which would fall into class C3 of the Use Classes Order. Occupation of any of the units would be limited by Section 106 agreement, to persons over 65 who are in need of personal care and subscription to one of the care packages on offer would be a compulsory requirement. As such the use would fall under class C2.

4.12 The applicants have provided a needs assessment report, which concludes that in South Norfolk there are some 771 bed-spaces for the elderly in residential care homes and nursing homes. Of these there are a maximum of 501 bed-spaces in single rooms with en-suite facilities, which is a minimum requirement both in terms of market expectation and National Care Homes standards.

4.13 The report states that there are currently 988 people in the district, giving a shortfall of some 487 bed-spaces. The need for such accommodation is likely to increase in the future and is estimated to be 1298 in 2017 rising to 1847 in 2028. The Needs Assessment Section of the Planning Statement submitted with the application is attached as Appendix 5.

4.14 The applicants consider that the under provision of accommodation providing care in the district is a material consideration of great weight. Norfolk County Council Adult Social Services whose response is attached as Appendix 4, also generally support the scheme and I must conclude that this a material consideration which should be given considerable weight. Although outside the development boundary the site is relatively close to a range of facilities and is not inappropriate for the use proposed.

4.15 As outlined above a number of objections have been received to this aspect of the scheme. The overwhelming majority of these relate to the proposed new access to the site via the Whispering Oaks development.

Residents consider that this would be a danger to highway safety, particularly given the proximity of a play area. However the Highways Authority has not raised any objections and I consequently do not consider that an objection on these grounds could be sustained.

Drainage

4.16 As members will be aware there are drainage problems within Wymondham. The Environment Agency did originally object to the scheme but following the submission of a revised Flood Risk Assessment are satisfied with the proposals for surface water drainage and have removed their objection subject to various conditions being imposed on any approval.
4.17 Foul drainage from both sites will go to a pumping station on the Whispering Oaks development where it will be pumped to the existing treatment works via a new rising main. As such it will not impact on the current drainage system in Tuttles Lane and whilst final details remain to be resolved neither Anglian Water or Environmental Services object to the proposals.

Referral to Government Office

4.18 If members accept the recommendation the application, because of its size and by virtue of it being contrary to policy would need to be referred to the Government Office for the East to determine whether they wish to call in the application.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal to relocate the rugby ground will allow the rugby club to expand and flourish. Although the site is within the countryside gap, a leisure use is not deemed to be inappropriate development and subject to conditions the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on either the character of the landscape or adjoining residents. Subject to the final comments of the Ecologist no objections have been received from technical consultees and the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan as listed in Section 2.1 above.

5.2 The use of the current rugby ground for a retirement care community would be contrary to Policy ENV 8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. However the benefits to be gained from the relocation of the rugby club and the provision of care accommodation, of which there is a current shortfall, are considered to be material considerations of sufficient weight to justify an approval contrary to normal policy. Subject to the final comments of the Ecologist no objections have been received from technical consultees and the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan as listed in Section 2.1 above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  
Paul Whitham, 01508 533814, pwhitham@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Minor Applications

10. **Appl. No**: 2012/2080/F  
    **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Mr M Halls  
**Site Address**: Church Of St Mary & St Thomas Church Street Wymondham  
Norfolk

**Proposal**: Two new single storey extensions to the southeast and northeast of the church, with new railings and path within the east monastic tower

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. **Full Planning permission time limit**
2. **In accordance with submitted drawings**
3. **Contaminated land - submit scheme**
4. **External materials to be agreed**
5. **Stonework panel**
6. **Details junction new and existing**
7. **Specific details to be agreed.**
8. **Make good repairs**
9. **Full details of external lighting**
10. **Tree protection**
11. **Service details**
12. **Retention of trees and hedges**
13. **Archaeological investigation**

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   - NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
   - 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 7: Supporting Communities
   - Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities 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
   - ENV 3: River valleys
   - IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)
   - IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
   - IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)
   - TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
   - ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)
   - ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value (Part Consistent)
UTL 15: Contaminated land
WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey Towers
WYM 13: Protecting the setting of Wymondham Abbey
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

2. Planning History

2.1 2004/0927 Proposed erection of 3no storey extension to southeastern end of Wymondham Abbey Withdrawn

2.2 2001/1415 Erection of two storey and single storey extension at Eastern End of Abbey Approved

2.3 1998/1825 Demolish and rebuild approx. 12metre length of wall abutting Becketswell Road to original design and height using original materials Approved

2.4 1997/0438 Extension to building to provide toilet facilities Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Should be approved subject to views of the Conservation Officer

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Conservation Officer No objection in principle. Design approach ensures minimum intervention to historic fabric. Opportunity to significantly enhance area by removing unsightly fence, oil tank and redundant brick flue. External elevational treatment is simple in detail. Sedum and wildflower roof appropriate. Extension to south east overall scale is appropriate. Careful consideration has been given to relationship between old and new. Relates positively to character of existing building. High quality contemporary design solution. Sustainability, energy use, energy efficiency, renewable energy technologies have been carefully considered as an integral part of the design process. Positively support proposals as distinctive C21 additions. Recommend approval subject to conditions regarding: external materials; details of junctions between old and new; details of glazing, PV cells, shading louvre's, door, green roof and external railings; details of unblocking of opening; and making good.

In response to the comments from English Heritage: matters can be controlled by condition or are internal works outside the scope of the planning application.

3.4 English Heritage Do not wish to comment in detail. Support principle of providing new facilities Support internal alterations. Welcome scale and form of southern extension roof Do not wish to oppose terne coated steel material for roof Suggest alternative arrangement for roof-lights
Comments regarding eaves detail of roof
Coursed rubble masonry better than ashlar for south extension
Green roof to northern extension is acceptable.
Concern about whether the sedum will flourish in this location.
Comments regarding the detail of internal proposals.

3.5 Landscape Officer
No comments received

3.6 Nick Bolton - NCC
Submitted surveys are fit for purpose.
Recommend condition regarding bat habitat protection.

3.7 Historic Environment Service
Submitted mitigation strategy considered appropriate.
Request conditions regarding a scheme of investigation.

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)
Recommends condition regarding ground contamination

3.9 Twentieth Century Society
No comments received

3.10 Ancient Monuments Society
No adverse comments.
Scheme based upon a professional understanding of the buildings importance and delicacy.
Request archaeological mitigation in Harris report is conditioned.
The conservation management plan should be followed.

3.11 Council For British Archaeology
No comments received

3.12 Soc. for Protection of Ancient Buildings
Much to be welcomed.
Deeply concerned about extension to south-east.
Extension to north-east - no objection, simple, elemental, appropriate, responds admirably to existing building.
East Monastic Tower - accept need for railings, no adverse comments regarding path.
Extension to south-east - not sympathetic to essential character of building, architecture, texture, visual appearance; large areas of glass are not in consonance; detrimental impact on character and significance of building and visual appearance; planning permission should not be granted.

3.13 Georgian Group
No comments received

3.14 The Victorian Society
No comments received

3.15 Garden History Society
No comments received

3.16 Landscape Officer
No objection to proposal.
Suggest conditions regarding tree protection, services details and retention of trees and hedges.

3.17 Wymondham Heritage Society
Information regarding current off street parking situation in vicinity of Abbey.
Not convinced exterior treatment of tower as successful as it might be.
At present tower is imposing empty space that has been used to effect with floodlight and in artwork.
Fence relates to nothing else in terms of height or scale.
Fence detracts from visual unity of tower.
Large window in extension along side tower opening will fight with it visually.
Will erode unique atmosphere around this ancient ruin.

3.18 Local Residents
None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 The Church of St Mary and St Thomas Wymondham is a Grade I listed building and partly an ancient monument. The nearby ruins are Grade II listed and are part of the ancient monument. The site is within Wymondham Conservation Area and adjacent to a County Wildlife Site. The building remains in use as a place of worship. The building also holds a collection or historical archives, is used as a visitor attraction and educational resource and as a place for musical concerts.

4.2 The planning application is for an extension to the south-east; an extension within the former St Margaret's Chapel: development within the east monastic tower; and external development. The application is for planning permission only. There is no requirement for a listed building consent application because the Church benefits from ecclesiastical exemption. Therefore the internal works proposed will be assessed as part of Faculty submitted to the Norwich Diocesan Advisory Committee and are therefore outside the scope of the planning application.

4.3 The proposed development is intended to provide spaces for interpretation, displays, education and meetings; new sacristy and clergy vestry including removal of existing facilities; new choir vestry including removal of existing facility; new lavatories; new servery; new shop facility; link between the extensions; level access to the building; new mechanical and electrical services; and herb garden.

4.4 In January 2002 planning permission was granted for extensions to The Abbey under application ref 2001/1415. The scheme included: two storey extension at the east end of the south aisle; two storey extension within the Abbey Tower; single storey extension within the ruined chapel to the north of the Abbey Tower and infilling the underground boiler room. The planning permission was not implemented and has expired.

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

4.6 The main issues in this case are: the impact on heritage assets including the listed church, nearby listed buildings, scheduled ancient monument, and archaeology; the impact on the character and appearance of the area including the conservation area; biodiversity including trees; ground contamination; and the amenity of nearby properties.

Extension to southeast

4.7 This extension is located at the east end of the south aisle and has been designed in a contemporary manner using traditional materials. This element of the proposal will provide space for interpretation, displays and meetings as well as the servery and WCs and the archive reading sacristy and clergy vestry.
4.8 The principle of extending The Abbey in this location was established with the previously approved scheme. The design approach ensures minimum intervention to the historic fabric. The extension follows the line of the south aisle and its overall scale and massing is appropriate in relation to the existing massing and scale of The Abbey. The use of traditional materials for the detailing relates positively to the character of the existing building. Opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficiency have been incorporated into the design. The proposal is in the form of a distinctive 21st century addition to The Abbey. Subject to the conditions this element of the proposal will enhance the heritage asset.

**Former St Margaret's Chapel**

4.9 This part of the proposal is for an extension within the ruined walls of the chapel. Three existing walls will be used with one new wall and a green roof constructed to form the internal space. This element will provide interpretation leaning space and choir vestry.

4.10 The principle of extending The Abbey in this location was established with the previously approved scheme. The design approach ensures minimum intervention to the historic fabric. The removal of an existing unsightly fence, oil tank and redundant brick flue will significantly enhance this area. Opportunities for water management, bio diversity, and energy efficiency have been incorporated into the design. The proposal is in the form of a distinctive 21st century addition to The Abbey. Subject to the conditions this element of the proposal will enhance the heritage asset.

**East Monastic Tower**

4.11 It is proposed to lay a path through the tower and erect railings across the opening. This will enable the two extensions to be linked. The principle of works to this part of The Abbey was established with the previously approved scheme. The design approach ensures minimum intervention to the historic fabric. Subject to the conditions this element of the proposal will enhance the heritage asset.

**External**

4.12 It is proposed to lay a path from the former St Margaret's Chapel to the existing churchyard path; to provide a paved standing area outside the south-east extension double doors; create a Medieval herb garden to the south of The Abbey; and provide foul drainage including pipework and pumping chamber. It should be possible to provide all these elements without causing harm to the heritage assets or other identified interests and whilst enhancing the facilities at The Abbey. Subject to the conditions this element of the proposal will enhance the heritage asset.

**Construction arrangements**

4.13 Subject to the conditions it appears possible to accommodate the construction arrangements without detriment to the heritage assets.

**Biodiversity**

4.14 The proposed bat mitigation relates to internal works which are outside the scope of this application. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to condition such matters as part of this planning application.

**Conclusion**

4.15 For the reasons set out above the proposal is considered to enhance the heritage asset and consequently the application is recommended for approval.
5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development is considered to accord with Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV9, ENV14, ENV15, ENV3, IMP13, IMP15, IMP17 and UTL15 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 it would preserve or enhance the character, appearance and amenity of the area due to the overall design and detailing of the scheme.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2012/1394/F  
**Parish**: LODDON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Peter Sheppard  
**Site Address**: Hales Hall Barn Hales Green Loddon Norfolk NR14 6QW  
**Proposal**: Works to Hales Hall Barn to install glazed covers for windows, new oak flooring with under floor heating, new internal doorway, creation of inner lobby and further sound proofing measures. Conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. Creation of new drive way to access proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn. Provision to host 48 events per annum (D2 use class) in the barn  
**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit (C)  
2. In accordance with the approved plans  
3. Details to be agreed - materials  
4. Outbuildings - windows and doors  
5. Acoustic Curtains - Fitting details  
6. D2 Use class restriction  
7. Events - 48 hours  
8. Hours of use  
9. No loudspeaker or live music outside building (C)  
10. Use of outbuildings  
11. Noise works to be completed first

12. **Appl. No**: 2012/1395/LB  
**Parish**: LODDON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Peter Sheppard  
**Site Address**: Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW  
**Proposal**: Works to Hales Hall Barn to install glazed covers for windows, new oak flooring with under floor heating, new internal doorway, creation of inner lobby and further sound proofing measures. Conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. Creation of new drive way to access proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn. Provision to host 48 events per annum (D2 use class) in the barn  
**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions  
1. Listed building  
2. In accordance with approved details  
3. Details to be agreed - materials  
4. Outbuildings - windows and doors  
5. Acoustic Curtains - Fitting details

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (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
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
EMP 3: Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment
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
TOU 7: Conversion of buildings in the open countryside to self-catering holiday accommodation (Part Consistent)
TRA 19: Parking standards

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1251 and 2012/1249
Provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms in attic storey on second floor. Continuation of existing staircase to second floor. New dormer windows to match existing on second floor. Replacement of 1970s chimney stack with chimneys to match original. New front door in new location. Reopening of bricked up original windows. Approved

2.2 2011/1166
Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/1029/CU - to allow use of barn for civil weddings and private functions for up to an additional 45 occasions in any calendar year in addition to the general functions currently permitted. Refused

2.3 2005/1029
Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions Approved

2.4 2002/2085
Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions Approved

2.5 2002/0126
Alterations to restore original features of door in stable, windows in East gable, stairs to first floor and bridge to meadow Approved
2.6 1996/0268 Remove corrugated sheeting from barn roof and replace with reed thatch

3. Consultations

3.1 Hales Parish Council No objection to the listed building works. Conditions are required regarding the increase in events to ensure that amenity is protected. The conditions should address issues regarding:
- length of events
- the type of events within the D2 use class
- extra signage
- the relocating of the cattle grid further into the common land.

Loddon Parish Council

No objection to the listed building works.

Recommend the following:
- That the additional events be restricted to cover only 60 days of the year
- Temporary permission for the event increase for one year should be granted
- The events should only be for weddings, civil ceremonies and cultural events
- A reasonable decibel level should be set for events
- New road signs for visitors
- The cattle grid should be relocated and dampers fitted for the protection of residential amenity
- Litchmere Lane gate should be replaced with a cattle grid

3.2 District Members:
- Cllr C L Gould To be reported if appropriate
- Cllr K Billig To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer No objections, conditions recommended. The following comments have been supplied:

The barn is listed grade 1 and is arguably the finest barn in South Norfolk. It is of exceptional significance in association with the Hall, also grade 1, and the gardens and moat which were the site of an ancient manor house. The barn is used for weddings which has enabled the building to remain largely unaltered both externally and internally where the impressive open space can be appreciated.

The previous owners rescued the barn and initiated its use, carrying out some commendable improvements: re-thatching, laying an oak floor in the first floor chamber, and the restoration of the rooms below, but other works were less successful: the crude plastic glazing to the ventilation slits, and the use of Indian marble and chip board on the floor of the main barn. The ancillary buildings were unaltered, providing only basic storage while toilet and catering facilities had to be brought in to service each event.

The new owners wish to improve the facilities at the barn, and the comfort of those using it, as part of a proposal to widen the range of events held there. The ancillary buildings would be converted to provide toilets, kitchens, and accommodation for guests.
Improvements to the bothy and the gatehouse have been carried out to a very high standard, and will make the venue more attractive and more comprehensive. I would have no issues with the other ancillary buildings, which are all much later than the barn, being altered as proposed.

It is important if the barn is to be maintained at the level it deserves, that the business is as attractive and competitive as possible: these works will help towards this aim.

The owners are keen to reduce the noise levels as well as making the barn more suitable for use outside the summer months. It is accepted that the current glazing in the ventilation slits is not efficient: they do not prevent draughts or reduce noise.

The floor of the main barn is a marble that was laid by the previous owners, and chip board at the west end. The brick floors at the east end are not affected. The proposal is to lay oak boards on the floor of the main barn, in a similar way to the upper floor of the great chamber, on top of the marble so no disturbance is caused to the archaeology. The pattern can reflect the former cart bays. The owners have confirmed that there will be no air source heat pumps or plant externally as the under floor heating will be serviced by the existing boilers.

I would support the increased number of events as I believe the use is the best for this magnificent barn. If the use continues successfully, it would offer a good prospect for the continued care of this exceptional building. The improvements to the ancillary buildings will enhance the experience and reduce the need for importing the services each time an event is held.

I also feel that, subject to details, the improvements to the glazing of the ventilation slits, will improve the comfort in the barn and also the noise levels, while retaining the unusual light in the building these slits provide. These insertions can be reversible if detailed carefully, and a condition to that effect should be sufficient in my view.

While having oak boards on the floor of a barn is perhaps unusual, the Indian marble and chip board has certain visual and practical disadvantages. Oak was, and is laid in the upper chamber, it is a traditional material, and can be inserted without any archaeological impact or permanent damage to the existing fabric. As such I would support its use.

I feel the proposal has the prospect of enhancing the significance of the building, which is accessible to the public, and supporting a viable use as required under NPPF para.131; it would help support the conservation of the heritage asset as outlined in para. 132.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections raised, conditions recommended. The following comments have been supplied:

Whilst we have no objection in principle to this planning application, we consider that there are several matters that should be addressed by condition (as discussed below), should the application be approved.
The revised acoustic report demonstrates that the development can be completed without significant adverse effects from noise during normal operation. This does not mean that there is no possibility of disturbance should abnormal conditions occur occasionally, but based upon the information supplied by the applicant, the noise should not be ‘detrimental to the amenity’ nor a ‘statutory nuisance’ to the neighbours.

We note that the applicant proposes to convert outbuildings to guest accommodation. Whilst we have no objections to this, as anyone staying there would be related to any wedding or performance related disturbance, and would not be resident, we would recommend that should the application be approved, conditions are applied to link the accommodation to the Great Barn venue, and to restrict their permitted use to use class C1 and not C3.

We would also recommend that the sound insulation improvements, and control of music levels contained within sections 4 and 5 respectively of the revised acoustic report dated 16/1/13, should be conditioned to be implemented.

We would recommend that the number of events permitted are conditioned as ‘the number of days of events’, so that there is a limit on the number of days of potential disturbance, and a certainty of expectations for the applicant, the Local Planning Authority and neighbours.

Furthermore, whilst we do not object to the change to planning use class D2, we consider that the uses within this class should be restricted, in order to limit the potential for disturbance (not considered within the scope of this consultation), and again to give certainty. A restriction to what we understand to be the intended uses of wedding/party hire, conferences, concerts and theatre would be appropriate. Of course, concerts and amplified music should be restricted to not take place outside the noise attenuating structure of the barn.

3.5 English Heritage

No objections, conditions recommended to determine final details of specific alterations.

3.6 NCC Highways

No objections, subject to conditions. The following comments have been received:

There is highway concern with respect to the proposal to hold week long events at The Hall on 8 occasions per annum. Following our concerns I understand that this aspect of the application has now been withdrawn with the events now proposed being a more favourable 48 events of a maximum 48 hrs duration.

Events should be restricted to weddings or private functions, in addition to theatre and arts within class D2 use as applied for rather than an open permission allowing conferences or other functions that could not have any justification for such a remote countryside location. It is requested that a condition be imposed to this effect together with the maximum length of event at 48hrs in total to include the setting up and site clearance.
This will remove the existing ambiguity allowing public functions to take place which span a longer time scale and generate greater volumes of traffic.

3.7 Licensing Officer

No objections raised. Commented that the planning application to increase the provision to host 48 events per annum would not have any bearing on the premises licence PLA0317 presently in place.

3.8 Local Residents

26 letters of representation have been received. 19 of these letters are objections. Three of the objection letters have been received from Tilney/Grapes household, three from Shaws, three from Waterhouse, two from Kittle and two from Chapman. The remainder are single letters of objection. They raise the following issues:

- The road network is unsuitable and dangerous with no passing places causing accidents
- Noise pollution from events and transportation movements over a cattle grid
- Poor management practices – broken glass on the road, gates left open for cattle to escape
- Anti-social behaviour
- The extra events are unacceptable as each event lasts up to 3 days
- Extra mid week events will keep children awake at night before school
- Music should be incidental to the event not the other way round
- The application lacks clarity and detail
- The commercial development is not in keeping with Grade I Listed status or the locality
- The use class and length of event need to be controlled so that events do not last a week or that bingo halls and other non compatible uses can’t be set up.
- Works for toilets have been carried out without permission
- Local businesses will be negatively impacted by the creation of in house facilities
- The application is contrary to Saved Policies IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10
- The events can cause a detrimental effect on the well being of cattle
- The methodology of the acoustic report is flawed
- The previous refusal should be a material consideration

7 single letters of support have been received, they raise the following issues:

- The increase in events will help the local economy
- The increase in events is necessary to maintain such buildings and their grounds
- The sympathetic soundproofing is a positive step for residents
- 48 events is less than one a week which is not excessive
- The increase in traffic associated with the events is minor in comparison to the past 10 years when the barn and the nursery both operated.
- The current owners are renovating the hall to a high standard which is providing investment in the local economy
• 30 weddings per annum are not sufficient to sustain the building and more events will be needed. (previous owner)
• The current level of events do not cause any issues of noise disturbance
• The increase in the type of events will allow even more people to enjoy the hall and barn.

4 Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site is located to the west of the A 146 Beccles Road and is accessed via the rural road network from the A 146 (Wash Lane and Litchmere Lane) to an unadopted access road across Hales Green Common. This single lane access track which is subject to common land ownership and this serves the application site and serves three other properties.

4.2 The character of the application site is typically rural with open fields, hedgerows, single lane carriage ways and large detached properties sporadically located. The common is grazed and the access road across it provides access to Wash Road and Litchmere Lane.

4.3 The application site is the Grade I listed Hales Hall and Barn complex. It is accessed from the east which leads to a driveway and walled garden area. Beyond the walls is Hales Hall which is located to the northern side of a large landscaped garden and to the south the Barn. Immediately to the northern frontage of the barn is a courtyard of outbuildings, with some used for storage and others empty. One of the outbuildings has had some work carried out by the previous owners to convert it into a toilet block. The work has been only been partially completed and the present owner has ensured that it has not progressed without the relevant permission. The outbuilding has been inspected and should approval not be forthcoming for the current applications relevant advice will be issued to the owner to regularise the situation.

4.4 To the south of the listed buildings complex is a series of substantial glasshouses which were previously used as a garden centre for the public, these are currently empty with the surrounding area becoming overgrown.

4.5 Both the barn and house are substantial buildings in scale and both occupy a similar sized footprint. The hall is more obviously detailed with ornate chimney stacks, cat slide roofs, carriage ways, detailed fenestration and gable features giving depth and variety to its southern elevation. The barn is of a simpler design in terms of its external appearance but it still contains some excellent detailing such as the 180 small window slits and restored thatch roofing. Internally the barn has an intricate timber roof form and mezzanine floor within its eastern section. The mezzanine floor has been laid with oak and provides for an internal overview area of the barn. Below the mezzanine areas is the bar, catering facilities and staff recreational area.

4.6 The current flooring within the main barn area is a mixture of brick, Indian marble and chipboard and the ventilation/window slits have a plastic covering held together with bamboo.

4.7 Parking is provided within a grassed area to the east of the barn beside the access driveway.

4.8 The current consent for the barn allows for 30 events per annum to take place. The events are limited within the D2 use class as civic receptions, civil weddings and other associated or similar functions (including arts and crafts functions) and for no other purposes. The current permission does not limit how long an event can take place for but does stipulate...
that events should not continue past 00.30 hours or begin before 08.00 hours. An event is defined by the act of setting up any equipment required to facilitate the event and the removing of the same equipment.

**Proposal**

4.9 The application is for works to Hales Hall Barn and outbuildings, and for the provision to host 48 events per annum.

4.10 The works to the barn consist of the following elements:
- Installation of glazed covers for windows
- Oak flooring with under floor heating
- New internal doorway
- Creation of an inner lobby and further sound proofing measures.
- Installation of acoustic curtains over the barn door openings

4.11 The application further proposes the conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. The outbuildings are located within the northern courtyard area directly to the front of the barn. The conversion of the outbuildings would require for full internal refitting and some external works for new doors and windows. The materials proposed for external works are mainly timber and glass.

4.12 The application also details the creation of a new drive way to access a proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn adjacent the disused greenhouses.

4.13 The events proposed would be those which would be considered to fall within the D2 use class and can be summarised as:
- Civic receptions
- Civil weddings
- Private parties
- Cultural
- Arts - Exhibitions
- Theatre
- Corporate

4.14 The events are proposed to be over a 48 hour period. The 48 hour period would include all of the time required to set up and remove any equipment associated with an event. There is no proposal regarding the amount of performances that could be undertaken within the 48 hour period.

**Principle of Development**

4.15 Saved Policy ENV8 requires any new development in the open countryside to be for an economic and social activity which demands a rural location. The application site is an existing business operation within the open countryside area and as such the rural location is required and established.

4.16 Saved Policy EMP6 in the South Norfolk Local Plan allows for the extension and alterations of existing businesses premises. Saved Policy EMP6 is considered consistent with the aims of NPPF section 3 - Supporting a prosperous rural economy which encourages the expansion of rural businesses provided the buildings are well designed.

4.17 Saved Policy EMP6 makes no distinction between rural and urban business operations and allows for approval provided the design and size of the proposal are in keeping with the existing building and surroundings, the landscaping would not be compromised and all necessary parking, serving and circulation can be accommodated.
4.18 The development would allow for an expansion of a rural events business without compromising any of the factors listed in Saved Policy EMP6 as there would be no additional floorspace created and the further parking proposed is all within the application site.

4.19 The principle of the development is considered to be acceptable in the open countryside area, by virtue of the existing planning permissions granting the change of use from agricultural barn to its current format and that the business could be expanded in accordance with Saved Policy EMP6 and NPPF Section 3.

4.20 The acceptability, or otherwise, of the proposals are therefore to be determined on the merits of the application against the planning policy criteria of the development plan documents including the NPPF, JCS and SNLP Saved Policies.

Heritage, Conservation and Design

4.21 Saved Policy IMP13 Alterations to Listed Buildings requires for development to be formulated so that the special architectural or historic interests of buildings are preserved. This policy is reinforced through the design guidance covered in NPPF - 7. Requiring good design and JCS Policy 2: Promoting Good Design, which directs that new development should take account of its siting, scale, form and character.

4.22 Furthermore NPPF Section 12 advises that development which is related to heritage assets should be refused if it would lead to substantial harm of that asset.

4.23 The development would result in the conversion of a series of outbuildings into floorspace to be used for kitchen facilities, toilets and guest accommodation. The external alterations proposed to these buildings are acceptable by virtue of the use of suitable materials and the size of the openings proposed. However, English Heritage raised concerns regarding the location of windows on the northern elevation of the western most outbuilding. These comments have been considered by the applicant and revisions for these minor modifications have been received and are considered acceptable.

4.24 The internal modifications to the barn have been considered by the Council's Conservation Officer and by English Heritage and no objections have been received, subject to conditions being attached to any grant of approval regarding the precise details of fixings and works methodology. The internal works would result in an internal lobby being created and the window slits having glazed screens installed. The oak floor proposed would be similar to that previously laid in the mezzanine area.

4.25 The modifications proposed to the buildings are all considered to be in keeping with the listed status of the heritage assets and the investment will provide for a more useable space which will secure the future of the buildings. None of the proposed alterations will be detrimental to the special architectural features of the barn or the outbuildings. Therefore the proposed physical developments associated with the application are considered to be acceptable and are in compliance with the design and conservation elements of NPPF 12, JCS Policy 2 and SNLP Saved Policies IMP13 and IMP15.

4.26 The site of the original Hales Hall is to the west of the barn. None of the works proposed would require any ground disturbance and therefore the application is considered compliant with the requirements of NPPF 12 and SNLP Saved Polices 9 and 13 with regard to protection of archaeological remains.
Residential amenity

4.27 Saved Policy IMP9 - Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents through overlooking and/or overshadowing of habitable rooms, damage to the setting of existing buildings or damaging impacts on the privacy or amenity of nearby dwellings.

4.28 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors, this policy obviously links with the protection of residential amenity

4.29 Changes to the converted buildings would not impact on residential amenity to the extent they do not overlook any other property outside of the Hales Hall complex. The developments would also not create any extra floorspace and therefore issues associated with overshadowing or overbearing buildings can be discounted. Should approval be forthcoming the converted buildings would be conditioned to ensure that their use is directly linked to the barn events. This will ensure that the units are not used for residential purposes or that they become holiday cottages in their own right.

4.30 The creation of a kitchen and toilets are considered acceptable as they will support the main use, however should either require the installation of fans or flues then these details will be required by condition to ensure that they are not creating issues associated with noise nuisance. The conversion and use of the outbuildings is considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

4.31 The application details that the barn would host up to 48 events per annum. These events are considered to be within the D2 use class and could involve the playing of music. The applicant has provided a noise/acoustic evaluation of the barn in relation to the use of music. Taking into account the internal works to the barn, which include the specific creation of an internal lobby to reduce the escape of noise, the Environmental Protection Unit has not objected to the application. The acoustic report details that with the proposed internal alterations and the effective management of events, such as ensuring doors are closed and music is not played past 23:00 hrs, then residential amenity should not be negatively impacted upon.

4.32 To aid with the protection of residential amenity the applicant has proposed that events be limited to a 48 hour period. This time limit would involve the setting up of any equipment for an event and the removal of the equipment. The proposed time limits could reduce the amount of people accessing the barn for events and therefore any disturbance which may be experienced on residential amenity related to this issue would be time constrained, unlike the current situation.

4.33 Currently the barn operates under a consent which allows for 30 events per year to be undertaken. These events are for weddings and private parties. The current planning approval gives no provision to control the length of an event and therefore no control on the amount of days an event can take place for and therefore no control over the amount of people who could access the barn over that event period.

4.34 The events at the barn have also been subject to noise complaints from local residents, and this has also been an issue raised throughout the consultation process for these planning applications. The current planning permission provides no recourse to retrospectively address issues associated with noise pollution.

4.35 The application under consideration would allow for a degree of control to be asserted over the operation of the barn which is lacking from the previous approvals. Should approval be forthcoming, the application would result in the venue being given increased noise insulation which would protect residential dwellings from noise pollution/nuisance.
4.36 The increase in events would be better controlled as what constitutes an event in terms of D2 use will be clearly conditioned and the length of time an event can take place will also be clearly defined. A situation which is considered to be clearly better for the protection of residential amenity than the ambiguity that the barn currently operates under.

4.37 It is considered that by installing the sound proofing/reduction measures and defining what is an event and how long it can last for then the operation of the barn as venue for events will not have any significant detrimental impacts on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers and that the proposed works and operating methods could significantly improve the amenity experienced by the local residents to that which is currently obtained. Therefore the application is considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Highways

4.38 The application does not propose the creation of any new vehicle or pedestrian access arrangements onto the site, however there is a proposal to extend the existing internal driveway and provide a further area for parking. The level of car parking proposed is considered sufficient to serve the uses detailed in the application in accordance with Saved Policy TRA 18 - Parking provision and all parking, servicing and turning areas can be accommodated within the application site as required by Saved Policy EMP6.

4.39 Saved Policy IMP8 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.40 The application had previously proposed that the barn be used for 40 events for a 48 hour period and eight events for a one week period. This proposal was considered by the Highway Authority to be unacceptable as it may put unacceptable pressure on the rural road network. The current proposal was agreed and there has been no objection raised by the Highway Authority regarding the application subject to the events not including corporate/conference style events. Should approval be forthcoming these will be specifically excluded from the available type of events which can be hosted at the barn, the applicant is aware of this issue and has accepted this outcome.

4.41 The application has also been subject to objections raising concerns regarding the access arrangements and the impact of the increased number of events on the rural road network. Suggestions have also been made regarding suitability of the private drive over the green, signage, moving/installation of cattle grids and the use of Litchmere Lane. The private access road across the common is outside of the control of the highway authority and any works which would be undertaken to it would require for an agreement to be reached between the common land owners and the relevant authorities. No upgrade works on this land have been proposed and if they had been it would not be enforceable to have works undertaken as part of this application, therefore the relocation/installation of the cattle grids and surfacing works are a private matter between the applicant and the other relevant parties.

4.42 The Highway Authority have not requested for any formal signage to be installed and they have considered the impact of the development on the safety and functionality of the adopted rural highway network which serves the site and common and they have not objected to the 48 events on a 48 hour basis. The application is therefore considered to accord with Saved Policy IMP8.
Conclusion

4.43 The application would result in substantial investment into a Grade I listed building and buildings within its setting. The works which are proposed are considered to be sympathetic to the fabric and architectural values of the heritage assets.

4.44 The investment would also result in the introduction of noise proofing/insulating measures which would result in a better quality of residential amenity for the neighbouring occupiers than what is currently experienced.

4.45 The investment in the Hale Hall Barn complex is accompanied by a proposal to host 48 events, this is 18 more than is currently permitted. However, unlike the current permission these events would be limited to a 48 hour period. The net gain on events is considered to be acceptable due to the further appropriate controls which can be made through the imposition of conditions of use. Consideration was given to limiting events further to a 24 hour period with setting up and setting down of equipment being restricted to set hours. Such a limitation by condition, however, would be unenforceable in practice and overly prescriptive and so probably found unreasonable, if challenged.

4.46 The increase in the number events proposed is not considered to have an impact on the rural road network serving the site to an extent that a refusal of permission would be warranted, this is provided that the events are limited to a 48 hour period and that corporate/conference style events are specifically excluded.

4.47 The application is compliant with relevant planning policies and could also benefit the local rural economy.

4.48 Through the use of conditions the development should not have a significantly detrimental impact on residential amenity or highway safety.

5 Reasons For Approval

5.1 The design, scale, form and materials proposed would respect the integrity of the listed status and enhance the visual aspect of the site in accordance with the intent of NPPF - 7. Requiring good design, JCS Policy 2: Promoting Good Design and Saved Policy IMP13 Alterations to Listed Buildings.

5.2 The development would allow for the expansion of a rural business without any detrimental impact on the functionality of the highway in accordance with Saved Policies IMP8 - Safe and free flow of traffic, TRA 18 - Parking provision. and EMP6 - expansion of business premises.

5.3 Through the use of appropriate conditions regarding hours of use and the control of use classes the development will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers to the extent that permission should be refused. The application therefore complies with the principles of Saved Policy IMP9 - Residential amenity.

5.4 The application proposes alterations to the existing barn structure which are considered sympathetic to its listed status in accordance with Saved Policy IMP13 Alterations to Listed Buildings and would provide for noise protection measures which would protect residential amenity in accordance with Saved Policy IMP9 - Residential amenity and would allow compliance with the aims and objectives of Saved Policy IMP10 – Noise to be achieved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2010/2223/F  
**Parish**: HALES

**Applicants Name**: John H Wones  
**Site Address**: Land At Filling Station Beccles Road Hales NR14 6SR  
**Proposal**: Erection of garage workshop with amended point of access from the A146

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. **Full Planning permission time limit**
2. **In accordance with amendments**
3. **External materials to be agreed**
4. **Limited Hours for Customer**
5. **No power tools outside building**
6. **Surface Water**
7. **Contaminated land - submit scheme**
8. **Existing Access - Closure**
9. **Existing Access, Widen or Improve**
10. **Access - Gradient**
11. **Access Gates - Restriction**
12. **Provision of parking, service**
13. **Construction Traffic (Parking)**

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 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)

2. **Relevant Planning History**

2.1 **2008/1199**  
Use of land for the display and sale of motor vehicles  
Certificate of Lawfulness issued

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**  
- whilst support the move from Mr Wones' current site, concerned about the affect the development of a new garage workshop on the site adjacent to the filling station will have on traffic flows around the Yarmouth Road/A146 junction  
- would like to be advised how it will be managed, if approved. Would like a condition on any planning permission allowing only exiting vehicles near to the proposed site and all incoming vehicles to gain access via the far entrance of the filling station
• it is understood this land is not in the ownership of Mr Wones but in order to avoid a collision point that agreement be gained to allow the use of this access

Amended scheme

Object
• continue to be concerned about the affect the access to new garage/workshop on adjacent site to filling station will have on traffic flows on Yarmouth Road/A146 junction
• feel a further access on the A146 in this vicinity, where already 7 points of access, notorious locally for accidents, is very dangerous
• add confusion to junction and compound confusion in this short piece of A146

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
Original scheme
Refuse
• intensify the use of an existing access, detrimental to highway safety

Amended scheme
• No objections subject to following conditions
  • limit use to proposed new access, other access to be closed
  • access to be upgraded
  • gradient not to exceed 1:12
  • access gate restriction
  • parking/access laid out
  • on site parking for construction traffic and to comply with Construction Traffic Management Plan

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)
Original scheme
No objections, subject to following conditions:
• limit hours of use
• no power tools outside specified hours
• no power tools outside building
• details of surface water
• contaminated land during construction

Amended scheme
No further comments to make

3.5 Local Residents
Original scheme
1 letter of objection expressing the following concerns
• outside development limits
• incremental extension of what was previously a breach (certificate of lawful use)
• traffic and safety issues

Amended scheme
1 letter of objection expressing following concerns
• still 2 basic issues, first point may be addressed with relocation of entrance
• 2nd issue re development outside development area will need to be addressed by relevant authorities and overall assessment
4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a site to the north of the village of Hales. The site is just outside the development limits but adjacent to the boundary. To north west of the site is a petrol filling station (pfs) and to the south and south east residential properties. Currently the site is used for car sales which was established under a certificate of lawfulness under application number 2008/1199. Current access to the site is to the south of the pfs and it is proposed to close this access off and utilise a gated field access to the north, which is to the north access of the pfs, with direct access from the A146.

4.2 It is proposed to erect a new workshop facility for the car sales sites. Previously the maintenance activities of the business were undertaken from the ‘Fairhead Wones’ site on Yarmouth Road. This site is being considered for re-development (housing and business units) under item 1 on this agenda.

4.3 The main issues for consideration are as follows:

- Policy implications
- Highway impacts
- Design and amenity impacts

which I will take in turn.

Policy implications

4.4 Policy EMP4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) requires employment development to be located within development limits. Although this policy, together with the other SNLP policies quoted above, can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the National Policy Framework (NPPF), policy EMP4 is now considered to be overly restrictive as the NPPF proactively encourages sustainable development. I am satisfied the site can be classed as sustainable as it has direct access from the A146 and is adjacent to the development boundary for Hales, a Service Village under policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS).

4.5 The proposal is therefore in accordance with Sections 1 and 3 of the NPPF which seek to secure sustainable economic growth.

Highway impacts

4.6 The access to the site has been the main area of concern raised by the Parish Council. They continue to be concerned about the affect the access to the new garage/workshop adjacent to the pfs will have on traffic flows on Yarmouth Road/A146 junction. They feel a further access on the A146 in this vicinity, where already 7 points of access, notorious locally for accidents, is very dangerous. Furthermore they consider this will add confusion to the junction and compound confusion in this short piece of A146.

4.7 The Highway Authority originally raised an objection to the proposed access arrangements. These have been subsequently been amended (to include closure of the existing access) and the Highway Authority have withdrawn their objection and conditionally support the application.

4.8 They have based their assessment on the current use of the land and consider there will only be a small increase in traffic. They consider moving the vehicle turning manoeuvres from the existing access to the new access will have a road safety benefit that mitigates the disbenefits of the extra traffic to the site.
4.9 They have stated the existing access will need to be physically removed with the dropped kerbs replaced by full height kerbs except where the cycleway crossed the pfs entrance, the tarmac removed and the verges reinstated on either side of the footway. The access to the north will be improved. These works can be secured by way of appropriate conditions which are listed in the recommendation above.

4.10 With these conditions and support from the Highway Authority I am satisfied the proposal will not endanger highway safety and accords with policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

**Design and amenity impacts**

4.11 The proposed layout and scale of the development is acceptable and will not be out of keeping with the character of the area, being located adjacent to the pfs. Environmental Services have not objected to the proposal and with the conditions suggested to restrict hours of opening, use of power tools and no outside working, I am satisfied the proposal will not have an undue impact on the nearest residential property. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy 2 of the JCS and policy IMP9 of the SNLP as the design is acceptable and there will be no adverse impacts on residential amenity.

5 Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal although technically contrary to policy EMP4, as the site is located outside the development limits for Hales, in this instance due consideration and weight can be given to sections 1 and 3 of the NPPF, which supports sustainable economic growth. The site can be classed as sustainable as it is adjacent to the development boundary and as direct access from the A146.

5.2 The Highway Authority with the conditions outlined above support the new improved access arrangements which will not endanger highway safety and accords with policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

5.3 The design and layout of the development is acceptable and will not have undue impact on the residential amenity of nearby residential properties. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy 2 of the JCS and policy IMP9 of the SNLP which can be given due weight and consideration as it remains consistent/part consistent with the aims of the SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors 01508 533789
and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14.  
**Appl. No** : 2012/1429/F  
**Parish** : KESWICK AND INTWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr Matt Bartram  
Site Address : Land At Low Road Keswick Norfolk  
Proposal : Residential development (Use Class C3) of 9 dwellings including 2 affordable homes, landscaping, associated access onto Low Road, and associated carriageway works to Low Road; and provision of a village green space adjacent to the Keswick Parish Room

Recommendation : Authorise DGL to Approve with Conditions

1.  
   Full permission time limit  
2.  
   Amended/Approved plans  
3.  
   Materials  
4.  
   Surfacing  
5.  
   Boundary treatments  
6.  
   Landscaping  
7.  
   Ecological mitigation and enhancement (residential site)  
8.  
   Levels  
9.  
   PD Rights – plot 5, first floor west elevation openings  
10.  
   Water efficiency  
11.  
   Details of sustainable surface water drainage  
12.  
   Details and implementation of roads, footways and drainage  
13.  
   Road and footway before occupation  
14.  
   Visibility splay  
15.  
   Off-site highway improvements – details and implementation pre-occupation  
16.  
   Vehicle activated speed sign before occupation  
17.  
   Maintenance/Management details of ‘village green’  
18.  
   Archaeological investigation  
19.  
   Village Green to comply with landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement details

Subject to Sec.106 Agreement to secure affordable housing

1.  
**Planning Policies**

1.1  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Para. 14 : presumption in favour of sustainable development.  
NPPF 6 : Delivering a choice of high quality homes (Paras.47-49 – Requirement for 5 year housing land supply).  
NPPF 7: Requiring good design (Para. 75 – protect and enhance public rights of way).

1.2  
Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 7: Supporting communities  
Policy 9: Policy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 16: Other Villages

1.3  
South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 6: Landscape setting of southern bypass  
ENV8: Development in open countryside  
ENV15: Species protection  
IMP2: Landscaping
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP9: Residential amenity  
IMP15: Setting of listed buildings

2. Planning History

2.1 1978/3396 Four detached dwellings Refused

2.2 1988/0243 Four detached dwellings Refused

2.3 2012/0714 Residential development (Use Class C3) of 15 dwellings including 5 affordable homes, communal green space and landscaping; associated access onto Low Road and pedestrian footpath; associated carriageway works to Low Road and incorporated pedestrian dropped crossing point; and provision of a village green space adjacent to the Keswick Parish Room Withdrawn

5. Consultations

3.1 Keswick and Intwood Parish Council
- Special parish meeting held 26th September – well advertised, including notice in Parish Newsletter delivered to every house.
- Councillors resolved it would be right to disconnect consideration of the residential proposal from the proposed Village Green.
- After hearing representations from members of the public, the Parish Council voted to object to the residential application (3-2 with 2 Councillors absent) for the following reasons.
  - Concern about increased traffic on Low Road. The suggested Vehicle Activated Speed Sign is not considered adequate to remedy the situation.
  - Concern for pedestrian safety, especially in absence of adequate pavements and proximity to ‘S’ bends on Low Road.
  - Development not in keeping with the area – style of dwellings does not accord with the form and character of the village.
  - Overdevelopment – the number and layout of dwellings gives impression of density different to rest of village.
  - Application premature pending outcome of the Site Specific Allocations Consultation.

In respect of the proposed Village Green: having heard representations against the proposal from members of the public, the Parish Council resolved to undertake a consultation with all residents before considering the matter further.

3.2 Local Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environmental Services
- Recommend condition to agree details of surface water drainage and subsequent maintenance.
- Require further information regarding routing of water for 1:100 year storm events and off-site drain from swale.
3.4 Housing Strategy and Enabling Team
- Meets policy requirement for 20% affordable housing.
- Welcome 2 units of affordable housing subject to confirmation internal sizes meet Housing Association requirements.
- Welcome Code Level 4 design.

3.5 Keswick Reading Room Committee
- Village Green proposal should be considered separately from residential proposal.
- Village Green welcome provided a local demand for it can be shown.
- Object to cycle stands within existing car park area as this reduces parking capacity and creates hazard for drivers.

3.6 Public Right Of Way Officer
- (Amended Plan) The amended scheme accommodates the Public Right of Way to satisfaction of PROW Officer.

3.7 Play And Amenities Area Officer
No comments received

3.8 Planning Policy
NPPF
- Para. 14 of NPPF sets out presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Norwich Policy Area does not have a 5 year supply of housing land as required by NPPF para47.

SNLP
- Proposal is contrary to SNLP Policy ENV8 – dwellings in the countryside.
- Site is within Norwich Southern bypass Landscape Protection Zone, but the small scale of the site means any harm would not be unacceptable.
- Assessment under SNLP policies needs to be seen in the context of the age of the Local Plan (2003).

Joint Core Strategy
- Keswick identified as “Other Village” which is to have development boundary to accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings. Keswick’s location in the Norwich Policy Area means it can also accommodate additional development to help deliver additional 1800 dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area.

Emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document
- Site is identified as preferred option

Discussion
- Limited weight can be given to the Site Specific Allocations and Policies document because it is at an early stage. However, full weight can be given to the JCS and its identification as an “Other Village” suitable to help deliver NPA allowance. NCC Highways objection does not outweigh status of Keswick in the JCS as an “Other Village”.
- No objection to the application on policy grounds.

3.9 Landscape Officer
No objection. Recommend conditions on landscaping, tree and hedge planting and boundary treatments.

3.10 Historic Environment Service
Request condition requiring archaeological investigation – monitoring groundworks under supervision.
3.11 NCC Highways  
Recommend Refusal  
- Does not have access to appropriate level of public transport provision as set out in Norfolk Bus Strategy.  
- Remote from local service centre provision, conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel and the ability to reduce reliance on the private car as set out in planning policy.

If SNC is minded to approve application then conditions recommended to include off-site improvements (as recommendation above).

3.12 Anglian Water  
No comments received

3.13 Local Residents  
Objections (16 letters)  
- Overdevelopment / Too dense / Too concentrated in one place / Ruin character of the village.  
- Urban style development not appropriate to Keswick.  
- Not consistent with the existing linear form and alignment of the village.  
- Tarmac entrance will spoil entrance to public footpath contrary to NPPF  
- Could prevent more appropriate development elsewhere.  
- Precedent for further development.  
- History of refused application on this site.  
- Likely problem with lighting in the future.  
- Highway danger – access too close to bend – contrary SNLP policy IMP8.  
- Additional traffic from access with poor visibility.  
- Inadequate footways along Low Road.  
- Inadequate parking on site.  
- No need for housing in view of large development at Cringleford.  
- Loss of wildlife.  
- Contrary to NPPF core principle to manage patterns of growth to make full use of walking, cycling and public transport – not within safe walking and cycling distance of wide range of local services – small shop in Cringleford 20 minutes walk; Cringleford school closing and moving further away; no formal bus stop in village.  
- Landscape harm contrary to NPPF, SNLP (ENV6) and Place Making Guide – does not take account of wider context; block views to and from countryside; harms rural setting of village; context includes a number of listed buildings; harm to heritage assets.  
- Village Green not justified by or necessary for the new development.  
- Village Green only offered on lease for 10 years – should be given to community.  
- Village Green lacks good pedestrian links.  
- Good play facilities at Cringleford playing field 15 minute walk away.

Support (1 letter)  
- Appropriate sized expansion of Keswick in suitable location. Additional population to help sustain facilities eg. church, reading room
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is supported by a range of documents including, a Planning Statement; Design and Access Statement; Archaeological Assessment; Ecological Appraisal; Flood Risk Assessment; Highways and Accessability Report and a Tree Survey. Having assessed the submission and consultee responses, the most significant issues to consider are those set out and addressed below.

**Principle of development**

4.2 As noted by a number of objectors, Keswick has limited facilities within the village and access by public transport is also not good. The village does not have a village boundary defined in the 2003 SNLP so new housing would conflict with SNLP policy ENV8. However, the settlement is within the Norwich Policy Area where distances travelled to access services (such as in adjacent Cringleford or Norwich itself) are generally modest and less than for more remote rural locations. In recognition of this, together with the need for housing land in the Norwich Area, the 2011 Joint Core Strategy identifies Keswick, not only as an “Other Village” which should have a development limit defined, but also a location where infill or small groups of dwellings (up to 10) may be permitted to meet the Norwich Area housing allocation, subject to considerations of form and character (Policy 16).

The Joint Core Strategy is an up-to-date, adopted part of the Development Plan which is consistent with the NPPF and consequently must be given very considerable weight. In these circumstances, the lack of facilities and public transport access within Keswick itself is not sufficient to justify objecting to the development in principle.

**Landscape/ Form and Character**

4.3 The site falls within the area defined in the SNLP where policy ENV6 indicates that “inappropriate development” (including residential) which would undermine the landscape quality and openness of the zone will not be permitted. However, the policy context for considering landscape impact and form and character issues has changed with the need to find additional housing land, particularly in the Norwich Policy Area. As noted above, the status of Keswick has changed with the adoption of the JCS in 2011. The lack of a 5 year housing land supply means that any harm resulting from development must be weighed against the need for additional land for development. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF indicates that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, especially where a 5 year land supply does not exist.

4.4 In the above context, the landscape or other harm caused by proposed development has to be very substantial to outweigh the presumption in favour. The application site contributes to the landscape in the immediate vicinity of the site, providing a visual link between the undeveloped higher ground to the south-west and the river valley meadows to the north-east. A public footpath passes along the side of the site from which this visual asset is most apparent. However, its development does not have a substantial impact on the general character and openness of the wider area, so the degree of weight given to this landscape impact should be reduced.

4.5 The undeveloped application site introduces a gap in the otherwise continuous development on the south side of Low Road. This gap is an attractive feature and provides a break between the Low Farm Group and more uniformly aligned dwellings to the south-east. However, in weighing the harm its loss would cause, it is not an essential feature in the general form and character of the settlement. The rural character and setting of the settlement would still be very evident, even without this undeveloped site and the form of the village would remain broadly unchanged.
4.6 Members will be aware that a similar assessment has resulted in the application site being put forward as a preferred option in the emerging Local Plan, Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document. That document carries little weight at this stage of the new Local Plan, but it reinforces my assessment of the site.

4.7 It has been suggested that the form and layout of the proposed development is not appropriate for the village. This part of Keswick has a generally linear form along Low Road. This is particularly evident in the row of mostly semi-detached properties to the south-east of the site which follow a similar ‘building line’. However, this frontage development and ‘building line’ is not consistent for the whole of the Low Road area. There is development in depth at Low Farm to the north-west of the site and at Eaton Gate further to the south-east. There are also a number of larger properties which sit further from the road in larger plots. In this context, while the proposed development in depth will be distinctly different to parts of Low Road, it is not alien or significantly harmful to the existing form of the settlement.

4.8 On balance, although I would acknowledge that some harm to the character and appearance of the immediate area would result from the development, this is not sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the context of the shortfall in land supply; the changed status of Keswick in the JCS; and the preferred option status of the site in the emerging Local Plan.

**Design**

4.9 The proposal includes 5, five bedroom, detached houses and 4, three bedroom, semi-detached houses. Two of the semi-detached units are affordable units for social rent. The scheme takes the form of a cluster of houses, grouped around the internal access road which is to have wide planted verges. This creates an inward looking development with a single point of access on to Low Road. While the layout could be criticised for not positively addressing the main road frontage, it does enable the existing roadside hedge to be retained which, with further new planting will soften the visual impact of the development and avoid the need for multiple new access points. The scheme does not echo the layout of the immediately adjacent frontage properties but, as concluded in the previous section, I do not consider it could be said to be unacceptable considering the overall form of the settlement.

4.10 Although the land generally slopes upward from the road, section drawings show that this is not so pronounced within the site and the dwellings will consequently not be unduly dominant in terms of the ‘street scene’ or their relationship to neighbouring dwellings. The design of dwellings is consistent with local traditions being for the most part simple in form and style with steeply pitched roofs. Plot 5, which stands at the end of the access road forms a focus for the layout. This unit is proposed to have slightly more distinctive styling with ‘dutch’ gables. The application indicates that all dwellings will be constructed to reach level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. With appropriate materials to be agreed by condition, I consider the design of the scheme to be acceptable. It will be important to ensure that the scheme retains a rural rather than urban or suburban character, so conditions are also recommended to control and agree details of landscaping, surfacing and boundary treatments. Subject to resolution of these details I judge the scheme to be consistent with the South Norfolk Place Making Guide and policy 2 of the JCS.

**Highways**

4.11 There have been a significant number of concerns expressed regarding highway safety issues. It should be noted however, that the Highway Authority do not raise objection on highway safety grounds. The access has been relocated from its originally proposed location and kerb re-alignment is included to ensure adequate visibility from and to the new
access point. The scheme also includes widening of the informal narrow footway on the opposite verge so that it links with the footway leading to Cringleford. In addition, a 30mph vehicle activated speed sign is to be provided on the approach to the site from the west. Appropriate conditions to secure these off-site improvements are recommended. I conclude that the proposal accords with SNLP policy IMP8.

Residential Amenity

4.12 Although the new development will obviously generate additional activity, this would not affect nearby dwellings to an unacceptable degree. The main orientation of the new dwellings would be to the front and rear of the site and there is generous space between so that no unreasonable level of overlooking or visual dominance would occur. Plot 5 has its rear elevation facing the adjacent bungalows, but the design has been amended to remove overlooking first floor windows and PD Rights are recommended to be removed to control this aspect. I consider that the proposal is consistent with SNLP policy IMP9.

Village Green

4.13 The application includes a proposal to create an area for public recreation on a separate site adjacent to the Parish Reading Room. The proposal includes a small equipped play area in the location of a previous stable building and hard-standing, together with a larger area for informal leisure, last used as grazing meadow. Various environmental enhancements and features such as new planting and a picnic area are proposed. It should be noted that the Parish Council suggests that the proposed Village Green should be considered separately from the residential site, and that the District Council’s standards do not require the provision of such public open space for the modest scale of the residential development proposed. Additionally, the space is offered on the basis of a 10 year lease rather than a permanent transfer to community control. In all these circumstances, I conclude that the inclusion of the Village Green in the application should not lend any significant weight to the merits of the residential proposal, nor is its provision essential as a pre-requisite for the residential development, so no related condition is recommended. Details of its future management and maintenance should be agreed before it is implemented.

Other Issues

4.14 There are a range of other considerations not specifically referred to above, that do not raise significant issues in this case. These include:
Heritage assets – The sites are sufficiently detached from listed buildings (eg Low Farm Farmhouse) so as not to materially harm their setting. A condition requiring archaeological investigation is recommended as requested by the Historic Environment Service.
Flood Risk – The site falls within the zone of least risk (Zone 1) and details of sustainable drainage will be agreed by condition.
Ecology – Neither site proposal would result in significant harm to ecological interests and appropriate mitigation and enhancement can be secured by condition in accordance with the submitted Ecological Reports. Net impacts are predicted to be neutral.
Public Right of Way – Objection was received from the PROW Officer but the scheme has been amended to address that objection.
5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 Although the site is not within a village boundary as currently defined in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, Keswick is identified as a location suitable for infill or small scale groups of dwellings, plus additional growth allocated to the Norwich Policy Area, within the more up-to-date Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (policy 16). Account has also been taken of the current lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 In the above policy context, the development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the landscape and the form and character of the settlement. The proposal has an acceptable design and will not result in significant harm to ecological interests, heritage assets, residential amenity or highway safety with the conditions imposed. The proposal is consequently consistent with SNLP policies ENV15, IMP15, IMP9 and IMP8.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: [Chris Trett, 01508 533794](mailto:ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk)
15. **Appl. No**: 2012/1757/F  
**Parish**: ROYDON

**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs B Daniels  
**Site Address**: Land Between 113 And 115 Shelfanger Road, Roydon, Norfolk, IP22 4DZ

**Proposal**: New 2 storey detached dwelling with 3 bedrooms

**Recommendation**: Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
- Policy 2: Promoting good design
- Policy 3: Energy and water
- Policy 15: Service Villages

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

2. **Consultations**

2.1 **Parish Council**  
Approve  
Subject to highways approving and any neighbouring objections

2.2 **District Member**  
To be determined by committee  
Whilst recognising the extremely tight nature of the site and the distances of the proposed dwelling from its neighbours, I am still of the opinion that this application should be put before the Development Management Committee for a decision. This will enable evidence of problems arising in similar situations to be fully explored and give the applicants opportunity to make their case before members.

2.3 **NCC Highways**  
Conditional support

2.4 **Shirley Bishop**  
Conditional support

2.5 **Conservation Officer**  
Site no longer within the conservation area, case officer to assess

2.6 **Local Residents**  
Original comments:
- 2 letter of objection
- If building goes ahead, the north flank wall of the proposed house will be 7.2 metres from our lounge and bedroom windows and therefore greatly reducing the privacy we have enjoyed to date.
- Increased noise and disturbance to property from new access drive
- Potential impact on pedestrians
- Vibration and potential damage to property
- New access not wide enough for emergency vehicles or service vehicles
- Impact on the conservation area
1 letter of neither objecting nor supporting
Concur with no. 12 regarding privacy issues; hedge adjoining property should be kept and maintained at its current height
Note window to second floor that could overlook our property and that it is proposed to obscure glaze, would ask that this is conditioned

1 letter in response to the amended plans
If the distance from the south elevation of our house to the north wall of the proposed house is to be in excess of 12 metres it would improve the situation for ourselves

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey dwelling within the curtilage of The Mill House, Shelfanger Road, with residential properties surrounding the site.

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

4.3 The site was within the Diss conservation area until September 2012, when the Diss appraisal was approved by Council, which included revisions to the conservation area boundary and the part that covered the application site was removed, therefore it is no longer within a conservation area and does not impact on any views into or out of the revised conservation area.

4.4 It is considered that the design of the proposed dwelling reflects the character of the area and is of good quality, therefore according with policy 2 of the JCS.

4.5 The new dwelling is proposed to be located on an open garden area between The Old Mill, 115 and The Mill House, 113 Shelfanger Road, which are both two storey dwellings. The distance (shown on the plans submitted) between the rear two storey wall of 113 and the front porch of the new dwelling is approximately 16.1 metres, the window to window at first floor is approximately 17.8 metres. Also the only private amenity space available to The Mill House is to its rear. Due to the close proximity of the new dwelling to the rear of The Mill House, the development would give rise to a situation detrimental to the residential amenities of both the existing property (this is within the applicant's ownership) and the new dwelling by virtue of overlooking and loss of privacy. The creation of a new access between 111 and 113 to serve the existing dwelling and the new dwelling would also give rise a situation detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the existing properties via noise and disturbance. The proposal is contrary to policy IMP9 of SNLP.

5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 Due to the close proximity of the new dwelling to the rear of The Mill House, the development would give rise to a situation detrimental to the residential amenities of both the existing property and the new dwelling by virtue of overlooking and loss of privacy. The creation of a new access between 111 and 113 to serve the existing dwelling and the new dwelling would give rise a situation detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the existing properties via noise and disturbance. The proposal is contrary to policy IMP9 Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788 and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
16. **Appl. No**: 2012/1843/RVC  
**Parish**: DISS  
Applicants Name : Tesco Stores Ltd  
Site Address : Tesco Superstore Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JN  
Proposal : Variation of condition 12 of planning permission 2002/1106/O to allow unrestricted delivery hours (currently restricted to between the hours of 7.00 and 22.00, no trading between the hours of 22.00 and 7.00, no change proposed to the trading hours)

**Recommendation** : Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**
   1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5 : The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 This site has been subject to a significant number of applications and therefore I have not included applications for signage received in 2005

2.2 2009/1266 Proposed glazed wind entrance lobby with automatic (fully glazed) sliding doors to either side. Relocation of trolley bays and street furniture. Loss of 2 parking spaces to accommodate new trolley bays. Approved

2.3 2008/1091 Proposed erection of front entrance lobby, relocation/modified trolley bay, together with associated enabling works. Refused

2.4 2006/1216 Revision to car park and re-alignment of internal access road Approved

2.5 2005/2178 Demolition of 119 Victoria Road in relation to works for new superstore Approved

2.6 2005/2169 Demolition of existing buildings and extension to car park for an additional 73 spaces Approved
2.7 2005/1892 Amendment to previously approved application 2005/0910 to include extensions to front elevation to incorporate customer toilets and ATM's, alterations to service dock area and north west elevation of store Approved

2.8 2005/1882 Five rooftop wind turbines Approved

2.9 2005/1814 Amendments to roof profile of 2005/0910 to incorporate roof lights and solar panels Approved

2.10 2005/1770 Amendment to 2005/0910 – extension to car park for additional 80 spaces Refused

2.11 2005/0910 Submission of reserved matters pursuant to condition 2no of outline permission 2002/1106/O to include details for conditions 3no, 5no, 14no, 19no, 20no, 21no & 25no Approved

2.12 2002/1106 Demolition of existing retail buildings and construction of new foodstore and car park Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Diss Town Council Refuse The applicant has successfully traded for several years with this condition in place and the noise disturbance for residential near neighbours would be unacceptable

3.2 District Members:
   Cllr K Kiddie: Can be delegated
   Cllr G Walden: Can be delegated
   Cllr T Palmer: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections The applicant's revised acoustic report includes all of the aspects raised by us with respect to delivery noise and I withdraw our previous objection to the proposed development on acoustic grounds

3.4 Historic Environment Service No views or comments

3.5 Environment Agency No views or comments

3.6 NCC Highways No objections

3.7 Local Residents 4 letters of objection
   • Since 2005 when Tesco's opened have suffered a significant deterioration in our quality of life
   • Subjected to continual noise from car horns, car alarms, delivery vehicles, trolleys and over-revving of car and motorcycle engines
4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent to vary condition 12 of planning permission 2002/1106 to allow unrestricted deliveries to the Tesco’s Superstore, Victoria Road, Diss. The site is located to the south side of Victoria Road with Morrison’s Superstore and commercial garage to the east/northeast, the River Waveney to the south and residential properties to the north and west.

4.2 Outline planning permission was given in 2004 for the construction of a new superstore and condition 12 states 'There shall be no trading or deliveries to and from the site between the hours of 22.00 hours and 7.00am'. The reason for the condition was to protect the amenities of the adjoining residents. The reserved matters applications were approved in 2005 and the store began trading later that year. The applicants wish to remove the restriction in relation to deliveries only. The submitted planning statement advises that in operational terms, the efficient and effective management of deliveries is critical to the success of the food store and its ability to meet the needs of the customers. The timing of the deliveries is important to ensure that stock levels are consistent throughout the week, and shelves are replenished in time. The current times makes it very difficult to maintain stock on shelves for customers, particularly fresh produce in the mornings. There needs to be a period of time whilst the store is closed for products to be delivered, unloaded, and on the shelves before the store opens. Unrestricted delivery hours would provide for great flexibility and would ease the current operational problems at the store.

4.3 The Tesco’s service yard is located to the west of the site, is enclosed and the existing store building screens the main activities. Morrison’s service yard, part of the building and car park are located immediately adjacent Tesco’s service yard. Morrison’s is not subject to any hours restrictions. The original condition was placed on the outline consent where the indicative plan showed the service yard and plant area to the east of the site, adjacent to existing residential properties. Tesco’s where approached at this time to relocate the service yard to the west but they were not happy to do so, hence the condition restricting both hours of trading and delivery was imposed. Under the reserved matters application the services yard had actually been relocated to the west separated from residential properties by the car park and main store building. The main issue of lifting the restriction is the potential impact on the amenities of the nearby residential properties via noise and disturbance. The Environmental Health Officer originally raised concerns due to insufficient acoustic information being submitted, however the agents have revised the acoustic report to include all aspects raised by the Environmental Health Officer and he now raises no objections.

4.4 I conclude that on balance, given the location of the service yard in relation to the neighbouring residential properties and the Environmental Health Officer not raising any objections that the removal of the restriction on the hours of delivery is acceptable and would not give rise to a situation so detrimental to their amenities as to warrant refusal of the application.
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 13 Main Towns of the Joint Core Strategy and SHO4 Town Centres, IMP10 Noise and IMP9 Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. It accords with the National Planning Policy Framework - 2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres.

5.2 The variation of delivery hours is considered to accord with the above policies SHO4, IMP10, IMP9, and Policy 13 as the site is within the central business area and Town Centre for the Town of Diss, it creates/retains employment; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree. These SNLP policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

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

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs P Bryce  
Site Address : Land Adj To Elm Lodge Downham Grove Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0SN  
Proposal : Outline application for two storey detached dwelling, cartshed/garden store and new access drive including matters of access, layout and scale.

Recommendation : Refuse

2. Insufficient Information – ecological impact.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0398/F (application on adjacent site)  
Erection of one and a half storey dwelling with open garage  
Approved

2.2 2010/1991/O (application on adjacent site)  
Outline application for two storey detached dwelling, cartshed/garden store and new access drive including matters of access, layout and scale.  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve

3.2 District Member  
Although the proposal falls just outside the Development Boundary the vicinity of the site has been so substantially changed by two large scale residential development to the south and east of the application site. The proposed dwelling will not erode the character of the immediate area.

3.3 Landscape Officer  
Object to the loss of 5 trees to make provision for the proposal - and to the pressure for the removal of trees on the east and south boundary which will result in shading to the property.
Revised plan to demonstrate that the buildings can be accommodated on site without impact to the Root Protection Area, but maintains objection on the grounds of shading to the property and pressure for the future removal of the additional trees.

3.4 Nick Bolton - NCC
No comments received

3.5 Shirley Bishop
No objections subject to adequate provision for disposal of surface water drainage.

3.6 Local Residents
2 letter of support
With 200 housing being developed on adjoining fields, no reason to refuse this application.
The small Hamlet of 5 dwellings is already linked to Wymondham on two sides by the current development; this proposal will not harm the countryside.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is an outline application for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated garage and garden store on land adjacent to Elm Lodge. The site is in a cleared area of woodland which is bordered on the east and south by existing mature trees and a hedge. The access to the site is off Downham Grove which is a single track leading from Norwich Common. The site is outside the Development Limits of Wymondham. Two large residential sites are under construction to the south east (Whispering Oaks) and the north east (Oaklands/Becketts Grove) of the site.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that new dwellings are for sustainable locations, are of good design and do not adversely affect the Ecology of the site or the surrounding area. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 Policy ENV 8 permits new dwellings in the open countryside under certain criteria either for existing agricultural or forestry purposes, or for commercial sites which demand a rural location. Section 6 (Para 55) of the NPPF also makes provision for dwellings in the open countryside if the design is truly outstanding or innovative. From the information submitted the application for a dwelling in this location is not for agricultural or forestry purposes or for a commercial enterprise which accords with policy, no justification is submitted with the application to depart from policy. As the application is for outline permission, no evidence has been submitted to consider the application against Section 6 of the NPPF (exceptional designs). For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policy.

4.4 The agent refers to an application on a plot on the opposite side of the track to the current proposal which was granted for a single dwelling on land adjacent to No 1 Downham Grove in 2011. This application followed an outline application which was refused, and dismissed on appeal in 2008 the reasons being:- the site is outside the Development Limit; the scheme would not significantly contribute to housing land supply; and permission without justification would make it more difficult to resist applications for single dwellings elsewhere in the open countryside which cumulatively would be damaging to the character of the rural area of the district.
4.5 A further application for 1 dwelling was submitted in 2010 also refused for the same reasons. A later application was received in 2010 for a new dwelling, recommended for refusal for the same reasons relevant to the Appeal decision in 2008, but the application was approved by the Planning Committee. The reason given was: although outside the Development Limits the open countryside in this vicinity of the site has been substantially changed by the development to the south and east of the proposal. The proposed dwelling will not therefore erode the character of the area to any significant degree and is considered to accord with policy. That dwelling has now been constructed.

4.6 The two large residential sites under construction, Whispering Oaks and Oaklands/Becketts Grove were also outside the Development Limit but contributed significantly to reducing the shortfall in the housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and this was a major consideration in the decision to approve them.

4.7 The Wymondham Area Action Plan currently going through the consultation process still excludes the current application site from the Development Limit although it carries little weight at this consultation stage.

4.8 Notwithstanding the decision on the adjacent site, this site is outside the Development Limit and officers remain of the view that a new dwelling is not justified. The proposed dwelling, while meeting the needs and aspirations of the individual applicant, will both singularly and cumulatively be damaging to the rural character of the Downham Grove area and in conflict with Policy ENV8.

4.9 Concern was been raised by the Council's Landscape Officer regarding the need for the felling of five mature woodland trees which are suitable for retention for at least 20+ years. The other concern raised is that of potential shadowing to the new development from the trees which are to be retained on the east and south of the site. These points were noted by the agent and amended plans have been submitted showing retention of additional trees on the site and a slight shift if the position of the building to demonstrate that the dwelling and garaging/garden storage area can be accommodated without encroaching onto the Root Protection Area of the retained trees. However, objection is maintained by the Landscape Officer with regard to future pressure to remove trees from the east and south boundary to improve natural light to the property. The retention of trees on the site is also relevant to the ecology of the site and the wider area for the retention of wildlife habitat.

4.10 No Ecology Survey has been submitted to assess how and if the proposal would have any impact on the surrounding wildlife or their habitat. Justification has been stated for not including this survey as the proposed site for the new dwelling is a recently formed clearing within woodland. The clearing is currently bare earth with some remaining tree stumps and is not therefore currently of high ecological value. Most of the woodland on the site will be retained with existing ditches and the pond at the site perimeter not being disturbed by the proposal. The agent considers that given the current bare state of the proposal site ecology is unlikely to be the fundamental consideration and could be submitted as part of the Reserved Matters Application. The agent also makes reference to the adjacent site which was allowed subject to a satisfactorily ecology survey being submitted.

4.11 However, given that the site is surrounded by mature hedges and trees, with ditches and a pond bordering the site it is not possible to assess if and how the proposal will impact on the wildlife or their habitat and what mitigating measures may be necessary.
5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal for the erection of one dwelling is assessed against Policy ENV8. The development of this plot would result in erosion of the undeveloped rural character of this area which is outside the Development Limits with no justification to depart from policy.

5.2 Insufficient information has been received by the local planning authority to adequately assess the impact of the scheme. In particular, in the absence of information relating to an ecology survey it is not possible to assess the impacts of the development on the ecology of the area including the existing trees and hedges which form the boundary of the site.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
18. **Appl. No**: 2012/2151/F  
**Parish**: DISS  
**Applicants Name**: Mr J Darrell  
**Site Address**: Kings Head Yard Car Park Mere Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4AG  
**Proposal**: Erection of restaurant bar  

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Specific details to be agreed  
4. External materials to be agreed  
5. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
6. Full details of external lighting  
7. Provision of fume extraction system  
8. Hours of use – 08.00 to 24.00  
9. Archaeological requirements  
10. Details of surface water drainage  
11. Development as per raft foundation design  
12. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
13. Landscape management plan  
14. Mere side walk to be provided  
15. Details of barriers to be submitted

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
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  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
SHO 10: Class A3 uses outside the defined Central Business Areas  
DIS 12: Enhancement of Diss Mere’s eastern banks  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0964 Extension of time limit application to planning permission 2008/2353/F - Erection of 1 single storey restaurant and associated works  
Approved Expires 10/08/2014

2.2 2010/0334 Proposed erection of 3no shop units and 3no first floor flats above.  
Approved
2.3 2008/2353  Erection of 1 single storey restaurant and associated works  Approved

2.4 2007/2595  Erection of 1 single storey restaurant and a three storey building with retail on ground floor and studio flats on 1st and 2nd floors  Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council  Approve
Principle of development of this site in a modern design is supported and previously supported the restaurant proposal. However whilst the application does state that it is for use as a restaurant, it is widely known that JD Wetherspoon will be the new tenant.
Concern that this will be a licenced premise run more as a public house with restaurant activity and consequently there may be potential noise nuisance for residential dwellings nearby, especially with the removal of the leylandii hedge.
Concerns at safety of inebriated patrons with the frontage very close to the Mere’s edge - measures should be implemented to minimise the risk.
No reference to relevant policy in Design and Access Statement
Proposed finish of the side elevations and the lean-to roof are considered unsuitable in the Conservation Area.

3.2 District Members:

Cllr Keith Kiddie:  Can be delegated
This development will occupy a prominent site in central Diss overlooking the Mere. It will need careful consideration as to its overall size and quality of build. I appreciate that this has been debated in the past.

Cllr G H Walden:  To be determined by committee
The development will have a major impact on the shoreline of the Mere, an important visual amenity. I support the development.

Cllr Tony Palmer:  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Emergency Planning  No objections:
Would ask that evacuation procedure are considered in the event of any flooding from the Mere

3.4 Planning Policy  No objections
The alterations proposed in the application from the previously approved scheme raise no new policy issues

3.5 Landscape Officer  No comments received

3.6 Conservation Officer  Conditional support
3.7 Environmental Services (Protection)  Conditional support

3.8 Historic Environment Service  Conditional support

3.9 NCC Highways  No objections

3.10 Norfolk Police  Conditional support
Physical protective measures to be installed at the water's edge
Lighting

3.11 Local Residents  1 letter of objection from local business
- High street is dying and needs new life - a cinema, bowling or entertainment type complex, to attract customers into the town
- This would encourage people to spend money, having a knock on effect thus increasing trade for existing food/beverage outlets
- Losing a central car park and not replacing will have a detrimental impact on local business in the town and does not serve the community and its residents effectively.

1 letter of no objection from local business
- But wish to draw to our attention the legal rights over sections of the application site, including rights of access for vehicles and pedestrians

4 Assessment

4.1 This application relates to a site within the historic core of Diss on the north east side of the Mere. The site is within the Conservation Area with several listed buildings within the vicinity. It is within the development boundary but just outside the central business area. Kings Head Yard is a private pay and display car park with service and pedestrian access to the rear of the buildings to the south and also contains a single storey building. There are important views from the south west where any development will be seen across the Mere against the backdrop of existing buildings.

4.2 This application seeks consent for the erection of a restaurant bar which will have a mixed A3 (restaurants and cafe) and A4 (drinking establishments) use. Consent was given in 2008 and 2011 for a restaurant on the site, this application whilst keeping the modern design approach, siting etc, increases the height of the proposal to enable a mezzanine floor to be provided at the front part of the building over looking the Mere, changes to the external appearance and an increase in its footprint. These changes do not negatively impact of the overall design and allow for a better use of space within the building. The design of the restaurant bar and layout around the building will enhance this part of the Conservation Area and the Diss Mere's eastern banks and can be supported under polices Policy 2 of the JCS and IMP15, IMP18 and DIS12 of SNLP. The scheme is also positively supported by the Council's Conservation and Design Architect who has no objections to the changes to the design.

4.3 In policy terms the proposed use accords with NPPF and JCS policies which support employment and mixed uses in Towns. The proposed use, which is an alteration from the previously approved scheme to enable more flexibility, can be supported under policy SHO10 which supports new restaurant/bar/pub uses outside the central business area. The use in this location will not give rise to adverse environmental effects, is acceptable in highways terms as the Highway Officer raises no objections, and would not give rise to demands to late night parking in residential side streets given the number of public car parks in the vicinity. The environmental health officers have raised no objections to the hours of use or the mixed use.
4.4 The concerns raised by the Town Council and local business are fully appreciated, however, the mixed use to the proposal is supported by policy and will not give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of nearby residential properties as to warrant refusal on this ground. The application changes the roof material from sedum to a single membrane with coloured edge profile and wall treatment from untreated Larch cladding to a mixture of timber cladding and manmade ‘fireline’ weather boarding. The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the changes in materials which do not significantly alter the design approach provided that the materials and their finish/colours to be used are agreed by officers. The issue of the erection of a physical protective measure (barrier) at the Mere water’s edge has also been raised by Norfolk Police and has been included within my proposed conditions. Whilst the precise means of barrier needs careful consideration and consultation with the conservation officer and the applicant, I consider this achievable without any adverse impact on the layout of the proposal or the character of the conservation 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, IMP15 - Setting of listed buildings, IMP18 - Development in Conservation Areas, DIS12 Enhancement of Diss Mere’s eastern banks, SHO10 - Class A3 uses outside the defined central business areas, IMP8 - Safe and free flow of traffic and IMP9 Residential amenity.

5.2 The proposal accords with the above policies as the design and scale of the restaurant bar building and layout around is acceptable and will positively enhances this part of the Conservation Area and the Diss Mere's eastern banks, the proposal creates employment; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree. These SNLP policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

5.3 The proposed layout is acceptable in highway terms and retains existing parking obligations within the ownership of the site and is considered to be in accordance with policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
The following reports relate to 22 roundabout sites where signage has been erected in association with Norfolk County Council by Market Force Limited. The background to the signage is set out in the attached documents which have been submitted by Market Force Limited and Norfolk County Council in support of the applications.

The sites are located within both rural and urban locations and Officer’s have sought to balance the objectives of the County Council with the policy context for signage within South Norfolk as set out in the adopted policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance in the Supplementary Planning document “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants”.

Members will note that that policies and supplementary guidance set out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient. Exceptionally, where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported. In this context, Officers have considered the desirability of restricting the signage to relate to a company in the locality of the site. Given the rural character of the district, it is considered that within 10km of the site is a reasonable definition of a local company.

In terms of assessing the impact on the amenity of the locality, consideration has been given to the commercial context of the site and the presence of other authorised signage which is seen in relation to the roundabout signs.

### A47 Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>App No</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2012/2040</td>
<td>Site 49 Norwich by pass</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2012/2051</td>
<td>Site 65 Newmarket Rd, Cringleford</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2012/2052</td>
<td>Site 68 Colney Ln, Colney</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2012/2050</td>
<td>Site 64 Watton Rd Colney</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2012/2049</td>
<td>Site 63 Watton Rd, Bawburgh</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2012/2061</td>
<td>Site 84 Dereham Rd Costessey</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2012/2063</td>
<td>Site 85 Dereham Rd Costessey</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2012/2064</td>
<td>Site 86 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2012/2065</td>
<td>Site 87 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wymondham Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>App No</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2012/2059</td>
<td>Site 81 Harts Fm Rd Wym</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2012/2056</td>
<td>Site 77 Tuttles Ln E</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2012/2066</td>
<td>Site 90 Browick Rd</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2012/2060</td>
<td>Site 82 Browick Rd</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2012/2058</td>
<td>Site 80 London Rd</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A61 Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>App No</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2012/2054</td>
<td>Site 75 Ipswich Rd, Pulham M</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2012/2053</td>
<td>Site 69 Norwich Rd Dickleburgh</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2012/2048</td>
<td>Sign 58 Diss Rd Scole</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2012/2067</td>
<td>Site 92 Park Rd Diss</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### East Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>App No</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2012/2045</td>
<td>Site 50 Norwich Rd Dickleburgh</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2012/2046</td>
<td>Site 53 Norwich Rd Gillingham</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2012/2068</td>
<td>Site 57 The Street Poringland</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2012/2047</td>
<td>Site 56 The Street Poringland</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roundabout Sponsorship – Norfolk County Council Statement

The scheme:

As Norfolk County Council moves to become more entrepreneurial, and offer better value for money, Members and officers have been looking at all areas to see how we can deliver services at lower costs for our residents.

With this in mind, a Member led initiative was agreed by Cabinet in November 2011 to provide a consistent approach to roundabout sponsorship throughout Norfolk and generate external funding to help support highway maintenance budgets.

Through securing sponsorship at a proper market rate, the initiative has allowed Norfolk County Council to offset the entire cost of roundabout maintenance each year and provide the opportunity to enhance specific roundabouts across the county at no additional cost to our council tax payers. Any surplus income generated over and above the cost to maintain the roundabout would be spent on routine maintenance of the highway network.

Background:

Although all roundabouts outside Norwich are owned and maintained by Norfolk County Council, prior to this initiative ad hoc roundabout sponsorship happened across the county, with no consistent rules, sizing or prices, and it was sold or let by a mix of county, district and borough councils. No formal planning consent was sought or granted for this sponsorship signing.

Our highways and marketing teams worked together to appoint a national company called Marketing Force to obtain and arrange roundabout sponsorship across the County. Marketing Force successfully work with over 100 local authorities undertaking similar arrangements and offer vast experience within this field and a wealth of knowledge with regard to the appropriate signage for each roundabout.

Sites & Signs:

All sites included within the scheme have been reviewed for suitability by both NCC Highway Engineers and Marketing Force themselves and the associated signs have been agreed with our Network Safety (previously Casualty Reduction) team.

Cabinet also approved a change to the restrictions on the size and type of permitted signs associated with provision of roundabout sponsorship. Given the size of the signs and their placement our safety experts’ view was that there is no impact upon visibility and that they offer no greater safety concern than existing sponsorship signs, planting and parish signs which are commonly placed at such sites around the county. The signs are consistent with those used by other authorities throughout the Country.

There are 2 standard sizes of signs currently used throughout the county with the choice of sign size depending upon the varying site constraints and road characteristics of each site. In addition, the text ‘in partnership with Norfolk County Council’ has been agreed by for use across every site within the arrangement. The ‘partnership’ referred to on the sign is standard wording that is used on similar signs across the UK and refers to the ‘sponsorship’ partnership to improve and keep the roundabouts well maintained across the county.

One of the over-arching aims of the scheme is to ensure and enhance the viability of local businesses. Roundabout sponsorship is one way in which Norfolk County Council can help local businesses promote their business, without the need for resorting to illegal signing.
Securing Sponsors:

In order to allow equal opportunity for all potential sponsors, once the agreement commenced, promotional boards were erected on number of sites asking for interested parties to make contact. Businesses were only proactively contacted by Marketing Force if there is no interest generated as part of this initial process.

Whilst the agreement is open to all, an ethical framework is in place to ensure all goods and services advertised on the roundabout are appropriate and are suitable.

Nick Tupper  
Highways Maintenance Manager  
14 February 2013
MARKETING FORCE LTD – STATEMENT

Marketing Force Ltd, founded in 1995, is the UK’s market leader in Roundabout Sponsorship. We are currently working with over one hundred local authorities on highly successful sponsorship initiatives, offering unique advertising opportunities to local and national businesses. Roundabout sponsorship is providing a significant income to Norfolk County Council which will enable them to improve the maintenance of their roundabouts and roadside verges which otherwise would be reduced due to recent funding cuts.

Throughout the UK MFL have found that planning authorities are giving advertising consent to display a sign at each entrance to a roundabout; irrespective if it is in an urban or rural location, this does appear to be planning authority ‘best community practice’ across the UK and within the safety community throughout Britain it is accepted that the signage dimensions proposed do not constitute a safety issue whatsoever. This is further endorsed by Norfolk County Council Highways as their engineers have inspected and approved these sites on an individual basis.

To date districts such as King’s Lynn and Broadland have consented to a number of sponsorship signs being installed in their areas, but a large number of other areas across the Country have been awarded advertising consent for similar sized signs to those in South Norfolk, for example; South Oxfordshire, Cheltenham, Trafford MBC, Buckinghamshire, Lancashire, Kent, Bedfordshire and Dorset.

Marketing Force were appointed by Norfolk County Council in June 2012 to manage their Roundabout Sponsorship Scheme, and the decision to launch a scheme was made at Cabinet level to formalize the sponsorship programme across the whole of the County as a number of ad hoc schemes were in operation with local Parish/District/Borough Councils.

The rationale behind this decision was in essence to:-

- Generate external funding to help supplement maintenance budgets
- Rationalize ad hoc approach to roundabout sponsorship
- Give local businesses the opportunity to advertise on the highway
- Help manage illegal signing on the highway
Since the launch in June 2012, 95% of available sites have been secured by local businesses, this is indicative of the need for advertising opportunities in this predominantly rural area of the Country, particularly in this extremely tough economic climate. This form of advertising is attractive to a cross section of local businesses, all with varying budget constraints that range from a funeral director to a hotel to a bathroom company. These companies all have a desire to promote themselves in a legal way to a wider audience, and this ultimately assists the County to deliver a better standard of maintenance on its highway assets, which in turn provides a better amenity value to the area.

The locations applied for are on Norfolk CC's road network and the sites are maintained by the County or in partnership with the Parish/Town/District Council. The proposed signage is uniform with a strapline “In partnership with the Norfolk County Council” along the bottom section of the sign – see Appendix 1.

I attach photographic examples of sponsors’ signs in situ on other road networks (Appendix 2) that have been awarded advertising consent to provide you with a comparison of sites that we are applying for in South Norfolk. (Appendices 3).

It is widely acknowledged that Councils are facing budget cuts and in order to keep the maintenance levels similar to that previously enjoyed by residents and the general public and income generation schemes such as roundabout sponsorship are being implemented by many County, District and Borough Councils up and down the Country to help sustain amenity standards.
Sponsors permitted to display company name and logo, short message and contact details (Website / Address / Telephone number)

Signs mounted on 1000mm x 50mm black posts. Non-Illuminated / Non-Reflective signage. (Matt finish)

Sign will be positioned a minimum of 1000mm away from the roundabout edge. Total overall height of signs from ground level no more than 750mm

Signs fascia will be produced in full colour on digital vinyl applied to 2mm di-bond aluminium.
19. Appl. No : 2012/2040/A  
Parish : KESWICK AND INTWOOD

Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address : Site 49 Norwich Southern Bypass Caistor St Edmund Norfolk
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Adversely affects the amenity and character of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8, IMP23 and ENV6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. Planning Policies

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV3: River Valleys
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

Supplementary Guidance
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

Draft Development Management Policies
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.
2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history

6. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Highway Agency Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents 1 letter of objection
- Distraction to motorists and result in danger to road users

4. Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the main roundabout between the A47 and A140. It is bordered by agricultural land to the north east and south, with the Park and Ride site to the north west. The area is predominantly rural in character and there are no other signs within the vicinity of the site.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Bathrooms by Design 2 Cooper Court, which have premises at The Street, Long Stratton and Plumstead Road, Thorpe End, which are 12km / 6km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. In addition, this site lies within the Southern By pass protection area which restricts new development.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and while this is a large roundabout where each sign is seen in isolation I consider that they detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A47 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8, IMP23 and ENV6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
20.  

**Appl. No**: 2012/2051/A  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD

Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address : Site 65 Newmarket Road Cringleford Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Adversely affects the amenity and character of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV2, ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV2: Strategic Gaps  
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.
2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history

7. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4. Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the A11 at the junction with the new housing development which is located to the north. The surrounding area is open in character and is bordered by open land, despite the new development to the north. There are no other signs within the vicinity of the site.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Gerald Giles TV, which is located at 16-20 Berr Street, Norwich which is 4.5km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and while it is a large roundabout, the signs are seen in the context of each other and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A11 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety
5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV2, ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
21. **App. No**: 2012/2052/A  
**Parish**: COLNEY

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 68 Colney Lane Colney Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Refuse

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**  
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history

8. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: None received  
3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate  
3.3 NCC Highways: Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.
3.4 Economic Development Manager
Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents
None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located within the development limit and is at the entrance to the N&N hospital and is bordered to the west by hospital buildings including Big C and Edith Cavell teaching facilities. To the east and south of the site the area is open in character comprising of playing fields and open land which are covered by policies ENV3 River Valleys, ENV8 Development in the Open Countryside and ENV6 Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the southern bypass. Signage in the vicinity of the site comprises that associated with the N&N, Big C, and Edith Cavell building.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The companies advertising on this roundabout are 4 Secure Storage and Simon Long storage, both of which are located on Hall Rd which is 7km from the application site.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and seen in the context of each other and detract from the character of the surrounding area. In addition, permitting signs at this junction close to the Norwich Research Park is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policy IMP19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
22. **Appl. No :** 2012/2050/A  
**Parish :** COLNEY

Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address : Site 64 Watton Road Colney Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Adversely affects the amenity and character of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2004/0849 Proposed erection of aluminium colour coated site nameboard sign Approved

2.2 2003/0955 Proposed erection of site nameboard sign Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council None received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Highway Agency Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents None received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the entry / exit of the eastern slip road to the A47 and is bordered to the west by the by pass and to the east by woodland, part of which comprises the Colney Woodland Burial ground. Signage in the vicinity of the site comprises that associated with the Colney burial ground. (See also 2012/2049)

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Ivan Fisher funeral Homes Norton House, 17 Park Drive, Hethersett which is 6km from the application site. In addition, this site lies within the Southern By pass protection area which restricts new development. (See also 2012/2049)

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A47 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

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

27 February 2013

23. Appl. No : 2012/2049/A
Parish : BAWBURGH

Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher
Site Address : Site 63 Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Adversely affects the amenity and character of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. Planning Policies

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

Supplementary Guidance
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

Draft Development Management Policies
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.
2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  Refuse

- Unwelcome additional signage in rural landscape
- Precedent for future signs
- Distraction to drivers on busy A47 junction
- Unnecessary notice in southern by pass protection zone

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Highway Agency  Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 NCC Highways  Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager  Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents  None received.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the entry / exit of the western slip road to the A47 and is bordered to the west by a nursery ground and to the east by the by pass. Signs in the vicinity of the site include a range of banner signs associated with the nursery grounds and a free standing sign in the field to the north. (See also 2012/2050)

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Wensum Valley Hotel which is 7km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. In addition, this site lies within the Southern By pass protection area which restricts new development.
The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A47 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV6, ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
24. **Appl. No** : 2012/2061/A  
**Parish** : COSTESSEY  
Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address : Site 84 Dereham Road Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs  
Recommendation : Approve with conditions  

1 The signage shall relate to a company within 10km of the site

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements  
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1971 Erection of 6 advertising flags and 2 approved aluminium signs - showground
2.2 2010/2192 Erection of a illuminated fascia sign – Brewers Fayre  Approved

2.3 2008/0805 Erection of new branding signs - 4no facias and 2no totems – showground  Approved

2.4 2007/2116 Proposed illuminated signage – Premier Inn  Approved

2.5 2006/1204 Retrospective application for installation of a double sided externally illuminated promotional display unit – Showground  Refused

2.6 2004/0389 Proposed illuminated welcome on business premises with erection of 2no double sided totems – Brewers Fayre  Approved

2.7 2004/0586 Proposed erection of 2no illuminated totem signs, 1no fascia sign & 1no roundel – Travel Inn  Approved

2.8 1999/0785 Erection of various signage to Travel Inn – Travel Inn  Approved

2.9 1997/0845 Erection of double sided free-standing advance sign – Brewers Fayre  Approved

2.10 1997/0109 Erection of various Brewers Fayre signs – Brewers Fayre  Approved

2.11 Enforcement  2009/8346 Unauthorised display of advertisement

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Approve – queried who would maintain planting

3.2 District Member  Can be Delegated

3.3 Highway Agency  Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 NCC Highways  Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager  Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents  None received.
4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the entry / exit of the western slip road to the A47 and is bordered to the west by the Norfolk show ground, to the north by the Premier Inn and to the south by the Park & Ride. There is a range of authorised signs on the Showground and Premier Inn, and a number of unauthorised hoardings by the showground and adjacent to the park and ride.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Holbrook Leisure, Swangey Farm, Swangey Lane, Attleborough which is 24km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. In addition, this site lies within the Southern By pass protection area which restricts new development.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible and while the area has open characteristics, it is clearly seen in the context of commercial developments including the hotel and car showrooms beyond and the showground. I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable. The company currently advertising on this roundabout is located a significant distance from the site, and in the context of the Council’s policies I consider that it is appropriate to require subsequent signage to relate to a company in the vicinity of the site.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
25. **Appl. No**: 2012/2063/A  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 85 Dereham Road Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements  
ENV6: Areas which contribute to the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2006/1166  
Erection of 3 illuminated totem signs - Sainsbury  
Approved
2.2 2006/2061 Proposed erection of a remote pole sign – KFC Refused

2.3 2006/1835 Proposed erection of (A) Illuminated building signs and brand wall signage (B) 5no banner signs (C) Parking and directional signage. – Sainsbury Part Approved / Part Refused

2.4 2005/2497 Proposed erection of 2no. 7mtrs & 1no. 5mtrs totem signs – Sainsbury Refused

2.5 2004/0169 Proposed erection of 5no external spokes for leaflet dispensing, 6 leaflet dispensing PFS spokes & 2no ATM surround panels and information panel – Sainsbury Approved

2.6 2003/0395 Display of illuminated advertisement on premises and directional signs on highway – Longwater business park Approved

2.7 1996/0906 'Builders equipment' sign Refused

2.8 1998/0400 Combined McDonalds and Sainsbury sign Approved

2.9 Enforcement

2009/8090 Unauthorised advertisements closed

2010/8006 Unauthorised Display of Advertisement

2009/8123 unauthorised advertisement at junction of A 47 and Dereham Road, Costessey

2009/8072 unauthorised advertisement closed

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve – queried who would maintain planting

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Highway Agency Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents None received.
4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the entry / exit of the eastern slip road to the A47 and is bordered to west by the A47 and to the east by the Longwater Retail Park and commercial area. Signage in the vicinity of the site comprises the totem advert for companies on the Longwater retail park and McDonalds, together with company signage opposite.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Morton Windows & Conservatories Chestnut Drive, Wymondham which is 15km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. In addition, this site lies within the Southern By pass protection area which restricts new development.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout, however they are seen in the context of the commercial developments in the vicinity of the roundabout. While the Council has sought to restrict signage at this junction in relation to the retail park and industrial area, I consider that the signage proposed is limited in scale and does not detract from the character of the area and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable. The company currently advertising on this roundabout is located a significant distance from the site, and in the context of the Council’s policies I consider that it is appropriate to require subsequent signage to relate to a company in the vicinity of the site.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
26. **Appl. No**: 2012/2064/A  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 86 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. The signage shall relate to a company within 10km of the site

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/1845 Replacement signage – Sainsbury Approved

2.2 2006/1835 Proposed erection of (A) Illuminated building signs and brand wall signage (B) 5no banner signs (C) Parking and directional signage. – Sainsbury  
Part Approved / Part Refused

2.3 2006/1166 Erection of 3 illuminated totem signs Approved

2.4 2005/2497 Proposed erection of 2no. 7mtrs & 1no. 5mtrs totem signs – Sainsbury Refused

2.5 2005/1470 Proposed erection of 11no illuminated and 2no non-Illuminated signs – Longwater Business Park Approved
2.6 2000/1335 Erection of illuminated projecting sign Approved

2.7 1997/0443 Erection of two display boards relating to proposed development. – RG Carter Approved

2.8 2010/1845 Replacement signage - Sainsbury Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve – queried who would maintain planting

3.2 District Member Can be Delegated

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located within the commercial area of the Longwater estate. It is bordered to the south by the entrance to Sainsburys and on the opposite side by a garden building company. To the north is a KFC and gym, both of which incorporate company signage. The site is enclosed by the built form and changes in land levels and is not seen in a wider context.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Longwater Gravel which is 0.5km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts. In addition to the proposed signs, the company has also erected a directional sign to identify the position of the company.

4.4 I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 **Reason for Approval**

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
27. **Appl. No**: 2012/2065/A  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 87 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. The signage shall relate to a company within 10km of the site

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**  
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0462 Erection of 15 various illuminated and non-illuminated signs – The Copper Beech - Approved

2.2 2010/1845 Replacement signage – Sainsbury - Approved

2.3 2006/1835 Proposed erection of (A) Illuminated building signs and brand wall signage (B) 5no banner signs (C) Parking and directional signage. - Part Approved / Part Refused

2.4 2006/1166 Erection of 3 illuminated totem signs – Sainsbury - Approved

2.5 2005/2497 Proposed erection of 2no. 7mtrs & 1no. 5mtrs totem signs – Sainsbury - Refused
2.6 2005/1470 Proposed erection of 11no illuminated and 2no non-illuminated signs – KFC Approved

2.7 2003/0395 Display of illuminated advertisement on premises and directional signs on highway Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve – queried who would maintain planting

3.2 District Member Can be Delegated

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4. Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located within the commercial area of the Longwater estate. It is bordered to the south by the entrance to the retail park, with a public house to the north west. Open land lies to the east, but is within the allocated commercial area. Signage within the vicinity of the site currently comprises company logos on Sainsbury’s, Argos, Next and the pub. There is one unauthorised banner sign on the fence opposite the pub.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Norwich Family Golf Centre which is 1km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 **Reason for Approval**

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
28. **Appl. No**: 2012/2059/A  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 81 Harts Farm Road Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/1301** Proposed erection of 4 new freestanding panel signs, 2 new wall mounted signs, 8 replacement freestanding panels signs and 1 replacement totem sign. – Waitrose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2011/1020</td>
<td>Proposed two replacement totem signs at petrol station – Waitrose</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2010/0177</td>
<td>Proposed 2no speed limit signs and 2no no entry signs. – Waitrose</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2008/1766</td>
<td>Erection of fascia signs and freestanding signs – Focus</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2008/1765</td>
<td>Erection of banners, vinyls and poster frames</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2004/0687</td>
<td>Proposed erection and replacement of signs on supermarket premises to include illuminated totems &amp; main sign, banners &amp; garage signage- Waitrose</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2001/1732</td>
<td>Erection of lamp post mounted banners – Waitrose</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1999/1029</td>
<td>Erection of non illuminated hoarding sign – Gateway 11</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2004/0250</td>
<td>Unauthorised Advertisements – Waitrose</td>
<td>Unapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009/8103</td>
<td>Unauthorised Advertisements - Waitrose</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Consultations**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Contrary to TRA13 – will compromise the safe and free flow of traffic as they are a distracting visual hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>District Member</td>
<td>To be reported if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Economic Development Manager</td>
<td>Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>None received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.
4.2 The site is located at the entrance to Gateway 11 commercial area and is bordered to the south west by the commercial estate which includes the former Focus DIY store, while to the north west is the Waitrose supermarket. Land to the east is currently open agricultural land although there are current planning applications for residential development.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Conservatories etc, Penfold Dr Wymondham which is 0.25km from the application site within the commercial estate. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible and while the area has open characteristics, it is clearly seen in the context of Gateway 11 and the supermarket. I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
29. **Appl. No:** 2012/2056/A  
**Parish:** WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address : Site 77 Tuttles Lane East Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. The signage shall relate to a company within 10km of the site

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1231 Charles Church sign advertising the Refused  
Oaklands Development at Becketts Grove, in the field on land south east side of Norwich Common
2.2 1990/0910 Erection Of Halo Illuminated Shop Signs To Supermarket.

2.3 Enforcement 2012/8164 Display of Unauthorised Advertisement Closed

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council Refuse Contrary to TRA13 – will compromise the safe and free flow of traffic as they are a distracting visual hazard

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located within an urban area and is bordered to the north by residential properties, although a number have been converted to commercial uses (dentist and children’s nursery) which incorporate signage. The site is also close to the entrance to Waitrose and is seen in the context of their signage and that associated with the petrol filling station and car wash. Land to the south east is currently open agricultural land although there are current planning applications for residential development.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Conservatories etc, Penfold Dr Wymondham which is 0.25km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible and while the area has open characteristics, it is clearly seen in the context of the supermarket and other businesses. I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an urban area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
30. **Appl. No**: 2012/2066/A  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

- **Applicants Name**: Mrs Jan Butcher  
- **Site Address**: Site 90 Browick Road Wymondham Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. The signage shall relate to a company within 10km of the site

### 1. Planning Policies

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**  
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

### 2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history

### 3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council  
Refuse  
Contrary to TRA13 – will compromise the safe and free flow of traffic as they are a distracting visual hazard

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  
Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.
3.4 Economic Development Manager

Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth.

3.5 Local Residents

None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by this application and applications 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located at the entrance to the Ayton Road commercial area. It is bordered to the east by residential properties, however land to the west is commercial in character and includes signage within the premises and on the buildings.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Carolines Cars Ashwellthorpe Industrial Estate which is 8km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 I consider that in the urban context of this site, and given the commercial character of development to the west of the site it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located adjacent to an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number

Stuart Pontin 01508 533796

and E-mail:

spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
31. **Appl. No**: 2012/2060/A  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 82 Browick Road Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs  
Recommendation: Refuse

   1. Adversely affects the amenity and character of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
- ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **Enforcement**
- 2012/8052 Display of Advertisement Closed
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Town Council**

- Refuse

Contrary to TRA13 – will compromise the safe and free flow of traffic as they are a distracting visual hazard.

3.2 **District Member**

To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 **Highway Agency**

Highway Agency generally specifies signs are a maximum of 0.3sqm and no more than 800mm high. However, the roundabouts are Norfolk County Council’s responsibility. Provided that the signs are not illuminate and do not resemble road traffic signs and do not obstruct any existing traffic sign they raise no objection.

3.4 **NCC Highways**

Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 **Economic Development Manager**

Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth.

3.6 **Local Residents**

None received.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the northern slip road to the A11 and is in a rural area set away from any other development. There are no other signs within the vicinity of the site.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Warners Estate Agents which is 1 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A11 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Agency have commented regarding sign sizes but have not objected to the proposal and the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796 and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
32. **Appl. No** : 2012/2058/A
   **Parish** : WYMONDHAM

   Applicants Name : Mrs Jan Butcher
   Site Address : Site 80 London Road Wymondham Norfolk
   Proposal : Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

   **Recommendation** : Refuse

1. **Planning Policies**

   Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

   1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

   1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV8: Development in the open countryside

   **Supplementary Guidance**
   In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

   The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

   **Draft Development Management Policies**
   Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

   Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

   No relevant planning history
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
Contrary to TRA13 – will compromise the safe and free flow of traffic as they are a distracting visual hazard

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4. Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the western edge of Wymondham and is bordered to the north by recent residential development. To the south east is the London Road commercial area, the entrance for which is located to the south. There is an entrance sign to the estate and a land for sale sign in the field opposite, but otherwise the area currently has a predominantly open and rural character.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Warners Estate Agents which is 1 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding area. While the site is bordered to the north by residential properties, it is on the urban edge of the settlement and is predominantly open in character. The entrance to the commercial area is located to the south of the roundabout and the commercial units and associated advertising are not seen in the context of the roundabout. In addition, permitting signs at this junction close to a commercial area is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5  **Reason for Refusal**

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
33. **Appl. No**: 2012/2054/A
**Parish**: PULHAM MARKET

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher
Site Address: Site 75 Ipswich Road Pulham Market Norfolk
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Refuse

1. Adversely affects the amenity of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8, IMP23 and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   - NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   - IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   - IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   - ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council's approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2003/0242 Advertisement – Display of Sign Adjacent to Closed a Highway
2.2 2011/8180 Unauthorised advertisements

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Object
- Distraction to motorists
- Imagery used is inappropriate
- Previous requests for business signage has been refused
- Signs should feature local businesses

3.2 District Member Objects
Government is on a drive to reduce street signage – the signs are a distraction
Signs should promote local businesses.

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located in a rural location on the A140. The site is bordered by agricultural land, and while there is the garden centre to the north, signage in the vicinity of the site is limited.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Martin & Co Letting agent 1 Charing Cross, Norwich which is 21 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. I understand that there has previously been sponsorship signage on this roundabout, however this was restricted in size and did not detract from the character of the area. Permitting signs at this junction to the A140 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.
4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety

5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
34. **Appl. No**: 2012/2053/A  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

**Applicants Name**: Mrs Jan Butcher  
**Site Address**: Site 69 Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Refuse

1. Adversely affects the amenity of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8, IMP23 and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
- ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Councils approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2008/0222**  
Two single sided directional signs for Dickleburgh Crown public house  
**Refused**
2.2 1995/0734 Advance direction signs on trunk road - 100TH Bomb Group Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Comment regarding:
   - visual littering of the parish with signs should be limited and
   - Consideration should be given to possible impairment of drivers vision

3.2 District Member Can be Delegated

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located in a rural location on the A140. The site is bordered by agricultural land, and the area is open in character. There is currently signage for the 100th Bomb Group Museum to the north, and a number of seasonal unauthorised signs in the adjacent fields and on the roundabout itself.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Stratton Windows & Doors Unit 9, Hopper Way, Diss Business Park which is 4 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A140 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
35. **Appl. No**: 2012/2048/A  
**Parish**: SCOLE

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 49 Norwich Southern Bypass Caistor St Edmund Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Refuse

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV3: River Valleys  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**  
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**  
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

No relevant planning history
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
None received

3.2 District Member  
Can be Delegated

3.3 NCC Highways  
Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager  
Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents  
None received.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located in a rural location on the A140. The site is bordered by agricultural land to the west and the entrance to Scole to the east. The area is rural in character. There is currently unauthorised signage on every exit to this roundabout, with larger trailer mounted hoardings on the entrance to Diss.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Holbrook Leisure Swangey Farm, Swangey Lane, Attleborough which is 22km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The signs are clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A140 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796 and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
36. **Appl. No**: 2012/2067/A  
**Parish**: DISS

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 92 Park Road Diss Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP19: Advertisements  
SHO4: Town Centres

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/0601 Erection of new illuminated fascia sign above entrance – Caxton House  
Approved

2.2 2006/1044 Erection of illuminated signs and flagpole advertisement – Morrisons  
Approved

2.3 2005/1611 Retention of free standing illuminated totem sign – Morrisons  
Refused

2.4 2005/2342 Erection of 4 metre high free standing illuminated totem sign – Morrisons  
Approved
2.5 2005/0456 Proposed erection of illuminated signs including (A) Replacement of 5no existing signs to supermarket and petrol station; (B) 1no new fascia car wash sign; (C) 2no new cash point signs; (D) 1no new fascia motif box; (E) replacement of petrol price sign. – Morrisons

Part Approved / Part Refused

2.6 2001/0519 Erection of 10no promotional banners attached to existing lamp columns – Safeway

Approved

2.7 2001/0520 Erection of promotional fascia sign on petrol station canopy – Safeway

Refused

2.8 1996/1064 Erection of replacement sign - Safeway

Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council Refuse

- Distraction to drivers
- Detract from Conservation Area

3.2 District Members

Cllr Kiddie Can be Delegated

Cllr Walden Can be Delegated

Cllr Palmer To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways

Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager

Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents

None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by this application and applications 2012/2066 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located within the commercial centre to Diss. It is located adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is bordered by commercial premises which incorporate a variety of signage in terms of scale, colour and illumination.
The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is The Gold Shop 6 Saint Nicholas Street, Diss which is 1 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.

With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

The signs are located within an urban area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796 and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
37. **Appl. No**: 2012/2045/A  
Parish: DITCHINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 50 Norwich Road Ditchingham Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

Recommendation: Authorise DGL to Refuse  
1. Adversely affects the amenity of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8, IMP23 and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Subject to expiry of consultation period (4 March 2013) and subject to no new issues being raised in representations

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**

In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.
2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  | Refuse  
- Add to highway clutter  
- Distraction to drivers

3.2 District Member  | To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Broads Authority  | To be reported

3.4 NCC Highways  | Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager  | Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents  | None received.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout. There is currently no signage on this roundabout.

4.2 Part of the site lies within the Broads Authority area and consultations have recently taken place with that Authority. The applicants will need to submit an application to the Broads Authority for any signs within their administrative area.

4.3 The site is located in a predominantly rural area, with housing to the north being predominantly screened and land to the south being a commercial building but having blank elevations facing the site.

4.4 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.5 The site is clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout and signage in this location would detract from the character of the surrounding countryside. In addition, permitting signs at this junction to the A143 is likely to result in further pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area.
4.6 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs would be prominently located in an area which is predominantly rural in character and would result in visual clutter which would detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising in the adjacent fields etc which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policies ENV8 and IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and merging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
38. **Appl. No**: 2012/2046/A  
**Parish**: GILLINGHAM

- **Applicants Name**: Mrs Jan Butcher  
- **Site Address**: Site 53 Norwich Road Gillingham Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
- IMP 23: Control of advertisements in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
- ENV8: Development in the open countryside

**Supplementary Guidance**
In December 2010 the Council produced “Advertisement and business signs in the open countryside – guidance notes for potential applicants” to expand upon policies in the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. This document sets out the Council’s approach to advertising and in particular signage away from the premises / company to which it relates.

The guidance sets out that signage on premises should normally be sufficient, but recognises that exceptionally where an existing access is dangerous or the business is located away from principal roads, advanced directional signage may be supported.

**Draft Development Management Policies**
Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs located off the site of the facility being advertised will be permitted where necessary to give directional information to an enterprise which is difficult for visitors to find by reference to conventional highway signs.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/1341**
- Installation of replacement signs – 4 internally illuminated freestanding totems and 1 internally illuminated height restrictor – McDonalds
Development Management Committee

2.2 2011/1343 Installation of customer order display with associated canopy and new signage – McDonalds

2.3 2007/1711 Erection of 2 single sided free standing illuminated display units – Hearts Services

2.4 2001/0706 Erection of 2no single sided free standing advertisement display units – Hearts Services

2.5 2001/1246 Erection of 1no single sided free standing advertisement display unit – Hearts Services

2.6 1996/0174 Display of "Golden Arch" logo on existing pole sign – McDonalds

2.7 1995/1318 McDonald's free standing directional signs (On site signs only) – McDonalds

2.8 1995/1316 Mcdonald’s Sky sign mounted on 4.0m pole Approved

2.9 1995/0268 Erection of various signs – Hears Services Approved

2.10 Enforcement 2001/0199 Advertisement - Unauthorised sign. Close

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council None received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.4 Economic Development Manager Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.5 Local Residents None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 The site is located on the A143, and is predominantly bordered by landscaping and agricultural land. To the south is a service area which includes a filling station and McDonalds both of which have signs at the entrance to the services and include the provision of two general advertising boards (2007/1711).
4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Citrus sharp security shredding, Ellough Rd, Beccles which is 4 km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 The site is clearly visible on each approach to the roundabout, however, the signage is seen in context of the existing petrol filling station and services and the associated signage. I consider that in the commercial context of this site, and given the scale of the roundabout, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.

4.5 With regard to public safety the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.

5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
39. **Appl. No**: 2012/2068/A  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: Mrs Jan Butcher  
Site Address: Site 57 The Street Poringland Norfolk  
Proposal: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Refuse

1. Adversely affects the amenity of the area contrary to paragraph 67 of the NPPF, Policy IMP23 and advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

---

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history

**Enforcement**

2.2 2012/8001 Unauthorised banner advertisement

2.3 2011/8283 Unauthorised Trailer and Banner adverts

2.4 2011/8005 Unauthorised trailer advertisement

2.5 2010/8211 Erection of advertising boards

2.6 2010/8080 Unauthorised advertisement
2.7 2010/8067 Number of Unauthorised Advertisements

2.8 2002/0212 Advertisement - Unauthorised advertisements

2.9 2002/0242 Advertisement - Unauthorised signs

3. Consultations

3.1 Poringland Parish Council
- Refuse
- Generic application which does not relate to specific conditions that are relevant to each parish.
- There are two roundabouts in Poringland, a mini roundabout where the signs are shoulder to shoulder and a larger roundabout where the signs are further apart.
- At each location there are a large number of signs giving information and instructions to road users and the additional signs do not assist with any road safety requirements.
- The words “In partnership with Norfolk County Council” imply approval and should not be displayed.
- The signs are causing a distraction to motorists and pedestrians at very busy road intersections.

Framingham Earl Parish Council
- Not opposed to the principle of advertising on roundabouts but each should be considered individually on its location, environmental impact and safety issues.
- Request site visit with Planning Committee to experience the problems being faced by pedestrians; see how the advertising boards have restricted pedestrians views of approaching traffic and consider the effect on the local environment.
- Concerns by residents and students at Framingham Earl High School.
- Should review the safety assessment of this site for its impact on pedestrians.
- The use of commercial advertising blights the environment which the local parish councils and residents aim to protect.
- The application is contrary to South Norfolk Planning Policies and should be refused (together with 2012/2068).
- The words “In partnership with Norfolk County Council” is misleading.

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Norfolk County Councillor – Cllr Smith
Wrote to convey residents serious concerns although as a County Councillor having an indirect interest in the applications
- Each site should be considered separately as each has a different context and setting.
- It is wrong to say that the signs are “sponsorship”. They are advertising signs which are intrusive and degrade the streetscene.
- The signs in Poringland are deeply unpopular with many in the community and both Parish Councils.
- The junctions at these locations are particularly busy and motorists can’t help but be distracted when reading these signs.
• The Fiveways roundabout in particular is used as a crossing by many pedestrians including students from Framingham Earl High School. The recent “keep your mind on the road” road safety campaign warns against being distracted while using the road. This particular roundabout is of such a design and location that users can not see over it and motorists and pedestrians alike are often taken unawares when they use it.

• With regard to the Devlin Road / Springfield junction, the signs and chevron traffic signs completely encircle the mini roundabout reducing visibility.

• Outdoor advertising by other businesses in the immediate vicinity has been severely restricted and companies have been advised to remove signs on the grounds of it being a distraction.

• The inclusion of “in partnership with NCC” could mislead consumers to believe there is some sort of business or product endorsed by NCC.

• The applications should be refused and enforcement action taken to remove them.

3.4 NCC Highways

Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager

Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth.

3.6 Local Residents

3 letters of objection

• Elvins garage has been in its current position for over fifty years and in situ before the roundabout was built. No advertising or even car sales on the car park has been allowed due to the proximity of the roundabout.

• Distraction to motorists who are unable to read them without taking their eyes off the road. They are all busy roundabouts where distractions can cause a loss of concentration and become a danger to all road users.

• The term “sponsorship” is misleading as the signs do not support the upkeep of the roundabouts.

• The signs have been erected without consent and other authorities (Welwyn, Dorset and Sevenoaks) have refused to allow such advertising.

• The number of signs on roads is increasing and creates an untidy and cluttered appearance, which is particularly unacceptable in a village environment. Central Government are opposed to this clutter.

• Both junctions are very busy with road traffic and pedestrians. The purpose of the advertising is to catch the attention of passing road users, and such have potential to distract drivers and pedestrians from road and traffic conditions which could result in an accident.

• The small roundabout by Budgens is raised on a plinth and directional signs are mounted on steel poles to allow a relatively clear view across the junction. The advertisements have been placed at a height between the plinth and directional sign blocking the view across the junction making it difficult for drivers to see and for pedestrians to see car indicators.
4  **Assessment**

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by this application and applications 2012/2066, and 2067 are 508mm by 1016mm.

4.2 The signs as originally submitted were pole mounted, and stood at each access point to the roundabout. Following discussions with the agents, they have amended the application such that the signs are now proposed to be suspended from the chevron sign to reduce the visual clutter of poles on this mini roundabout.

4.3 This site is located at the junction of Devlin Drive, Springfields and The Street. The roundabout is predominantly bordered by residential properties with an open area to the north west, beyond which is Budgens supermarket. The signs are mounted on a mini roundabout which incorporates chevron signs with illuminated directional signs above. The adverts have been installed between the mounting poles for the chevron signs and are proposed to be amended to remove the supporting poles.

4.4 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but within development limits seeks to restrict signage to that associated with an existing business and which is well designed, in scale and appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Morton Windows & Conservatories Chestnut Drive, Wymondham which is 16km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.5 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the character of the area, the content of the signs and highway safety implications for pedestrians and vehicles.

4.6 The signs have been installed between the mounting poles for the chevron signs and are clearly visible to drivers on their approach to the roundabout. The adverts as installed add to the signage which is already on a small island and result in a cluttered appearance which contrasts with the predominantly open character of the immediate environs. While the removal of their supporting poles will reduce the impact, I still consider that the addition of the signs to this roundabout results in a cluttered appearance.

4.7 There is limited existing signage in the vicinity of the site, with temporary signage currently associated with the new housing and some signage on Budgens. However, members will note that this Authority has consistently taken action against temporary banner adverts etc in the vicinity of the roundabout associated with Budgens and I therefore consider that the provision of general advertising on this roundabout is not acceptable.

4.8 With regard to public safety the signs are clearly visible to highway users, however, the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5 Reason for Refusal

5.1 The signs are prominently located in an area which is predominantly open in character. They are located on a mini roundabout which incorporates chevron signs and illuminated directional signs above. The addition the adverts result in visual clutter which detracts from the character of the area. In addition, their presence in close proximity to the principal highway network is likely to result in pressure for advanced directional signage and advertising adjacent to the roundabout which is likely to result in a cumulative impact and further detract from the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary paragraph 67 of the NPPF and policy IMP23 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, advice in the supplementary guidance note and emerging Policy 3.9

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
40. **Appl. No**: 2012/2047/A  
**Parish**: Poringland

- **Applicants Name**: Mrs Jan Butcher  
- **Site Address**: Site 56 The Street Poringland Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Retrospective application for non illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

Planning Policy Guidance 19 – Outdoor Advertising Control was replaced by the NPPF.

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
- IMP 19: Advertisements

**Draft Development Management Policies**

Policy 3.9 of the draft Development Management Policies relates to signage and sets out that signs will only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials location and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity.

Little weight can be given to this emerging policy, however, it has been agreed in principle by Members at Cabinet on 26 November 2012 and is based on the Supplementary Guidance above.

2. **Planning History**

2 The Street – Garage

2.1 2001/1922 Erection of double sided advertising display unit  
- Refused

2.2 2001/0251 (Enforcement) Unauthorised Structure - Unauthorised advertisment board  
- Closed

2.3 1989/1990 Consent To Display Free Standing Forecourt Sign.  
- Approved

The Railway Tavern

2.4 1984/0048 Erection Of Illuminated Advertisements On The Building And Two Free Standing  
- Approved
Consultations

3.1 Poringland Parish Council

Refuse
- Generic application which does not relate to specific conditions that are relevant to each parish.
- There are two roundabouts in Poringland, a mini roundabout where the signs are shoulder to shoulder and a larger roundabout where the signs are further apart.
- At each location there are a large number of signs giving information and instructions to road users and the additional signs do not assist with any road safety requirements.
- The words “In partnership with Norfolk County Council” imply approval and should not be displayed.
- The signs are causing a distraction to motorists and pedestrians at very busy road intersections.

Framingham Earl Parish Council

- Not opposed to the principle of advertising on roundabouts but each should be considered individually on its location, environmental impact and safety issues.
- Request site visit with Planning Committee to experience the problems being faced by pedestrians; see how the advertising boards have restricted pedestrians views of approaching traffic and consider the effect on the local environment.
- Concerns by residents and students at Framingham Earl High School.
- Should review the safety assessment of this site for its impact on pedestrians.
- The use of commercial advertising blights the environment which the local parish councils and residents aim to protect.
- The application is contrary to South Norfolk Planning Policies and should be refused (together with 2012/2068).
- The words “In partnership with Norfolk County Council” is misleading.

Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council

Refuse
- Signs cause a distraction to motorists and pedestrians at a busy intersection near to the High School where in addition to normal traffic, children walk and cycle to school. All concerned need to pay full attention to the highway.
- Highway signs giving traffic information are now partially obscured by the adverts which affects road safety.
- Notices which display “in partnership with Norfolk County Council” implies approval. Businesses near the roundabout have not been able to advertise in the past because it was considered a distraction to road users.

3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Norfolk County Councillor – Cllr Smith

Wrote to convey residents serious concerns although as a County Councillor having an indirect interest in the applications.
- Each site should be considered separately as each has a different context and setting.
- It is wrong to say that the signs are “sponsorship”. They are advertising signs which are intrusive and degrade the streetscene.
- The signs in Poringland are deeply unpopular with many in the community and both Parish Councils.
• The junctions at these locations are particularly busy and motorists can’t help but be distracted when reading these signs.
• The Fiveways roundabout in particular is used as a crossing by many pedestrians including students from Framingham Earl High School. The recent “keep your mind on the road” road safety campaign warns against being distracted while using the road. This particular roundabout is of such a design and location that users can not see over it and motorists and pedestrians alike are often taken unawares when they use it
• With regard to the Devlin Road / Springfield junction, the signs and chevron traffic signs completely encircle the mini roundabout reducing visibility
• Outdoor advertising by other businesses in the immediate vicinity has been severely restricted and companies have been advised to remove signs on the grounds of it being a distraction
• The inclusion of “in partnership with NCC” could mislead consumers to believe there is some sort of business or product endorsed by NCC
• The applications should be refused and enforcement action taken to remove them.

3.4 NCC Highways
Prior to implementing the scheme all roundabouts were inspected and reviewed. It is the view of the accredited and independent safety experts that there is no significant detrimental impact upon highway safety.

3.5 Economic Development Manager
Provide potentially high profile affordable advertising for local forms and should be considered as an asset for local businesses and economic growth

3.6 Local Residents
3 letters of objection
• Elvins garage has been in its current position for over fifty years and in situ before the roundabout was built. No advertising or even car sales on the car park has been allowed due to the proximity of the roundabout
• Distraction to motorists who are unable to read them without taking their eyes off the road. They are all busy roundabouts where distractions can cause a loss of concentration and become a danger to all road users
• The term “sponsorship” is misleading as the signs do not support the upkeep of the roundabouts
• The signs have been erected without consent and other authorities (Welwyn, Dorset and Sevenoaks) have refused to allow such advertising.
• The number of signs on roads is increasing and creates an untidy and cluttered appearance, which is particularly unacceptable in a village environment. Central Government are opposed to this clutter
• Both junctions are very busy with road traffic and pedestrians. The purpose of the advertising is to catch the attention of passing road users, and such have potential to distract drivers and pedestrians from road and traffic conditions which could result in an accident.
• The small roundabout by Budgens is raised on a plinth and directional signs are mounted on steel poles to allow a relatively clear view across the junction. The advertisements have been placed at a height between the plinth and directional sign blocking the view across the junction making it difficult for drivers to see and
4 Assessment

4.1 22 applications have been submitted for the retention of signage which has been erected on roundabouts by Market Force Ltd in partnership with Norfolk County Council. The majority of the signs are 508mm by 1219 mm, although the signs covered by applications 2012/2066, 2067 and 2068 are 508mm by 1016mm. They are pole mounted, and stand at each access point to the roundabout.

4.2 This site is located at the junction of Stoke Road, The Street, Norwich Road and Pigot Lane which links to Long Road. The roundabout is bordered to the south west by a commercial garage and opticians, the Nightingale Centre to the south east, Railway Tavern public house to the north east and dwellings to the north west. Each of the adjoining commercial premises incorporates signage associated with the activities on that site. The area is urban in character and the immediate environs of the roundabout have a commercial character.

4.3 The policy context for the proposal is set out above, but in principle seeks to restrict signage to that reasonably necessary to direct customers to the business. The SNLP policies quoted above can be given due weight and consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The company advertising on this roundabout is Brooke Garage, 9 Norwich Road, Brooke which is 5km from the application site. The NPPF recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact and sets out that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.4 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the character of the area, the content of the signs and highway safety implications for pedestrians and vehicles.

4.5 The signs are positioned at each access point to the roundabout and are clearly visible to drivers on their approach to the roundabout. The island incorporates elevated chevron signs and there are directional adverts on the approach to the island. At each junction there is a pedestrian island which incorporates illuminated bollards. The signs as installed are lower than the chevron signs and while they increase signage in the locality I do not consider that they result in significant clutter which detracts from the amenity of the area.

4.6 Concern has been raised that other signage for businesses in the vicinity of the site has been refused in the past. Proposal for illuminated signage at 2 and 4 The Street have been resisted in the past, with the sign at the garage being an elevated broadsheet panel which was significantly larger than the non illuminated signs which are the subject of this application.

4.7 I consider that the scale and form of the signs does not dominate the area and are comparable with other signage in the vicinity of the site. While I note concerns regarding the “in partnership with Norfolk County Council” I do not consider that this is sufficient to justify refusal of the application.

4.8 I consider that in the commercial context of this site, it is difficult to argue that the signs on this roundabout detract from the character of the area, and while they do not fully comply with the Council’s policies, I consider that in this case their retention is acceptable.

4.9 With regard to public safety the signs are clearly visible to highway users, however, they are set away from pedestrian crossings, which include pedestrian refuge at each crossing and do not directly obstruct views of pedestrians using those crossings. In addition, the Highway Authority has confirmed that the site and the signs were reviewed and there is no significant impact upon highway safety.
5 Reason for Approval

5.1 The signs are located within an existing commercial area and are seen in the context of a number of existing businesses which are all displaying signage. The additional signage on this roundabout does not significantly detract from the character or amenity of the area or adversely affect public safety. The proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Policies in the SNLP and principles of the Supplementary Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Background (Storage of Caravan)

1.1 The above matter has been considered at two previous Committees. The Third Wednesday Planning Committee on the 25 May 2011 and the Development Management Committee on the 20 June 2012. I have attached the report from the latter as Appendix 2.

1.2 Committee gave authority to take enforcement action and as the caravan remained in situ and an Enforcement Notice was served requiring the removal of the caravan. The Notice has now been appealed and a decision is pending from the Planning Inspectorate.

1.3 A further caravan has arrived on site, which is the fourth caravan that has been brought on to the land, making a total of two currently on the site. The location of this caravan is shown in Appendix 1. This, like the previous caravans does not appear to be used in connection with the permitted agricultural use of the land. The owners of the site have been invited to remove the caravan but no response has been received and the caravan remains in situ.

2. Background (Untidy Land)

2.1 Part of a dismantled caravan and its contents including a microwave, digital box, wiring and other metal goods/parts remain on the site adjacent to the hedgerow and are visible from the highway during the winter months. A trampoline that had been brought on to the land, some time ago, now stands upright in an area where the hedgerow is sparse. The location of these is shown in Appendix 1. There are some other stored items on the site but these are some distance from the road (in excess of 120metres) and any public vantage point. Concerns have been raised regarding the appearance of the site, its impact on the amenity of the surrounding area and the detrimental effect it has on the nearby Boudicca Way footpath.

3. Planning Policies

South Norfolk Local Plan

3.1 Policy ENV 8 - Development in the Open Countryside

Joint Core Strategy

3.2 Policy 2 - Promoting good design
4. **Assessment (Storage of Caravan)**

4.1 South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8 restricts development in the open countryside unless it is requisite for agriculture. There are currently no agricultural activities taking place on site. In view that the caravan is not being used for that purpose its use is contrary to these policies. Furthermore the storage of the caravan would detract from the landscape character of the area and is therefore contrary to the provisions of Joint Core Strategy Policy 2.

4.2 Members will be aware that use of the site for the storage of caravans has been ongoing for some time with no evidence of them being used in connection with the agricultural use of the land. Legal advice has been sought to see whether there is any other route/action open to the Council to prevent the cycle of caravans being brought on to the land, for example, an Injunction, a Stop Notice or an Article 4 Direction.

4.3 Legal advice was not to pursue the above at this time but to serve a further enforcement notice to cease the use of the land for the storage of one or more caravans.

5. **Assessment (Untidy Land)**

5.1 Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 gives local authorities the powers to serve notices 'Requiring the proper maintenance of land' if it appears to the local planning authority that the amenity of a part of their area is adversely affected by the condition of land in their area. Whilst the storage of the dismantled caravan, its contents and the trampoline are visible from the highway I do not consider they have such an impact on the amenity of the area that a Section 215 Notice should be served requiring their removal. In terms of the impact on the Boudicca Way footpath the dismantled caravan and its contents are approximately 30metres from the footpath and are screened by the hedgerow. The trampoline is much further away and does not impact on the Boudicca Way footpath.

5.2 The Council's Environmental Services are currently looking in to whether they can take action to remove the stored items under legislation open to them.

6. **Recommendation (Storage of Caravan)**

6.1 That subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of the land for the storage of one or more caravans.

7. **Recommendation (Untidy Land)**

7.1 That subject to legal advice no further action be taken on this matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Andy Baines 01508 533840
and E-mail: abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Report

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. Enforcement Ref : 2010/8302
Parish : SAXLINGHAM THORPE
Site : Land On The North Side of Windy Lane, Foxhole, Saxlingham Thorpe, Norwich
Development : Caravan parked in agricultural field
Developer : Mr Steven Fryett and Mr Victor Francis

1. Background

1.1 It was brought the Council’s attention in late 2010 that a caravan (first caravan) had been stationed on an agricultural field. In 2011 a further caravan (second caravan) was brought on to the site. The first caravan appeared not to be used incidentally to the agricultural use of the land but the Council were satisfied at the time that the second caravan was being used incidentally to the agricultural use of the land. An Enforcement Notice was served in relation to the first caravan which was then subject to an appeal. The appeal was subsequently quashed on a technicality. However, the first caravan was removed from the land prior to the appeal decision.

1.2 The second caravan remained in situ, however it then became apparent this was no longer being used incidentally to the agricultural use of the land. The owner was asked to remove the caravan from the land or submit a planning application to regularise the situation. The caravan has since been dismantled but remains, in part, on the site.

1.3 Following a visit to the site on the 25 May 2012 it was apparent that a larger touring caravan had been brought on to the land. It had been stationed together with a generator, two polytunnels and a portaloo. The occupiers of the caravan confirmed they were living there and hoped to stay for approximately 2 months and that they were hoping to establish a small holding on the site. They informed me that they rent half the site, approximately 9.5 acres (shown on location plan) from a Mr Victor Francis. They were of the understanding that planning permission had been granted for a caravan to be stationed on the land. I explained that this was not the case and that I would write to them explaining the situation.

1.4 The occupiers of the caravan have been informed that the use of a caravan for residential use in an agricultural field requires planning permission. However, under Part 5 Class A of the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 1995 (GPDO) and the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 Paragraph 3 the use of the land for a caravan site for up to 28 days in a period of 12 months from the date the caravan was first stationed anywhere on that land would not require planning permission. The 28 days will expire on the 22 June 2012.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 8: Development In The Open Countryside
3. **Assessment**

3.1 The stationing of a caravan on a piece of land does not require planning permission provided that it is used incidentally to the permitted use of the land, which in this case is agricultural. However, if it is not used incidentally to the permitted use of the land the stationing of a caravan would constitute a material change of use and therefore require planning permission, except for the 28 days explained in paragraph 1.3. To date I have received no response from the occupiers informing me of their intentions.

3.2 National Planning Policy Guidance Section 6 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8 restricts development in the open countryside unless it is requisite for agriculture. There are currently no agricultural activities taking place on site. In view that the caravan is not being used for that purpose its use is contrary to these policies. Furthermore the stationing of the caravan would detract from the landscape character of the area and is therefore contrary to the provisions of Joint Core Strategy Policy 2.

3.3 In view that there have been a number of unauthorised caravans stationed on the land and there has been little co-operation in the past in terms of adhering to the Council’s requests it is considered appropriate to seek authority to take enforcement action before the breach has taken place to ensure the Council are in the best position to take relevant action if a breach does occur.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to secure the removal of the touring caravan.
## PLANNING APPEALS
Appeals received from 17 January 2013 to 14 February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/1485</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE 29 Norwich Road</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Bush</td>
<td>Proposed rear extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1468</td>
<td>HARLESTON Storage building at 3 Smith's Court</td>
<td>Mrs R Rackham</td>
<td>Conversion of redundant storage building to one bedroom residential unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appeal decisions from 17 January 2013 to 14 February 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>2012/1729</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD 2 Milestone Lane</td>
<td>Mrs Janet Parker</td>
<td>Proposed two storey extension and alterations</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>