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>

Pool of Substitutes

Leslie Dale
Nigel Legg
Brian Riches

Please note that Items 1-4 will be heard from 1pm.

Items 5-24 will be heard from 3pm onwards

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

12.00pm – 12.30pm Blomefield Room

Date

Wednesday 27 March 2013

Time

1.00 pm

Place

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

Contact

Caroline Heasley  tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE
Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

Please note that the order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 - 4, and arrive at 3.00 pm if you intend to speak on items 5 – 24.

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 7)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 27 February 2013;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 45)

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>2011/0581/F</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Colney Hall Watton Road Colney</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/1814/F</td>
<td>HETHERSSETT</td>
<td>Land North Of Great Melton Road Hethersett</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/1777/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land Rear Of Mount Pleasant Norwich Road Dickleburgh</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/0101/F</td>
<td>LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY</td>
<td>Langley School Langley Park Langley</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/0145/LB</td>
<td>LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY</td>
<td>Langley School Langley Park Langley</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/0150/F</td>
<td>LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY</td>
<td>Langley School Langley Park Langley</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/1615/F</td>
<td>FORNCETT</td>
<td>Fourways Long Stratton Road Fornett St. Peter</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2011/1698/F</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>Land at 59, Norwich Road, Tacolneston</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2011/1699/F</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>59 Norwich Road Tacolneston</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2011/1700/LB</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>59 Norwich Road Tacolneston</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/1574/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Sub Division Of Garden At The Bungalow Station Road Spooner Row</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/1758/CU</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Three Gates Farm Fen Street Bressingham</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/1919/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North Of Right Up Lane Silfield</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2012/2081/H</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>4 Santolina Close Costessey</td>
<td>165</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>2012/2180/F</td>
<td>SHELFANGER</td>
<td>Church Farm Barn Church Road Shelfanger</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2012/2191/F</td>
<td>THURTON</td>
<td>Sub-division Of The Garden Of 33 Ashby Road Thurton</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2012/2312/F</td>
<td>TOPCROFT</td>
<td>Land South East Of 12 Church Road Church Road Topcroft</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2013/0023/F</td>
<td>TOPCROFT</td>
<td>Land South Of The Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street Topcroft</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2013/0085/H</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>70 Colney Lane Cringleford</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2013/0091/CU</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land West Of South View Harleston Road Rushall</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2013/0161/F</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Chez Denis 76 Dereham Road Easton</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2013/0248/RVC</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Sub-division Of The Garden Of 109 High Road Wortwell</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2012/2310/CA</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land At Windmill Public House Norwich Road Wymondham</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2011/2093</td>
<td>MULBARTON</td>
<td>Land East Of Long Lane Mulbarton</td>
<td>207</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. **Planning Appeals (for information)**

(attached – page 222)

8. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 24 April 2013
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following guidelines are to assist Members to assess whether a Site Panel visit is required. Site visits may be appropriate where:

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;

(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;

(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

Members should appreciate that site visits will not be appropriate in those cases where matters of fundamental planning policy are involved and there are no significant other material considerations to take into account. Equally, where an observer might feel that a site visit would be called for under any of the above criteria, members may decide it is unnecessary, e.g. because of their existing familiarity with the site or its environs or because, in their opinion, judgement can be adequately made on the basis of the written, visual and oral material before the Committee.

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Applications will normally be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda. Each application will be presented in the following way:

- Initial presentation by planning officers followed by representations from:
  - The town or parish council - up to 5 minutes for member(s) or clerk;
  - Objector(s) - any number of speakers, up to 5 minutes in total;
  - The applicant, or agent or any supporters - any number of speakers up to 5 minutes in total;
  - Local member
- Member consideration/decision.

TIMING: In front of you there are two screens which tell you how long you have left of your five minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after five minutes, at which point the Chairman will ask you to come to a conclusion.

MICROPHONES: In front of you there is a microphone which we ask you to use. Simply press the button to turn the microphone on and off

WHAT CAN I SAY AT THE MEETING? Please try to be brief and to the point. Limit your views to the planning application and relevant planning issues, for example: Planning policy, (conflict with policies in the Local Plan/Structure Plan, government guidance and planning case law), including previous decisions of the Council, design, appearance and layout, possible loss of light or overshadowing, noise disturbance and smell nuisance, impact on residential and visual amenity, highway safety and traffic issues, impact on trees/conservation area/listed buildings/environmental or nature conservation issues.

Please note: In accordance with the Council’s constitution no one may make photographs, film, video or other electronic recordings of the meeting without the Chairman’s consent.
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fire alarm</strong></th>
<th>If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile phones</strong></td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets</strong></td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking water</strong></td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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.

Does the interest directly:
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.

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.

Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?

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.

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.

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.

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

NO

YES

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

If you have not already done so, notify the Monitoring Officer to update your declaration of interests

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

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

NO

YES

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

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?

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in recommendations

S.P Structure Plan
S.N.L.P South Norfolk Local Plan
P.D Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings or works specified).
J.C.S Joint Core Strategy
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No**: 2011/0581/F  
   **Parish**: COLNEY

   Applicants Name: Mr James Boddy  
   Site Address: Colney Hall Watton Road Colney  
   Proposal: Outline masterplan for healthcare campus (C2 use 16,950 sq m), with associated research and development (B1b use 1100 sq m) and ancillary development consisting of retail and restaurant/cafe (A1-A3 500 sq m) with all matters reserved. Infrastructure comprising new access roads, structural landscaping and drainage (full)

   **Recommendation**: Refusal

   1. Non compliance with Saved Policy COL1 and the NRP SPD
   2. Insufficient information to assess the impacts of the development on Listed Buildings/Structures
   3. Non compliance with JCS Policy 9

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   - NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   - NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   - NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   - NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
   - NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   - Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   - Policy 3: Energy and water  
   - Policy 5: The Economy  
   - Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
   - Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   - ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
   - ENV 14: Habitat protection  
   - ENV 15: Species protection  
   - IMP 2: Landscaping  
   - IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)  
   - IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   - IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   - IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
   - EMP 1: Employment land allocations  
   - TRA 19: Parking standards  
   - COL 1: Research and development uses at Norwich Research Park  
   - COL 2: Norwich Research Park, contingency reserve  
   - COL 3: Norwich Research Park, transportation issues

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0965 Revised timber gates in lieu of adjusted metal gates previously approved  

   **Refused**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2010/1515</td>
<td>Internal alterations to Coach House medical consultancy rooms</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2009/1789</td>
<td>Request Scoping Opinion for future planning application: Healthcare and Research Campus including Education, Training, Conference Centre, Residential Accommodation and related facilities</td>
<td>EIA Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2009/1276</td>
<td>A new &quot;Independent Living Centre&quot; to house the Norwich Branch of the Multiple Sclerosis Society and Norfolk Multiple Sclerosis Therapy Centre and a centre for the Guideposts Trust to give direct services and information to a number of user groups.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2009/0287</td>
<td>Conversion of workshop and change of use of vinery, potting sheds and studio to research and development, education and training facility</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009/0286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2008/2466</td>
<td>Scoping Opinion for Neurological Research Facility</td>
<td>EIA Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2008/1889</td>
<td>Proposed extension to existing premises to provide additional medical consultancy rooms. D1 use.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008/1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2008/0248</td>
<td>Conversion of potting sheds and rebuilding of storage building to create educational/tuition facility. Replacement vinery and peach house. Associated access and parking areas.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008/0247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2006/0250</td>
<td>Change of Use to planning classification D1 - Consulting Rooms for Medical &amp; Dentistry</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006/0249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2004/1365</td>
<td>Proposed change of use from general business use to orthopaedic surgeon consulting rooms with erection of extension to rear of the Pumphouse</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2001/1554</td>
<td>Conversion and extension to outbuildings for B1 business use</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001/0854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Colney Parish</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The estimated use – level of activity – the proposal will generate is immeasurable because of the outline nature of the application and therefore limits the ability to appreciate the true nature of the proposals impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The application is essentially a highly speculative private development of residential care homes based on less than convincing justifications and an ethos and objective which does not collate with the principles of the NRP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Application ignores policy laid down in the NRP supplementary planning document (SPD), the parish plan and national policies on listed buildings. Approval would risk setting a precedent of disregarding planning policies.

• The piecemeal delivery of the site contravenes s.3.5 of the SPD for Colney Hall – this section also compels a holistic appreciation of the site which can not be ascertained because there is no indication of how the areas omitted from the application will be managed, particularly the listed buildings and the management which are at threat of becoming disjointed by the piecemeal delivery of proposed development.

• Fig 13 of the Design and Access statement has not been amended and retains the frontages in relation to the original application.

• The proposal would create a considerable destruction of woodland valued for biodiversity.

• If the decision to approve is minded conditions should be applied to secure the development from conversion to residential housing as the idea of multiple freehold plots would be incompatible to the vision of Colney Hall becoming a world class campus for Health and Research activities.

• The proposed access route and the foreseeable volume of traffic envisioned is a threat to the listed buildings and walled garden and thus an alternative should be sought.

• The legality of works previously made to the listed buildings has been raised and compels the argument that the listed buildings futures are secured against the proposal to development to protect the history and architectural merits.

• Given the history of failed development plans concerns are raised over the viability of current proposals – case law is stimulating councils to consider viability as a material consideration and should be included in the application as a Viability statement and a clearer assessment of activity and economic stimulation this development could really stimulate.

• The Parish is not adverse to the development of Colney Hall site but sees the current plans for the site as far from suitable.

3.2 District Members:

Cllr C Kemp To be reported if appropriate

Cllr G Wheatley To be reported if appropriate

3.3 County Cllr Virgo

Concerns raised regarding traffic movements onto the B1108 and A47.

The residential healthcare campus and associated research does not in my view make a case for the possible connection to the NRP or NNUH.

It is not clear from the plans whether the target market for residential facilities on the campus are for specific patients or for a more general nature.
Norwich City Council Supportive in principle of the development of the Research Park as set out in the recently adopted JCS and is co-operating closely with South Norfolk Council to progress proposals. It has grave and significant concerns about the nature, timing and form of the development proposals embodied within the current application and would strongly object to the grant of planning permission for the development as proposed until sufficient information is available to assess whether the proposal adequately responds to a number of local and strategic issues.

Norwich City Council raise the following concerns:

- The proposal has potential for significant impacts on the setting of Colney Hall (a designated heritage asset) and the surrounding areas and features of strategic and local landscape and biodiversity value. Care should be taken to ensure that the design approach proposed is appropriate to minimise these impacts through e.g. limitations on height and massing, which does not appear to be sufficiently expressed in the documents submitted so far with the application.

- The scheme at 2.5 of the D&A is indicated as still having the potential to generate around 500 jobs which is assumed to be a long term aspiration. However the floorspace proposed for B1 research park use has been downgraded from around 20% to now being indicated at 6% of the proposal. The larger majority is shown as being for (unspecified) forms of residential institutions and/or residential care. The principle of new specialised facilities to support the very specific healthcare needs in the Norwich area is fine at a strategic level (and is supported by the Joint Core Strategy), and there is of course an existing healthcare “cluster” in the area. However the original plan allocation for Colney Hall was much more employment focused and the rationale for development in this area is to provide for employment growth in high-value knowledge-based sectors. The reduction in B1(b) floorspace and downgraded employment opportunities (also noted at 2.5 of the D&A statement) brings further into question whether the scheme represents the right balance of land uses and employment opportunities for this site.

- We would recommend that Officers consider carefully whether the scheme would be exploiting the potential of the Colney Hall site to deliver employment growth in the most appropriate way (bearing in mind the priorities of the Joint Core Strategy). Consideration needs to be given as to whether the scheme would be providing for the right balance of employment opportunities or would merely become some kind of care-home campus with a predominance of low-value jobs, which would not be desirable.

- Acceptance of C2 uses per se would leave open the possibility of other forms of residential institutional use such as student residences. These issues will need to be investigated in more detail before committing to such a major quantum of nonspecific C2 floorspace.
At this outline stage (with only a broad indication of the breakdown of floorspace proposed and the little detail of the nature of the uses) it is difficult to assess with certainty what its transport impacts might be. Also given the suggested additional future development described within application documents we would recommend that Officers should be satisfied that junction improvements proposed would be adequate and that any predicted increase in traffic impacting on the Earlham Road corridor can be mitigated through the travel plan and an appropriate contribution to sustainable transport infrastructure required by JCS Policy 20.

Any public transport enhancements sought from the development would need to secure appropriate linkages to the Newmarket Road and Dereham Road BRT corridors. This development if approved would also benefit from a number of practical measures to improve access by alternative means other than by car and which should be investigated.

For consistency with JCS Policy 19 (Retail Hierarchy) the amount of floorspace set aside for A1 and A3 needs to be limited to no more than the 500 sq.m stipulated to ensure that the retail facilities proposed do not expand beyond a purely local facility serving the campus. A condition specifying a maximum floorspace for individual units would also be necessary to prevent the possibility of sanctioning e.g. a freestanding general purpose foodstore as part of the development.

3.5 Planning Policy

The application site is allocated principally for B1(b) uses under saved South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) allocation COL1, as part of the wider Norwich Research Park (NRP) allocation.

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

The fundamental concern with this application is the exact nature of the proposed uses. B1(b) uses are limited to a very small proportion of the floorspace proposed. Whilst the SPD recognises the need for flexibility in terms promoting delivery at the NRP, including promoting health related uses, the emphasis is on the main uses being Science Park and hospital based, with non-hospital residential uses, such as recuperative and respite care, being ancillary.

Given the lack of information about the predominant C2 uses, it is difficult to assess how close the proposals are to achieving the aims of the Development Plan policies and/or the SPD.
The Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to take a positive approach towards economic development. Whilst the NPPF states that allocations should be regularly reviewed and alternative uses considered where allocations remain undeveloped in the long terms (para. 22), it also requires local planning authorities to plan positively for ‘clusters or networks of knowledge driven … industries’ (para. 21). Given the lack of certainty about the proposals, in terms of specific uses and likely timings, and the need to retain sites to deliver important B1(b) development related to the NRP and its existing institutes, the fundamental concerns with this application remain.

3.6 Economic Development Manager

The proposed development allocates only 5.9% of the development to B1(b) uses. This is clearly not reflective of the aspiration for predominantly B1(b) uses on the site. 91.4% of the proposed new accommodation is to be allocated to C2 uses, which may or may not be used for purposes related to healthcare, which itself is considered ancillary to the preferred predominance of B1(b) uses on the site. Even if the use of this proposed C2 accommodation was solely for use as healthcare facilities directly ancillary to the main B1(b) uses. The ratio would be much too biased towards C2 uses. As it is, the application does not attempt to restrict the C2 uses to those that are directly ancillary to the main B1(b) uses and the proposed development could therefore significantly dilute the strong B1(b) nature of the whole NRP.

Additionally, the application provides very little detail about the number and type of jobs that could be generated by the development (excluding jobs associated with its construction)

It would be preferable for jobs on this site to be higher skill, higher value jobs commensurate with the nature of the land use allocation and occupation at the wider NRP site. The current application does not give sufficient detail about the nature of jobs to be created to allow analysis and evaluation of this objective.

Any application that fails to provide a significant proportion of higher value jobs on the wider NRP site risks displacing such jobs away from the district and the Greater Norwich area.

3.7 Landscape Officer

No objection. This application is supported by a landscape and visual impact assessment, detailed and exhaustive tree survey and constraints information and comprehensive landscape infrastructure concept. I have assessed these and find no reason to dispute the information and findings.

Despite the number and nature of buildings proposed (along with their associated infrastructure), the proposals appear to safeguard most, if not all of the ‘A’ category trees across the site. Many of the trees to be lost are twentieth century plantation trees.
3.8 Conservation Officer: Object – Recommend refusal

The revised application has now deleted the extension to Colney Hall and development previously proposed around the walled garden where there were concerns about the impact on heritage assets. However, although previously raised, the amended Heritage Impact Assessment (Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement) still contains factually incorrect information. Colney Hall is the principal listed building, but the extent of protection includes all pre-1948 ancillary buildings associated with the hall by virtue of their inclusion within the curtilage and includes the walled garden amongst other structures.

Paragraph 7.5.3 of the revised Environmental Statement (Chapter 7: Archaeological and Cultural Heritage impact) states: ‘the only potential indirect impacts of the proposals will be to the setting of Colney Hall and its wider setting’. However there is no assessment of the impact on setting and whether the development will cause any harm. Furthermore, there is no assessment of impact on setting in the revised Chapter 8 (Heritage Impact Assessment).

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states ‘Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting’. Both the access road which is the subject of the full application and the development of the masterplan (outline application) will impact on the setting of Colney Hall and other heritage assets.

The Planning Statement dated 31 October 2012 in support of the revised proposals submitted in November 2011 states: ‘The development of the masterplan has been guided by detailed surveys of the existing landscape features, landform, trees, buildings and landscape character. The proposals have been designed to respect the listed and historic buildings and their parkland setting.’ However there is no supporting evidence to demonstrate how this has been achieved through appropriate positioning of buildings on the site and their scale and height etc.

The Planning Statement also refers to several policy documents including the NPPF, JCS and the NRP Development Framework SPD. However there is no reference to the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide adopted as SPD in September 2012 and how the relevant design principles have been taken into consideration and informed the development of the masterplan.

3.9 Environmental Services (Protection): No objection subject to EA being satisfied, Anglian Water agreeing to connect the development to the sewer system and an Environmental Management Plan for the control of noise, dust and odour during construction being submitted.

3.10 National Planning Casework Unit: No comments received
3.11 Norfolk Wildlife Trust  No objection.

- Any approval needs to ensure that a full package of mitigation and enhancement measures are included.
- Consideration needs to be given to light pollution and a further assessment on bats is required.
- Measures would need to be put in place to protect the heronry and to ensure that this area remains undisturbed.

3.12 Highways Agency  No objections

3.13 Historic Environment Service  No objections, condition recommended

3.14 English Heritage  The application details that the internal road will be tarmac with gravel aggregate, in order to retain parkland character it might be preferable to adopt a bound gravel finish for both road footways.

The application details a typical section through the road and footpath and this suggests the lighting will be by bollards. Will lighting columns be required at the axis road to the bus turning head?

The application states that ‘The only potential indirect impacts of the proposals will be to the setting of Colney Hall and its wider setting’ but no assessment is made of that impact.

A development of the nature and extent of that purposed will have some impact on the setting of Colney Hall and that needs to be properly assessed.

From the information provided with the application it is clear that the development will have some negative impact on the setting of Colney Hall which will result in harm, but that harm is likely to be less than substantial harm. When assessing the application it will be necessary for the planning authority to weigh the harm to Colney Hall against the wider public benefits that may result.

3.15 Natural England  No objections

3.16 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No objections raised subject to conditions regarding the delivery of sewage infrastructure.

3.17 Environment Agency  No objection, conditions recommended.

Concern has been raised regarding the proposal to connect the proposed development to the public foul sewer and that consultation be undertaken with Anglian Water.

Furthermore should overloading of sewer occur as a result of the proposed development Anglian Water could be guilty of offences under Environmental Permitting Regulations and the Environmental Protection Act. The Local Planning Authority should ensure that due consideration is given to this matter as pollution occurring in this manner would be contrary to planning guidance.
3.18 NCC Highways  
No objections, conditions recommended.

3.19 NCC Minerals And Waste  
No objections

3.20 Ecologist  
No comments received

3.21 Yare Valley Society  
Objection raised regarding the following issues:

- Impact on the River Yare and the valley landscape
- The application is weak in terms of details for materials and tree retention
- The development needs to be connected to the main drainage
- The development does not conform with the NRP SPD vision for the site

3.22 Representations  
19 letters of representation have been received. The are 14 letters of objection, the following issues have been raised:

- Potential for increased noise and traffic
- The development is too large and will impact negatively on the landscape
- Dementia care will require secure units which will mean lots of fences and gates
- There are no end users/financial backers secured
- The development is not for research and development as allocated
- No clarity on which buildings would be for research and development
- The applicant does not own all of the land and has not served the relevant notices to landowners
- The potential development is devaluing other land holdings
- The development proposal for dementia care has no substance or details that would qualify it as a suitable site
- The site is unsuitable for dementia and elderly care due to its location and lack of services
- The site is unsuitable for access by foot or by bicycle
- The development of the site is being marketed in a manner which is not in accordance with the planning application vision

5 letters of support have been received which raise the following issues:

- This type of care facility is to be welcomed to the area
- This project will complement the existing NRP and NNUH uses
- Employment opportunities which will boost the local economy
- The location is suitable with good infrastructure links
- The development would be consistent with and helpful to the overall activities undertaken at NRP
- The development would enhance the NRP cluster
Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site located within the parish of Colney and measures 29 ha, this includes the existing on site residential and commercial buildings. The application site is located to the west of Norwich and to the north of Watton Road and the established Norwich Research Park and Hospital grounds. The surrounding local area comprises a number of villages, including Colney, Hethersett, Cringleford, and Little Melton.

4.2 The site is heavily wooded on its northern and western elements and has within the wooded areas natural clearings. The site slopes significantly from its central area down to the northern aspect which contains a heronry and the banks of the River Yare. The southern area of the site is a more open landscape with views of Colney Hall available from the Watton Road.

4.3 Colney Hall is accessed by a tree-lined, private drive which gives direct access onto the B1108 Watton Road. The private drive splits into two sections before it meets with the Watton Road which allows for access to be gained from two different points directly onto the highway.

4.4 The application site is not within a conservation area, however the central area of the application site contains a complex of Grade II listed buildings and structures:
   - Colney Hall
   - Walled garden
   - Potting shed
   - Water Garden

4.5 It should also be noted that Grade II Listed Colney Old Hall, Gate Piers and the Old Rectory and Grade II* Listed St. Andrew's Church are within close proximity to the site.

4.6 Colney Hall is currently occupied as a residential property, to the north and north west of the hall are outbuildings which have been converted and added to, these are used by the Global Clinic as medical consulting rooms. The central area of the site contains a car park with current provision for 61 car parking spaces.

4.7 The application site is allocated as COL1 in the South Norfolk Local Plan and identified as Yare Valley Urban Fringe to the north and Yare Tributary with Parkland to the south in the South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment.

Proposal

4.8 The planning application proposes an outline application and a detailed application. The main built form components of the proposed outline planning application are the following:
   - A healthcare campus (C2 use – residential institution) with a floorspace provision of 16,950 sq m
   - Research and development (B1b) use with a floorspace provision of 1100 sq m
   - Ancillary development consisting of retail and restaurant/cafe (A1-A3) with a floorspace provision of 500 sq m.
   - Car parking provision for 313 spaces (17 disabled spaces)
   - 138 Cycle spaces

4.9 The detailed element of the planning application is for an infrastructure package which includes provision of access roads, drainage, and structural landscaping.
4.10 The site layout plan accompanying the planning application details that there would be development located in the northern section of the application site, this development would occupy a flatter area of the site which contains some plateaus and clearings. The development would not encroach upon the northern boundary with the River Yare and the heronry. The site location plan also details that a building would be located to the south west of Colney Hall.

4.11 The site location plans shows that each building would be served by a car park directly adjacent. The parameter plans detail that the buildings on the upper southern areas would be approximately 10m in height and that on the less prominent northern areas of the site the buildings would range between 15-20m in height.

4.12 The application does not detail any alterations to any of the listed structures or buildings.

4.13 The detailed full element of the application relates to the access arrangements, structural landscaping and drainage details.

4.14 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development, economic implications of the proposal, the impact of the development on the listed building/structures, the landscape character and drainage. Attached to this report is a summary provided by the applicant (appendix 2) which also discusses many of the matters examined in this report below.

Principle of development

4.15 The application site is located within the development limits of Colney as identified through the South Norfolk Local Plan. Colney is regarded within the South Norfolk Local Plan as being a main strategic location for new employment in the Norwich Policy Area and is allocated as part of the COL1 - Research and Development uses at NRP and EMP1 - Employment Land Allocations policy areas.

4.16 COL1 - Research and Development directs that development will be approved within the NRP area provided that it is acceptable in relation to design and layout and that the development would provide for B 1(b) use and others which would be ancillary to that use. This policy direction is a detailed reflection of Saved Policy EMP1 which allocates 35ha of restricted use development within the COL1 NRP area.

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

4.18 The NPPF also encourages the local authorities to plan positively and in a flexible manner for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries, which accords with the provisions and intent of Saved Polices EMP1, COL1, COL2 and COL4, JCS Polices 5 and 9 and the NRP SPD.

4.19 The application seeks approval for 1,100 sq m of B1b use which is in compliance with the direct guidance of SNLP Saved Policies EMP1 and COL1 and JCS Policies 5 and 9.

4.20 It should also be acknowledged that the NRP Development Framework - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in March 2009, details that the following 'possible' ancillary uses to development and research could be acceptable: 
- Patient hotels, recuperative/respite care;
- Education and training facilities;
- Social/networking and conference facilities to encourage and develop knowledge transfer;
The ancillary uses proposed would by virtue of their quantum on site need to be considered as the main use and the research and development function would be ancillary to this. The relevant policies associated with this site, and the wider development of the NRP, are clear that those sites with the COL1 land allocation should predominately be for higher value, knowledge economy jobs. The application proposed details that the development could accommodate for approximately 325 full time jobs the majority of these would not be considered to meet with this description.

The Colney Hall Saved Policy COL1 land area is to the north of the NRP North site which is adjacent two further allocations for development COL2 and COL 4. COL2 covers an area of 14 ha between Hethersett Lane and Watton Road, and is a contingency reserve for the NRP. Land allocation COL4 is an area of land covering 5ha which would allow for expansion of the hospital towards Hethersett Lane.
Part of the consideration for development of these allocated sites is whether separate proposals would prejudice against the others being brought forward. It is considered that the quantum of proposed ancillary style uses on the Colney Hall site may impact negatively on the deliverability of the NRP North and South sites, which encompass the Saved Policy COL1, COL2 and COL 4 land.

The NRP North and South sites have been previously considered and they have both clearly shown that the predominant use of those sites would be in accordance with the land allocation and SPD. In that regard both contain provision for associated ancillary services and the provision of these services in an ancillary manner is considered to be in the best interests of proper planning and key to their commercial deliverability. The use of Colney Hall to solely provide these ancillary type functions may undermine the deliverability and viability of NRP North and South developments which would therefore undermine the intention of the Saved Policies COL1, COL2 and COL4 and clearly indicate that a departure from the policy provisions are not warranted.

It is considered that by virtue of the proposed amount of C2 floorspace proposed the application is a departure from the provisions of the COL1 land allocation and the intent of the NRP SPD. Furthermore the development would not provide for the nature of jobs that would be visualised as arising from the development of this site and it could potentially hinder the commercial deliverability of the other SNLP COL land allocations.

For the reasons outlined above the principle of the proposed development is therefore not considered acceptable and the application is determined to be contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Polices EMP1, COL1, COL2 and COL4, JCS Polices 5 and 9, the NRP SPD and the guidance contained in the NPPF regarding positive forward planning for knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

There is a letter and supporting vision statement which the applicant has supplied. These detail the provision of dementia care on site. These do not give any demonstrable evidence that this site is suitable for a dementia care facility, in lieu of Research and Development, or that an end user has been secured.

The principal of development for a predominantly C2 use class proposal on the application site is not considered to be acceptable and therefore the provisions of JCS Policy 7 do not alter the recommendation that the proposal is not in accordance with the relevant land use policies and that a departure from them should be considered.

Economic Development

The application site is allocated with the Saved Policy requirements of EMP1 and COL1. The development proposal is detailed as giving provision for 325 jobs, the breakdown of those jobs in relation to the use class has not been provided but by virtue of the floorspace balance proposed it would be anticipated that the majority of the employment would be derived from the C2 use class proposal.

NPPF Section 1 directs that planning should operate to encourage sustainable economic growth. The development of the application site for such a large amount of residential institution in the location proposed and at the expense of potential B1b use development, within an existing cluster of this use, would not be considered to be a sustainable practice.
4.39 JCS Policy 5 - Economic Growth recognises that the growth strategy is to provide for an increase in the proportion of high value, knowledge economy jobs while ensuring that opportunities are available for the development of all types and levels of jobs in all sectors of the economy and for the entire workforce. In achieving this aim JCS Policy 9 - strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area states the following:

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

4.40 Although JCS Policy 5 provides support for all levels and types of job creation the weight of this policy in support of the proposal is counter balanced by JCS Policy 9.

4.41 JCS Policy 9 promotes the development of the NRP land, which due to its COL1 land allocation includes Colney Hall, as being essential for the economic strategy of the Norwich area. The policy reflects the advice contained in NPPF Section1 which directs that local authorities should plan positively and in a flexible manner for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

4.42 JCS Policy 9 gives clear guidance on the nature of the job creation envisaged for the NRP which the development does not comply with. To allow for the development of the site for the use class proposed would be to potentially restrict the growth of the Norwich Policy Area in relation to the provision of suitable sites for the expansion of clusters of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries; this would be contrary to JCS Policy 9 and the guidance of the NPPF.

4.43 The NPPF Section1 states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Furthermore it is advised that where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated employment site being used for its designated purpose then applications for other uses should be considered on their merits, with regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support local communities.

4.44 The application documents do not provide any details to demonstrate that the site has been appropriately marketed and valued as a development opportunity to provide research and development uses. The time period which has passed since the land was initially allocated in 2003 is acknowledged as a significant period. However, this is also the case for NRP North and South for which two applications in accordance with the land allocations have recently been approved, this is considered to demonstrate that there is a market demand for the allocated land in the locality.

4.45 The applicant has provided a letter from an organisation called Central and Regional Estates (CARE) Ltd which indicates that they are interested in developing on the site for dementia care facilities. It is not considered that this letter alone demonstrates that there is a demand for care home (C2 use) facilities of any nature in the locality, rather than research and development. Furthermore, it is not considered sufficient to outweigh the economic planning policy guidance associated with the land use allocation and that contained in the NPPF.
Highways

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

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

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

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

"that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas"

4.49 The planning applications for NRP North (2012/1477) and NRP South (2012/1880) were accompanied by a joint Transport Assessment. This assessment, and its subsequent mitigation recommendations, took account of the proposed Colney Hall development when considering the accumulative traffic impacts.

4.50 This application has been submitted with a Transport Assessment of its own and detailed drawings showing the improvements to the road access onto Watton Road. The road access arrangements would require for a set of signalised traffic lights to be provided and for the current access to be formalised further with road markings and surfacing treatments.

4.51 The pedestrian and cycle access arrangements are proposed to be upgraded through the site, this would potentially give rise to a linkages with the new internal road system proposed as part of the NRP south development. The NRP South development has a link road planned to join with the Watton Road to the west of School Lane. It should be noted that this connection is subject to the NRP South development being at an advanced stage.

4.52 The Transport Assessment for the Colney Hall development states that the safest method of pedestrian access to Colney Hall would be via a public right of way which meets with the Watton Road/Hethersett Lane junction. There are no plans to upgrade this route and at present it has typical rural characteristics.

4.53 The application also details the use of a shuttle bus system to transport staff/visitors/patients to the nearest transport hubs.
The application details that there would be improvements for vehicular access and management of that access in accordance with the main thrust of Saved Policies IMP8 and elements of COL 3. Also it is considered that through the promotion of a travel plan and use of a shuttle bus service further, elements of Saved Policy COL3 could be addressed in keeping with the NPPF guidance regarding the use of different transport solutions for different developments.

However, there are no footpaths along the sections of the Watton Road close to the application site and the connections of this site with pedestrian links are subject to two very different solutions.

The site would rely on an existing public right of way which may difficult to access during times of inclement weather, and it may also be able to connect with the NRP South development access onto Watton Road.

The existing pathway may not be accessible all year round and may not provide for an access which would be perceived as safe by the user. The second potential solution to connect with the NRP South development is reliant on another development taking place. The connection road from NRP South is detailed within application 2012/1880 as being provided within the 3rd phase, which may be available at approximately 2026. This is obviously dependant on how fast the site is built out, it may be earlier or later.

It is noted that the Highway Authority have not objected to the proposal however it is considered that the footpath provision which is associated with the site is not sufficient to meet with the aims and objectives of Saved Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and partly COL3. This is by virtue of the public right of way potentially not being available for use all year round and the reliance on a further development, not in the applicant’s control, which may or may not be available in approximately 13 years.

As the Highway Authority have not objected then it may not be possible to defend this position and it is therefore not included as a reason for refusal. On balance the location of the site is not one which would maybe encourage users to walk to it and the effective management of shuttle buses to transport links may resolve any access issues. It should also be noted that the NPPF does suggest that different solutions may required from urban to rural communities and although the site is within the development limits it does have many rural characteristics.

Policies TRA 18 (off-street parking provision) seeks to ensure appropriate levels of car parking including appropriate landscaping and disabled parking. Policy TRA 19 (parking standards) sets maximum parking standards for the County. However it should be noted that the parking requirements for the NRP sites are guided by the SPD ration of 1 per 60 sq m.

The application proposes 330 parking spaces which is only 21 more than the amount required by the SPD ratio, this over provision of spaces is not considered to be of a sufficient number to warrant a reason for refusal.

Design, landscape and heritage

The design and appearance of development on this site is considered to be a challenge which would need to take account of the historical assets, the landscape setting and the land form. The site contains the Grade II Listed Colney Hall and the various structures and buildings within its curtilage are also considered to form part of the listing. The landscape setting is made up of open parkland on the southern Watton Road aspect, with a heavily wooded area sweeping down to the northern valley floor. The wooded area contains clearings and areas of plantation which are of non native species.
4.63 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.

4.64 The NRP SPD also recognises the unique qualities of the site and advises that any new development would have to give careful consideration to them. The NRP SPD gives specific design principles which would require to be considered if development was proposed for the Rose Garden, The Pump House Area, any extensions to the Hall, The walled garden and the Plantation area. 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.

4.65 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.

4.66 The application proposes the majority of its development within an area to the north east of Colney Hall. There is no development proposed which would be directly adjacent or attached to Colney Hall. A building of considerable mass is proposed to be positioned to the south of the Rose Garden.

4.67 The application is in outline form only and the parameter plans which have been provided detail that buildings of approximately three storeys are proposed on the lower level areas of the site. These buildings would be on the southern slope down towards the river side and would utilise the existing clearings. The NRP SPD contains a guideline parameter plan for the development of the site which shows most of the development contained in the centre of the site within the plantation area and to the south west of the hall. The application does not conform to this approach although it is acknowledged that the NRP SPD is only a guidance document and that each application should be evaluated on its own merits.

4.68 Saved Policy COL1 allocates 15 ha of land at Colney Hall for development, of this land the NRP SPD states that approximately 8ha should be developed at a ratio of approximately 25%. This would give a floorspace of approximately 20,000 sq m, the application is therefore compliant with the quantum of development envisaged for the site.

4.69 The development would undoubtedly result in the loss of mature vegetation to accommodate the development. This would result in the change of the character of the area from wood and plantation to that of a wooded landscape setting for a series of buildings. The relatively low level buildings proposed coupled with the retention of the majority of the peripheral existing tree cover and its enhancement with supplementary planting would ensure that the development is not overbearing on the landscape setting. It is acknowledged that the development would be visible from the Bowthorpe side of the valley, however the impact of this is not capable of being fully considered due to the design of the buildings not being available in the outline application.

4.70 The site has several listed structures and the Councils Conservation Officer has advised that there is insufficient information and detailed assessments on the impact of the development upon the listed buildings.
4.71 The fine balance of developing the site whilst retaining elements of the woodland character, protecting the heritage assets and respecting the existing outlook from the opposite side of the valley are considered to require further examination. It is accepted that the site is allocated for development, but to achieve this allocation the intricate qualities of the site need to be protected and enhanced. It is not considered that the current proposal would achieve this in relation to the listed buildings and the wider appearance of the development within the valley landscape setting.

4.72 The application is therefore considered to not comply with the requirements of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policy IMP15 as it does not supply sufficient information regarding how it would respect the local distinctiveness of the site and the wider locality.

4.73 However, the application is in outline form and the plans are all indicative, should committee be minded to grant approval to the application then the precise details of the development scheme would have to be submitted for consideration.

Archaeology

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

4.75 The applicant submitted a desk based archaeological survey which was required by Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Service (NCC HES) and no objections to the development have subsequently been raised.

Ecology

4.76 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.

4.77 There are no statutory designated sites i.e. RAMSAR, SAC within the immediate locality of the application site. However, there are several county wildlife sites within 2km of the application site. It should also be noted that the site has within its boundary on the northern element a county wildlife site, The Heronry.

4.78 The application details are supported by an ecology survey which identifies bats and their roosts as the most likely protected species and habitat to be impacted by the development of the site. It is considered that by using mitigation methods associated with the landscaping the impact would be neutral to beneficial and the development would comply with the relevant planning policy.

Drainage and Flood Risk

4.79 The majority of the application site is located within flood risk zone 1 with a small portion on the western boundary on the periphery of flood risk zone 2 and 3.
4.80 The Environment Agency have examined the details of the Environmental Statement and advised that they have no objections to the development proposal subject to a series of conditions. The application is therefore considered to comply with section 10 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that appropriate development is provided in suitable areas and that adequate mitigation measures are used to limit any damage from flooding.

4.81 Anglian Water have given consideration to NRP North, NRP South and Colney Hall and have advised that capacity is available for the developments at Whitlingham Sewage Treatment Works, however there would be an upgrade of the Yare Valley Trunk Sewer required. Anglian Water have advised of a cooperative method of working between NRP North and South and Colney Hall to achieve the necessary sewer upgrade and a method of connection which can be carried out separately, but at a greater cost. The applicant has not been able to agree to a joint method of working with the NRP North and South to deliver the sewer upgrade and will therefore have to provide for their own connection.

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

Amenity

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

4.84 It is considered that the development would not have any impact on the residential amenity of any dwelling in the locality in terms of overlooking or overshadowing. However, should approval be forthcoming the residential amenity of Colney Hall would need to be considered within any detailed building design.

4.85 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors. Consideration would therefore need to be given to the noise associated with plant and traffic. The Environmental Statement concludes that there would be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity in relation to noise from the development, and the Council's Environmental Protection Team have not objected to the development either. The Council’s Environmental Protection Team have advised that if approval was granted an Environmental Management Plan to control noise, dust and odour from construction would be required.

Sustainability

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

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

4.88 The application proposes a mix of Residential Institution and Research and Development at a ratio which is not considered acceptable. The research and development element of the proposal is considered to be the ancillary use. The principle of the development is not consistent with the planning policy land allocations which would dictate that the site should be developed for a Research and Development focus with associated/supportive ancillary uses.

4.89 The impact of the proposed development on the listed structures and buildings has not been assessed adequately to allow for full consideration to be given.

4.90 Notwithstanding these issues the development has not received objections from the majority of the statutory consultees and the applicant has invested time and money in resolving issues associated with drainage, sewer connections and minerals investigations.

4.91 The development could provide for economic development in the supply of dementia care. The creation of jobs and the provision of dementia care are both recognised as being promoted through the NPPF and the JCS Policy 7. However, these factors are not considered to be sufficient to outweigh the saved SNLP land allocation policy COL1 and the application does not provide enough confidence that a departure from the Saved Policy COL1 could actually be delivered.

4.92 The applicant in their summary paper, vision statement and letter from the CARE organisation have not demonstrated that the current application is either consistent with policy; or should be granted as a departure from policy due to the site not being viable for its land use allocation and/or that growth will be deliverable through secured end users.

5 Reasons for refusal

5.1 The application is contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Policy COL1 and the provisions of NRP SPD with regard to the quantum of C2 land use proposed. The amount of C2 land use proposed would make it the predominant land use rather than being an ancillary element of a B1b use class development.

5.2 The application does not comply with the requirements of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policy IMP15 as it does not supply sufficient information regarding how it would respect the local distinctiveness of the site and the wider locality with special regard to the listed buildings and structures.

5.3 The proposed development does not comply with the intent of JCS Policy 9 which directs that land allocated for the expansion of the NRP should be developed to secure knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly 01508 533674 and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5 March 2013

Ian Reilly
Senior Planning Officer
Development and Environment
South Norfolk District Council
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

Dear Ian

Re: Colney Hall outline application for healthcare campus ref: 2011/0581

I refer to your email of 19th February 2013, setting out a number of issues that you consider need to be addressed to enable you to determine the above application. In response, I set out below my comments to each issue in the order that they appear in your email:

1. The suitability of the site for the type of development proposed

Land at Colney Hall has been allocated for employment generating development for the past ten years. Its extensive parkland setting on the edge of an urban centre makes it a natural candidate for the healthcare complex proposed, which will generate a significant number of jobs.

On the basis that it is queried whether it is necessary to demonstrate the suitability of the site for this development and to the extent that it is, it may be noted that no complex of this kind exists at present anywhere in the region, or indeed the country.

The specialist residential care accommodation of the kind proposed would be inappropriate in a urban location, as it could not achieve the level of quality and tranquility offered by the Colney Hall site which is so important to the treatment of degenerative illnesses.

The Colney Hall proposal is properly seen as an integrated healthcare complex which if it is to succeed in providing exemplary age-related care cannot reasonably be disaggregated and therefore requires a site of this scale. Every component will form a complementary part of a complex whole, making disaggregation inappropriate and the Colney site an ideal location.
2. The deliverability of the proposed development

When considering whether to grant planning permission it is immaterial whether a scheme is deliverable or not. A decision should be based solely on whether a proposed use is acceptable in the context of the Development Plan and other material considerations such as, whether the physical or environmental impact of the development for those uses would similarly be acceptable.

Furthermore, even if there is no developer interest in the scheme it will not get built. That is not material to the question of whether permission should be granted. It follows that as a matter of law it is not necessary to show the scheme will be a viable commercial proposition.

3. Why the application site is not suitable and/or capable of delivering the land use allocation

The applicant does not accept the premise upon which the question is based. The land is allocated for research and development together with healthcare related uses. They are employment generating uses. Whilst the uses proposed at Colney Hall are focused on the provision of healthcare and associated uses, they use will deliver a significant number of jobs. The proposal is therefore also to be regarded as an employment use. Even if that were not the case the application site is a suitable location for the type of economic development that is proposed. The planning challenge is therefore to facilitate, manage and accommodate this form of sustainable economic growth. The Colney site represents an appropriate development in the context of planning policy set out in the Norwich Research Park SPD and more recently the JCS, which in itself accords with the NPPF as set out in the applicant’s Planning Statement submitted in November 2012.

Furthermore, the NPPF makes it clear that the long-term protection of sites for particular uses is to be avoided. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed with applications for alternative uses being treated on their own merits having regard to market signals and the need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities (paragraph 22).

4. Why the application should be approved as a departure from the local plan especially in the context of the two recent NRP approvals

The applicant’s primary case is that the scheme is a hybrid of cutting-edge healthcare and employment development. The scheme therefore accords with a strict, narrow reading of the somewhat dated development plan policies for the site.

The scheme also complies with the Norwich Research Park Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was adopted in 2009, to guide and co-ordinate the form of development of land allocated as an extension to the NRP at Colney. More particularly, the SPD promotes development at Colney Hall including promoting inter alia health related uses, hospital based and non-hospital residential uses, such as recuperative and respite care. The aim of the development framework is to establish development principles that allow sufficient flexibility in the manner in which development may occur and recognises the need for some ancillary uses as part of the overall NRP. The SPD recognises the special and complex character of Colney Hall and acknowledges that the physical characteristics of the land surrounding Colney Hall provide an opportunity for a high quality development in a mature landscape setting.

It is a primary aspiration of the allocation of land at the Norwich Research Park both in the JCS, the SPD and the Council’s emerging Site Allocations Plan, that additional employment opportunities will be created, particularly in health and life sciences for which it is currently the main focus, employing some 9000 people. It is estimated that future development at Colney Hall will provide between 500 to 800 new jobs depending on the nature of its end users.
The jobs created would provide a range of semi-skilled, skilled and professional opportunities as well as a number of student and training opportunities. The first phase of development, which would comprise the formation of a 72 bed dementia care facility to be located within the former Rose Garden which has the potential generate up to 60 full-time equivalent jobs.

Healthcare development of the type proposed by this application site would not prejudice the delivery of the approved schemes for NRP North and South. The Norwich Research Park, hospital and university sites already comprise a centre of substantial employment. The existing employment uses include a range of research and development, education and hospital uses. This cluster of research and development and in particular hospital development in the proximity of the application site underlines why the site is sustainable and an appropriate location for the type of development proposed.

The Council intimates that there is no need for the facilities proposed at Colney Hall. That is, belied by JCS Policy 7, which expressly recognises that there is a need for care home provision specialising in dementia care on the periphery of Norwich. The Colney Hall healthcare complex will offer a state-of-the-art range of complementary facilities without parallel in the UK.

Overall the effect of the Colney Hall proposals would be beneficial. The development would be accessible by a choice of means of transport. Its traffic effects, relatively minor by comparison to the approved NRP schemes as many of its users would be resident on site and its shift patterns would allow for an effective travel plan to be agreed and implemented. The development would be sustainably located in the context of its target population and relationship to the hospital and designed in such a way that the principles of sustainable development can be implemented.

In summary, the Colney Hall proposal provides for:

- The development of a major healthcare complex of national standing and regional significance, close to a urban centre, with excellent links to the hospital and other institutes;
- The creation of a significant number of skilled and unskilled jobs and economic development, both on-site and off-site, within a designated growth point;
- New green infrastructure, including woodland management, new landscaping and the protection of key environmental assets;
- Management and enhancement of ecological assets.

The quantum and type of development are allowed for in the SPD. The scheme would be wholly consistent with JCS Policy 7, and therefore the overall strategy of the development plan and the NPPF.

The application is not considered to be a departure from the development plan and it is the applicant's view that there is a high degree of compliance with the key elements of the Development Plan when taken as a whole and more significantly the NPPF. The site is allocated in the SPD as a part of the Norwich Research Park and has the potential to make a valuable contribution towards meeting the overall high level of development growth sought by the SPD, JCS and NPPF.
5. Demonstrated progress regarding the connection of the site to the sewer system and an
acknowledgement of the costs and works required to connect the site to the main sewer.

The Environment Agency’s letter of 23 December 2011 confirms that they have no objection to the
application. However, this is cavetated with advice that Anglian Water Services should be consulted
regarding the available capacity in the sewerage infrastructure including the waste water treatment
works and foul water sewer.

In response to this advice the applicant commissioned Anglian Water Services to prepare a
Development Impact Assessment Report to investigate the issues raised. The report outlined two
possible technical solutions to upgrading the local sewer capacity. The first option provides for foul
water to be dealt with on-site and the second option provides for the development to be connected
to the foul water system manhole nearest the site downstream of the Norwich Research Park South
development. The report, which was submitted to the Council on 25th September 2011 concludes
that either option is achievable and provides costs for their implementation.

Whilst Option 2 is applicant’s the preferred solution the Anglian Water report has demonstrated that
should other parties not wish to participate in this solution then an acceptable solution can be
delivered on land wholly within the applicant’s ownership. The complexity of providing an acceptable
system does not affect the principle that one is possible. A suitable condition can be imposed to
ensure that the required foul sewerage infrastructure and waste-water treatment works are approved
and implemented prior to the commencement of development.

6. The Council’s Conservation Officer has advised that there is insufficient information and detailed
assessments on the impact of the development upon the listed buildings.

The applicant does not accept this assertion. The application is in outline, with the details of design
reserved for future consideration. Chapter 6 of the ES assesses the potential landscape and visual
implications of the proposed development including and in particular its impact upon the listed
buildings.

It is acknowledged that certain landscapes are ‘essential’ to the character of listed buildings because
they were laid out to complement them. This is not the case with Colney Hall, which is a Grade II
listed building set within the remnant of a historic landscape and parkland. Woodland forms the
principal landscape character providing a dense envelope to the north and eastern half of the site.
The south-western sector of the site forms the remnants of Colney Hall’s original designed landscape.
Those important elements of the landscape and the setting of the listed building are to be retained
and will not be affected by the development.

The original proposals were submitted in March 2011 this included an extension to Colney Hall and
development within the walled garden and on Boathouse Hill. As direct result of comments by the
Council’s Conservation Advisors, at a meeting held on 25th August 2011 these elements of the
proposals were removed and a revised application submitted in November 2011. As it was agreed
between the parties that the remainder of the proposed development would be outside of the
historic parkland, and there would be no further objections to the application on the basis of impact
on the listed building or its setting.
7. Planning Policy issues, including the clarification of the use class outcome i.e. which parts of the CZ use class would be restricted.

At the time of writing the South Norfolk Local Plan has been adopted for ten years. That said there is very little conflict with the Local Plan. The Colney Hall site is allocated for employment generating development in accordance with the adopted (albeit out of date) Local Plan, the NRP SPD and the JCS, which fully accords with the NPFF. There are various policies in these documents with which the Colney Hall scheme is fully compliant.

On this basis, and insofar as it is relevant, I address below the specific comments raised by the Planning Policy Officer in his Internal memorandum of 15 November 2012.

Relationship to the remainder of the NRP campus

Future development of Colney Hall meets with the Council’s stated aspirations for the development of healthcare and life sciences and provides significant opportunities for additional support services and associated uses. This will help to create and attractive, high quality and sustainable cluster of uses which are mutually supportive. The application proposals therefore meet the important economic, environmental and social objectives set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

We consider that the proposed development at NRP North, NRP South and Colney Hall will complement each other in a way that maximises the economic, social and sustainable benefits of the NRP area and that this inter-relationship between the three sites should be recognised in the Council’s assessment of the Colney Hall scheme.

High quality design

There are numerous policies including SPD 2.1, 2.5, 3.5, and JCS Policy 2 against which no assessment can be made at this outline stage. However, there is no reason why detailed design should not accord with those policies. Accordingly, given the modest nature of what conflicts there is no reason in the context of the Development Plan or the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document why the application should be refused in terms of its quality of design.

Impact on the historic character of the site

For the reasons set out above at Section 6, the requirements set out at paragraph 3.5 of the SPD and saved policies ENV5 and IMP15 have been complied with.

Impact on the surrounding landscape, including lighting issues

There are limited impacts on the landscape as a result of the scheme. The views were assessed as part of the ES process and it was concluded that, due to the existing trees and vegetation around the boundary and within the site together with the design and layout of the proposed buildings, there would be only limited impact on the surrounding landscape.

Colney Hall is located on a south-east facing ridge with a relatively steep scarp slope descending to the river. The proposed development on this scarp takes full advantage of the nature of the topography. It is, in fact, a remarkable feature of the Colney proposals that a complex as extensive as that which is proposed should be so well integrated into the landscape.
The conclusion to be drawn therefore, is not simply whether the development would have an impact, to a degree it would, but whether, and to whom or what, that impact would be harmful. Even if the initial impact would represent harm, the question is would it be permanent. The Woodland Burial Ground to the west appears to have become an accepted feature of the landscape, even though at the time of its approval it too, no doubt incited negative opinion, as to the actual visual harm that would occur as a result of their development.

The detail of the buildings is not a part of this application and will be subject to reserved matters applications. The Council therefore retains the control to ensure that the buildings are well designed, well detailed and finished in suitable materials, that would be sufficient to render their impact at least neutral, rather than actually harmful.

With regard to lighting issues, various measures have been proposed to minimise light pollution and light spillage (These are summarised at Section 11.7 of the ES). These can be secured by a suitable condition requiring the prior approval by SNDC of a Lighting Strategy and Monitoring Plan.

In terms of perception, it comes down to the extent that the development in what was previously an unlit area would be visible. Parts of the lighting for the access roads and car parks would probably be visible from some directions, as is currently the case. So would lighting from those parts of the buildings that would probably be visible by day. Neither would amount to harmful levels of light pollution particularly in the context of the planned NRP developments to the east, and the A47 corridor to the west. It would simply be that a development which is partially visible, by day would also be partially visible by night – which runs to the acceptability of the Colney Hall proposal in land use policy terms rather than whether it would cause light pollution serious enough to be a contributory reason to refuse the application.

SPD 3.3 and saved SNLP IMP25 have therefore been properly addressed.

**Ecology and woodland management**

Overall the ecological work carried out by Norfolk Wildlife Services provides a careful and reasonable assessment of the value of the site and a platform for successful mitigation and enhancement. A mitigation and enhancement strategy for the proposed development outlined in Chapters 5 and 6 of the ES establishes a strategy to provide high quality, green infrastructure, within comprehensive landscape structures, promoting ecological networks and continuous links between habitats.

The application submissions include a comprehensive landscape and management strategy together with a set of ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals which can be secured by conditions or s106 agreement. The mitigation proposed which includes a woodland management scheme, is more than adequate to ensure that species and habitats would not be harmed and nature conservation interest are preserved and enhanced (These are set out in full at Section 5.5.4 of the ES).

JCS Policy 1, SPD 2.5 and 3.4 and saved SNLP Policy IMP2 would be fully complied with because the landscape, habitats and species on the site are capable of being adequately mitigated or compensated.

**Transport issues**

There are no objections to the proposal on highways grounds the Highways Agency has issued a TR110 confirming that they have no objection to the proposals. The County Council are satisfied, provided that a travel plan is secured as part of a s106 agreement.
Restriction of use classes

Any planning permission would be constrained by conditions and/or the section 106 agreement. These would comprise a complete system of control over the use of buildings and content of the scheme, with the amount of floorspace set aside for each use being limited to an upper level. With regard to the C2 healthcare and residential uses the following condition is suggested:

Unless otherwise agreed by the granting of a specific planning permission the development hereby permitted (as shown on masterplan ref: 2721/110) shall be limited to use for the purposes of residential care, intermediate healthcare, respite and recuperative care, palliative care, day care, supporting clinical services, healthcare research, development and training facilities.

With regard to the A1-A3 uses proposed it is anticipated that a condition specifying the maximum floorspace for individual units would also be necessary to prevent the possibility of the creation of retail space beyond that of purely local facilities serving the campus.

Summary

The Colney Hall proposal will provide an integrated specialist healthcare facility of national significance. The scheme is located in an appropriate and sustainable location close to where it is needed. The proposal accords with the development plan and national policy, providing a large number of jobs and meeting the requirement for dementia care in and around Norwich. The scheme is therefore commended to the Council as a flagship proposal that will establish South Norfolk as a leader in the management and treatment of dementia and other illnesses that affect the elderly.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Erica Whettingsteele BA (Hons) Dip TP Dip UD MRTPI

cc. James Boddy – Colney Hall
2.  

Appl. No : 2012/1814/F  
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Gladedale Estates  
Site Address : Land North Of Great Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed residential development of 158 dwellings and associated access, car parking and open space provision

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1.  

Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres  
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of listed buildings  
HOU 3: Strategic Land Reserve (Part Consistent)  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0584 Screening opinion for residential development  
EIA not required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse  
- The development site is in the wrong location  
- A development of 158 dwellings would compromise and overload existing facilities  
- Added congestion to roads  
- Urban development in a rural setting  
- The development will bring no benefits to the village  
- The proposed road network for the development should be redesigned around the periphery of the site to encourage traffic to use New Road rather than through the village centre  
- The play areas are designed to be adjacent to the main estate road  
- Consideration needs to be given to the capacity of the neighbouring field ditches to take surface water flow  
- It is essential that the footway in Great Melton Road joins with the new development

3.2 District Members  
To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 GNDP  
No comments received

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objection in respect of flood risk, subject to appropriate conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Comments/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>Amendments requested to improve the internal estate road layout. Comments on amended plans awaited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NCC: Historic Environment Service</td>
<td>No objection subject to an appropriate condition requiring a written scheme of investigation has been submitted and agreed, and the development shall be built in accordance with the agreed scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Anglian Water Services Ltd</td>
<td>The development will require off-site foul drainage upgrades. The drainage strategy for the site will cover the procurement of these works and should be required by condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Conservation Officer</td>
<td>Comments on amended plans to be reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Landscape Officer</td>
<td>Consulted but not received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Ecologist</td>
<td>Consulted but not received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Housing Strategy Manager</td>
<td>The proposed level of affordable housing (52 units) equates to 33% as required by JCS Policy 4. The proposed housing mix meets an appropriate range of need, and is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>NCC- Planning Obligations</td>
<td>Request developer contributions towards Primary and High School provision, totalling £807,938.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>SNC Planning Policy</td>
<td>- As a Key Service Centre and Major Growth Location in the NPA, Hethersett was identified for an additional 1,000 dwellings in the JCS, plus consideration for additional development to help deliver the 'smaller sites in the NPA' allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- During the recent Site Specific Allocations process, the application site emerged as one of the preferred sites in Hethersett. It has been identified for 106 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The NPA does not have a five year supply of housing land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Norfolk Police</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Representations</td>
<td>31 letters of objection received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is already too much traffic in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Should not be building on green fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic will be forced to go through the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site has a high ground water table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site has no footpath links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development will lead to increased noise/air pollution and traffic safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development will impinge on the setting of a listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Will jeopardise the neighbourhood’s peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Will affect the setting of two heritage assets (no. 70 Great Melton Road, and Cedar Grange). Should be a screening belt between the site and no. 70 Great Melton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development offers nothing for the residents of Hethersett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 This applicant proposes the development of 158 dwellings, together with access, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure. It is a full application, so matters of detailed design are to be assessed at this stage. The application site comprises approx. 5.75 hectares of arable land located to the north of Great Melton Road at the western edge of the village. The western boundary of the site follows the line of the public footpath and parish boundary. This boundary has a hedge and trees that provide significant screening to the site. The northern boundary of the site also contains a mature hedgerow and trees, with the southern boundary being more open where it fronts onto the road. The proposed development density is 27 dwellings per hectare.

4.2 A good mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed properties are proposed, along with 33% affordable housing in accordance with JCS policy.

4.3 The site adjoins existing residential development to the south and east, where there is a mix of bungalows and two-storey properties. No. 70 Great Melton Road (directly adjoining the site to the east) is a grade 2 listed building, as is Cedar Grange to the north-east of the site. The site is not within a Conservation Area.

4.4 Although separate to the recently approved larger Hethersett North strategic site (1196 dwellings to the north of the village), one element of the scheme provides a new road connecting the western side of ‘Hethersett North’ to Great Melton Road. This road will eventually allow for a new bus link through ‘Hethersett North’ to the rest of the village via New Road to the south.

4.5 As the site is located outside the current development boundary in an area of open countryside (as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003), the application is clearly contrary to saved local plan policy ENV8. The proposal should therefore be refused unless there are material considerations that dictate otherwise. In my opinion, the following material considerations need to be taken into account in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Hethersett for further development of at least 1000 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026.

- There is an acknowledged lack of a 5-year housing supply within the Norwich Policy Area (currently 68.3% years supply in the NPA.) The recently published National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply also includes an additional buffer of 5%.

- Having regard to Hethersett being a location for major expanded communities as set out in Policy 10 of the JCS, the site is a sustainable location for development.

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

- Other relevant sections of the NPPF as set out above.
4.6 It will be noted above that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents raising a number of issues. The Parish Council also objects to the development of the site. Taking these comments into account, the main issues that members need to consider are:

- The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the identification of the majority of the site as a preferred allocation for residential development, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing.
- Suitability of the site, having regard to the design and layout and the impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on the setting of heritage assets
- Drainage & flood risk
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highway Impact (including cycleway and pedestrian links)

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

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

4.8 In terms of sustainability, the site is well located in relation to the secondary school and other local facilities. The village has a range of local facilities dispersed throughout it with there being two clusters of facilities located on the convergence of routes. Hethersett has good bus links to Norwich and Wymondham, and it is well located for the Norwich Research Park, Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital, and the University of East Anglia to the north-east of Hethersett and Longwater Business and Retail Park to the north.

4.9 It is noted that some residents feel that the site should not be considered ahead of specific sites having been allocated for development through the Local Development Framework process. However, taking the above into account it is clear that in location terms this site represents sustainable development and that a demonstrable lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of this application.

4.10 Although carrying limited weight, consideration must also be given to the fact that the site is a preferred allocation for development.

Design and layout and the impact on the character and appearance of the area

4.11 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design, and great importance is attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The design and access statement submitted with the application explains how the scheme has been influenced by a contextual and character appraisal of the site and the surrounding area. A site layout and example street scenes are attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.12 Landscape and ecological assessments have been carried out that conclude that the due to the undulating nature of the local landscape beyond the site and the frequent occurrence of trees, hedgerows and woodland, the visual impact of development of the site would be constrained to views in close proximity to the edge of the site. The ecological assessment concludes that with the exception of the hedgerows and trees bounding the site, the site
has limited ecological value. I would generally concur with these conclusions, although the development of the site will lead to the loss of habitat for such species as brown hare and grey partridge. I also note that no objections to the development have been received from either the Council’s Landscape Officer or Ecologist.

4.13 Generally, the layout has been informed by the retention of existing landscape features within the site boundary, including hedgerows and trees along the edges of the site that help to enhance the overall quality of the scheme. The retention and enhancement of the pond in the north west corner of the site creates an attractive focal point and will enhance the biodiversity of the area. The layout is structured around a hierarchy of streets with variations in character that help to define streets and keep vehicle speeds low. The central open space area has been improved through negotiation, and now incorporates more of a ‘tree lined avenue’ approach.

4.14 The house types proposed for the site are generally appropriate in terms of their context and scale and amendments have resulted in the majority of parking provided on-plot, in garages, or under car ports. The layout has successfully accommodated car parking so that it does not dominate the street.

4.15 The amended scheme has been assessed by the Council’s Design Officer who comments that it generally follows the criteria set out in ‘Building for Life’, and accords with the requirements of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. The application therefore accords with JCS Policy 2 and section 7 of the NPPF.

Impact on the setting of heritage assets

4.16 There are two listed buildings adjoining the site. Cedar Grange to the north east of the site, beyond Cedar Road, and No. 70 Great Melton Road (The Hollies). Cedar Grange is a 17th century house with 19th century additions, and No. 70 Great Melton Road is an intact example of a mid-19th century house. Both are Grade 2 Listed buildings.

4.17 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a requirement on local planning authorities to give special regard to the preservation of the setting of listed buildings. The Conservation Officer has visited the site and raised some concern with the proximity of the proposed development to The Hollies, and considered that Cedar Grange should be further protected by the enhancement of the natural setting of the building through additional planting on the road frontage.

4.18 Amended plans have now been received from the applicant that indicates an increased gap between the proposed bungalow on plot 125 and the boundary of The Hollies. Additional planting has been provided to the road frontage and the north-east corner of the site. I have reconsidered the impact on the setting of the listed buildings, and have concluded that the amended scheme will not have a significant or substantial detrimental impact on their setting. The scheme therefore accords with the requirements of section 66 of the 1990 Act, and section 12 of the NPPF.

Drainage and flood risk

4.19 Local residents have raise some concerns in respect of flood risk attributable to the development, however the site lies within Flood Zone 1 defined as having a low probability of flooding. The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment that is compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. The scheme incorporates a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and the drainage strategy has been designed to accommodate a 1:100 year storm event with a 30% allowance for climate change. The system includes the use of an attenuation basin, and the discharge rates from this will be restricted to less than Greenfield run-off rates.
Subject to the effective management of the surface water drainage system, which can be required by condition, the Environment Agency raises no objection to the application.

Anglian Water has been consulted in respect of foul water drainage, and they confirmed that Whitlingham sewerage treatment works has capacity to accept the foul flows from the development. The drainage strategy being prepared in consultation with them will provide for the necessary off-site network improvements required to accommodate the development, and again this can be required by condition.

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

Impact on residential amenity

The impact in terms of existing residential amenity has been considered in respect of properties that front onto Great Melton Road, and those that border the site in Glengarry Close, Melton Court and Cedar Road. Adequate separation distances (window to window) have been provided where the site adjoins these neighbouring properties, and, where appropriate, single storey dwellings are proposed to further minimise any potential impact.

Some residents have raised concerns in respect of the access onto Great Melton Road causing disturbance at night through car headlights shining into facing windows. However, whilst it is clear that there will be additional disturbance from vehicular traffic using this access (which is also a future link through to the large Hethersett North site), I do not feel that this will be so detrimental as to warrant refusal of the application.

Whilst it is acknowledged that development of this site will give rise to an increase in general levels of disturbance and impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, this impact would not be so severe as to warrant a refusal of the application, which accords with saved local plan policy IMP9.

Highway Impact

The main access to the site is via a new road in the middle of the site frontage to Great Melton Road that will ultimately link through to the recently approved ‘Hethersett North’ development. A pedestrian/cycle link is proposed to Cedar Road. Improved footway connections along Great Melton Road are proposed to give improved links to the village centre, and the development will also link in to the existing public footpath running along its western boundary. Two smaller private drive accesses will also connect with Great Melton Road.

I acknowledge that many residents have expressed concerns in respect of highway impact, however NCC: Highways raise no objection to the principle of the development or the proposed access arrangement from Great Melton Road. Amendments to the internal road layout have been requested and these changes have been incorporated within the revised scheme. Comments from NCC: highways on these plans are awaited. Subject to their being no objection raised to the amended plans, then the proposal accords with the requirements of saved local plan policy IMP8.

Reason for Approval

It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of this application.
5.2 The site is in a sustainable location, and has been chosen as a preferred site for housing for inclusion in the emerging LDF site allocations document. The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8.

5.3 The design and layout of the scheme is appropriate for its context and will not significantly harm the amenities of neighbouring properties. The development will not cause significant or substantial harm to the setting of the heritage assets adjoining the site, and accords with section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as section 12 of the NPPF. The development accords with the relevant saved Local Plan policies, in particular policies IMP8 (Safe and Free Flow of Traffic), IMP9 (Residential Amenity), and IMP15 (Setting of listed buildings). These policies are given due weight as they remain wholly/partly consistent with the published NPPF.

5.4 In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with the Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Gary Hancox 01508 533841
and E-mail: ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Character Area 1: Site frontage

6.8 The site frontage on Great Melton Road consists of rows of houses set back behind landscaped courts. The houses are largely two-storey, made contiguous by linking garages or carports. Bungalows are located at the eastern end, arranged around a Local Area of Play, preserving the setting of 'The Hollies' Listed Building and reflecting the scale and character of the bungalows opposite.

6.9 The access road area is marked by a pair of prominent houses on either side, picked out in white and given pyramidal roofs and chimneys. The set-back of houses from the road mirrors that on the south side of Great Melton Road, the landscaped areas in front of the parking courts provides a green edge, also mirroring what happens on the south side.
Area 2 - "The Avenue"

6.10 The Avenue is the principle route into the development, with the potential for the road to extend northwards to the 'Hethersett North' development. The Type 1 road is a wide tree-lined street with deep planted verges and free of car parking and leads to and through the central space, The Green. Short groups of terraced houses line the entrance section of the road.

6.11 The Avenue continues northwards, lined with building frontages (or flanks with entrances), stopping short of the northern boundary with a landscaped strip. Houses will be treated in a mix of materials with predominance of brick, both in the yellow brick found widely in the area and red brick.

4384 Acanthus LW Architects

Great Melton Road, Hethersett
Area 3 – "The Green"

6.12 The centre of the site is dominated by 'The Green', a large open space and containing a 400sqm LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play). The Green acts as a focus for movement around the site, where the 'loop roads' connect to all areas and most footpaths have direct access to it.

6.13 The area is enclosed and defined by short terraces of two-storey houses and will be landscaped to create an attractive amenity at the 'heart' of the development. A raised pedestrian crossing has been proposed, across the Type 1 road, to unify both sides of the open space, improve connectivity and provide a safe convenient crossing point.

Great Melton Road, Hethersett
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3. **Appl. No**: 2012/1777/F  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

**Applicants Name**: Mr A Pym  
**Site Address**: Land Rear Of Mount Pleasant Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Development of 15 affordable residential units with associated landscaping, parking and highways works

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with the approved details  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Slab levels to be agreed  
5. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
6. Tree planting (full applications)  
7. Retention trees and hedges  
8. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
9. Maintenance of amenity areas  
10. Ecology mitigation  
11. Standard Estate Road  
12. In accordance with highway drawings  
13. Works prior to occupation  
14. Visibility splay  
15. Surface Water Run Off  
16. Foul Water Drainage

Subject to a section 106 to secure all of the dwellings as affordable and the public open space.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural 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 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 10: Historic hedgerow pattern - Dickleburgh  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD

2. Planning History

2.1 None relevant

3. Consultations

3.1 Dickleburgh Parish Council  
Objections raised. The application should be refused for the following reasons:
- The development exceeds the requirement stated in the Councils Planning and Housing Policy
- The development fails to provide safe and convenient access to community facilities
- The PC supports the preferred option sites
- The PC has been in discussions with Saffron and SNC Officers regarding the preferred sites and meeting the requirements of the Councils Planning and Housing Policy Team
- Traffic issues accessing the site
- There is no pedestrian access provided across Norwich Road and Rectory Road
- The PC and Anglia Water is fully aware of the problems relating to excess rainfall and infringement into cordon sanitaire in this area
- The sensitivity of the conservation area and the Church.

3.2 District Member Wilby  
The application should be determined by planning committee due to neighbour concerns.

3.3 Conservation and Design Officer  
No objections.

3.4 Public Right Of Way  
No objections subject to the PROW being re-routed within the estate and being adopted.

3.5 NCC Highways  
No objections.

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager  
No objections.

3.7 Landscape Officer  
No objections subject to detailed landscape plan being conditioned

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objections

3.9 Historic Environment Service  
No objections

3.10 Environment Agency  
No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.11 Ecologist  
No objections

3.12 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
No objections
3.13 Representations

There have been 24 letters of objection submitted, they raise the following issues:

- Dickleburgh has already provided affordable housing
- Negative impacts on views across the farmland and public footpaths
- The vehicular access point is situated in an area where traffic speeds up
- The applicant has no regard for the opinion of the people of Dickleburgh
- The development will have negative impact on property values especially as the development is for affordable housing
- Increased traffic volume
- Increased hazards when crossing the road to access services
- Existing drainage/flooding issues will be increased with new development.
- A site at Rectory Road is more suitable
- The development has been designed to crate a larger estate.
- The development will have a negative impact on the conservation area and listed buildings
- The development will have a negative impact on the PROW
- The development will infringe the cordon sanitare
- Services, including the sewage system, are at capacity
- Negative impacts on wildlife
- Negative impacts on residential amenity from traffic entering and leaving the site
- Loss of residential amenity
- The provision of play space is in the wrong location
- The construction traffic should enter and leave from the north.
- Affordable housing in the surrounding area is empty

4 Assessment

4.1 Site Context

The application site is agricultural land located to the west of The Street/Norwich Road and the development limits of Dickleburgh, however it still falls within the conservation area of Dickleburgh.

4.2 To the immediate north and west of the site are open agricultural fields with mature hedging and trees around the fields boundaries, the A140 is beyond the fields on the western side.

4.3 Along the north eastern and eastern boundary of the site are residential properties of differing styles and scales. These properties face onto The Street/Norwich Road. The properties to the north east of the site are single storey 1960’/70’s build and those along the eastern boundary and abutting the site are varied in age and styles, they are generally two storey and have off street parking provision and garden areas to the rear. The variation of styles and age of properties is also reflected on the opposite side of the road.

4.4 Within the adjacent buildings on the eastern boundary are Mount Pleasant, Rose Cottage and Milestone Cottage which are all Grade II listed, there are several other properties similarly listed on the opposite side of the road. To the south of the site is the Kings Head public house which is Grade II listed and the Church of All Saints which is Grade I listed and associated school building adjacent which is Grade II listed.

4.5 The site has a public right of way (PROW) which dissects the site through the middle from the southern boundary to the northern boundary. There is a field access between two residential properties on the eastern boundary onto the roadside.
4.6 Dickleburgh has the a post office, church, public houses(s), bus stops, a village hall, playing fields and a school within its locality.

Proposal

4.7 The full planning application seeks approval for the construction of 15 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, fencing and highway works. The dwellings would all be for affordable housing.

4.8 The development proposes a mixture of single and two storey properties with all of them either semi detached or terraced. The housing mix would provide for the following property types:

- 4x 1 bedroom houses
- 5 x 2 bedroom houses
- 3 x 3 bedroom houses
- 1 x 4 bedroom house
- 2 x 2 bedroom flats

4.9 The materials proposed are a mix of red brick and cladding panels with grey concrete roof tiles. The application also details provision of landscaping throughout the site and an area of open space for play/recreational purposes.

4.10 Each dwelling is provided with at least two car parking spaces and a visitor space is also incorporated. The site proposes to create a new vehicular and pedestrian access on the eastern boundary on to Norwich Road/The Street. The access point would be provided between two properties on the eastern boundary and would require for the removal of an area of hedgerow.

4.11 The application further proposes that the existing PROW would be retained but would require some diversion works and its physical form on the section which runs across the site would be altered to reflect the build standards of the development proposal.

4.12 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development outside of the development boundary and the impacts this would have on the landscape, built and natural environment, highways and PROW and the character and integrity of the conservation area and listed buildings in the locality.

Principle of Development

4.13 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.

4.14 JCS Policy 4 states that affordable housing can be considered on sites which would otherwise not be released for housing provided there is a demonstrable local need. The application has been referred to the Council’s Housing Strategy Team who have advised of their support of the application on the basis that there is a shortage of affordable properties in the locality to meet the registered needs.

4.15 The NPPF directs that sites should be both sustainable and deliverable to be considered for approval. The application site is within walking distance of the village services and the applicant has advised that two social housing providers have taken options to purchase the site with a view to immediate development.
4.16 By virtue of the identified local need for affordable housing, the sustainable location of the site and its deliverability the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

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 site layout responds positively to the existing residential development to the east by continuing the incremental growth of the settlement from the urban edge into a more agricultural character. The edges of the development are generally well screened by trees and vegetation that follow the alignment of existing field boundaries. A buffer zone of land and tree planting is proposed to the east between the site and the adjacent properties, which helps minimises overlooking from and to the Grade II Listed Mount Pleasant.

4.19 The layout of the development is structured around a simple primary street which forms a cul de sac at the end of the street. The variations in character of streets and distinction between public and private spaces across the site help to encourage low vehicle speeds and streets that function as social spaces.

4.20 The layout has been informed by the retention of most existing landscape features, including hedgerows and mature trees that form part of the proposed landscape design. Buildings have been positioned so that they benefit from and compliment the topography of the site with view across surrounding fields. Vistas to and from All Saints Church have also been carefully considered and the layout reflects this by the formation of a ‘square’ at the south end of the site with dwellings facing a central court and public open space

4.21 The dwellings proposed have been considered by the Council’s Design Officer who has advised that they score highly within the Building for Life criteria.

4.22 Saved Policy ENV10 aims to protect the historic hedgerow pattern of Dickleburgh and this application proposes to remove a section of hedging on The Street/Norwich Road frontage to allow for a vehicular access to be obtained. It is proposed to plant new hedging around the entrance which would allow for the visibility splay to be maintained.

4.23 The hedging to be removed has been assessed by the applicant and is not considered to be a hedge of historic value in relation to the original hedgerow pattern of Dickleburgh, this assessment and conclusion as not be disputed by the HES.

4.24 The current hedgerow is not considered to add any value to the conservation area and its removal with a hedgerow which is less over bearing on the roadside and surrounding buildings could be considered to be an enhancement of the conservation area.

4.25 Through the considered design which takes account of the existing surrounding development, topography of the site and existing vegetation the development is considered to comply with NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2, Saved Policy IMP2 and Saved Policy ENV10.

Heritage assets

4.26 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.

4.27 The application site does not contain any listed buildings, however as detailed previously in the report there are several listed buildings in the close vicinity.
It is considered that by maintaining key vistas and through the low density layout the integrity of the surrounding listed buildings would be maintained and that the materials proposed are not in conflict with those used within any of the listed buildings or wider conservation area.

The design of the development is considered to add further qualities to the character of the conservation area through the establishment of strong design principles and furthermore the development flows with the topography of the site and is not over dominant on the wider landscape or streetscene.

An archaeological report has been submitted with the application and the use of a condition regarding the monitoring of the site for archaeological finds during construction is considered to be sufficient to meet with the requirements of Saved Policy ENV9 (nationally and locally important archaeological remains).

Highways and PROW

The application has been considered by the Highway Authority and no objections have been forthcoming. The development proposal is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP8 and TRA 19.

The PROW Officer has raised concerns that the rural nature of the path way will be eroded through the development. However, provided that the development results in a pathway which will be adopted by the Highway Authority the PROW Officer has no objections to the development. The Highway Authority have advised that the section of the PROW which would be within the site would be adopted.

It is acknowledged that the PROW will change in character but this alteration is only to a small section of a larger rural network and this alteration is not considered to be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

Ecology

The site is considered to have low ecological value. The application has not been objected to by the Ecology Officer and it is considered that the recommendations of the ecological report should be conditioned to achieve the aims and objectives of Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV 15. The recommendations include the planting of native trees and hedging to form wildlife corridors through the site.

Drainage

The application has been supplemented with a flood risk assessment which has been examined by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA have not objected to the application and have recommended conditions regarding the implementation of SUDS techniques.

Conclusion

The development would provide for a local housing need in a sustainable location on land which is not of high quality agricultural or ecological value. Furthermore the implementation of the recommendations for the ecology report would enhance the green infrastructure of the locality.

The removal of hedgerow to form the access is regrettable however the hedgerow is not considered to add value to the conservation area or to be of heritage significance in its own right. The hedgerow will be replaced with new planting which will be more in keeping with the character of the area.
4.38 The PROW will be diverted across the site which will allow for the current access arrangements to be sustained and that section of the PROW will be adopted by the Highway Authority which will ensure that its surfacing is kept to a high standard.

4.39 The development has been designed in a manner to not be overbearing on the conservation area and to respect the listed buildings in the locality. This has been achieved through the use of landscaping, separation areas, retaining key views and the scale of the proposed dwellings.

4.40 The development is not considered to have negative impacts on highway safety or residential amenity and the use of appropriate conditions can ensure that the development does not increase the risk of flooding in the area.

5 Reasons For Approval

5.1 The principle of the development is considered acceptable outside the development boundary by virtue of the application being for an entirely affordable housing scheme in accordance with the requirements of JCS Policy 4.

5.2 Through consideration of the design, use of materials, scale and siting of buildings the development is considered to respect the established principles of the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area and therefore in compliance with NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policies IMP15 and ENV10.

5.3 The vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements have been proposed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority in accordance with Saved Policy IMP8.

5.4 The proposed landscaping will aid to integrate the development into its rural surroundings and enhance the green infrastructure of the locality in accordance with Saved Policies IMP2, ENV14 and ENV15.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly 01508 533674 and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No:** 2013/0101/F  
**Parish:** LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY

**Applicants Name:** Langley School  
**Site Address:** Langley School Langley Park Langley Norfolk NR14 6BJ  
**Proposal:** Resubmission of planning permission 2012/1929/F- Construction of new sixth form building consisting offices, teaching space, foyer, multi use hall and associated spaces. Construction of external landscaping and associated external lighting

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted plans  
3. Contaminated land during construction  
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
5. Surface water details to be submitted  
6. External materials to be agreed, including paving  
7. Details of junction between new structure and existing kitchen wall  
8. Details of new openings and doors in kitchen wall; new garden enclosure and gate; bin store enclosure  
9. Details of external lighting  
10. Details of hard landscaping and materials  
11. Making good to match existing  
12. Water efficiency measures  
13. No occupation of building until new car parking area completed

Subject to satisfactory car parking arrangements being approved under application number 2013/0150

5. **Appl. No:** 2013/0145/LB  
**Parish:** LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY

**Applicants Name:** Langley School  
**Site Address:** Langley School Langley Park Langley Norfolk NR14 6BJ  
**Proposal:** Construction of new sixth form building (subject to separate application in connection with 2013/0101/F) which involves utilisation of existing kitchen garden wall on two sides and formation of new fire escapes in existing wall

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Listed building time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted plans  
3. External materials to be agreed, including paving  
4. Details of junction between new structure and existing kitchen wall  
5. Details of new openings and doors in kitchen wall; new garden enclosure and gate; bin store enclosure  
6. Details of external lighting  
7. Details of hard landscaping and materials  
8. Making good to match existing

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises
UTL 15: Contaminated land
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Most recent Planning History

2.1 2012/1929 Construction of new sixth form building consisting of offices, teaching space, foyer, multi use hall and associated spaces. Construction of external landscaping and associated external lighting Withdrawn

2.2 2012/1947 Installation of vehicle parking area and associated lighting Withdrawn

2.3 2013/0150 Resubmission of planning permission 2012/1947/F - Installation of vehicle parking areas & associated lighting, parkland planting scheme and landscaping to front of mansion house Pending consideration

2.4 2012/0448 Replacement infill area to kitchen yard, brickwork repairs, upgrading fire resistance to 4 existing sash windows and internal doors. Approved

2.5 2012/0447 Replacement infill area to kitchen yard, brickwork repairs, upgrading fire resistance to 4 existing sash windows and internal doors. Approved

2.6 2011/1299 Installation of netball courts Approved

2.7 2009/0512 Erection of two storey (15 classroom) teaching block, erection of bio mass boiler enclosure, re-location of oil/lpg tanks, material alteration to pottery room roof, external landscaping to courtyard and provision of an additional 15 car parking spaces. Approved
### 2.8 2009/0511
Erection of two storey (15 classroom) teaching block, erection of bio mass boiler enclosure, re-location of oil/lpg tanks, material alteration to pottery room roof, external landscaping to courtyard and provision of an additional 15 car parking spaces.  
**Approved**

### 2.9 2008/1193
New all weather surface pitch, removal of existing all weather surface pitch and reinstatement of part of formal garden  
**Approved**

### 3. Consultations

#### 3.1 Parish Council
Approve
- Improvement to educational facilities
- Have seen a copy of neighbour objections and agree with the contents of letter, that vehicular access to the school needs to be improved for the safety of pupils, staff, other road users and residents of Langley with Hardley and Chedgrave parishes

#### 3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

#### 3.3 English Heritage
Do not want to offer any comments
- Should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance

#### 3.4 NCC Highways
- Langley School have submitted two planning applications, 1 - (2013/0150) for new car park and 2 this proposal, for sixth form building. Have already expressed concerns about level of parking of the car park proposal and appears to exceed the requirements of the school.
- Note intention to build 620 seat auditorium with cafe and toilet facilities - which could be capable of separate occupation to sixth form centre
- Confirmation on what the building is to be used for is required and without knowing the intended use it is difficult to assess the traffic impact

#### 3.5 Landscape Officer
Conditional support
- Landscape scheme to be submitted

#### 3.6 Conservation Officer
Conditional support

#### 3.7 Garden History Society
No comments received

#### 3.8 Norfolk Gardens Trust
No comments received

#### 3.9 Historic Environment Service
- Potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be present appears to be low
- Do not request any archaeological work
- Provided scale/design not intrusive should not have any adverse impact on the setting and significance of park
3.10 Head Of Environmental Services

- Note O/S maps show the premises currently occupied by Langley School to include site of former gas works
- Whilst development will not take place on site formally occupied by the gas works, there is a potential that works form the gas works could be encountered, plus site used as car parking that potential to have been polluted by hydrocarbons.
- Recommend condition re contamination land during construction
- Suggest surface water advise attached to any permission

3.11 Representations

1 letter received expressing the following concerns:
- Further development should be made dependant on a satisfactory and practical solution to problem of vehicular access
- Access inadequate, 2 mini buses cannot pass in entrance
- Should be a safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists

4. Assessment

4.1 The site relates to Langley School in Chedgrave, set within a grade 11 listed parkland, accessed from a long private drive which connects to Langley Road. The main school building is a Grade 1 listed building. This is a full and listed building consent for a new sixth form building and performance building with associated soft and hard landscaping.

4.2 The applications have been re-submitted following a previously withdrawn scheme where concerns were raised on the design of the building and how it related to the Place-Making Guide. The new building is proposed to be located within the former walled garden of the grade 1 listed Langley Park. The area undeveloped in this walled courtyard is currently used for car parking. Also within this walled courtyard is the recently completed teaching block, which was awarded a commendation in the Council's 2011 Design Awards.

4.3 A parallel application (2011/0150) for a new car parking area is being considered at Item 6 on this agenda. As the new sixth form centre is being built on the current parking area, this application should be determined at the same time to ensure satisfactory car parking arrangements can be achieved.

4.4 The main issues in considering these proposals are as follows:

- Policy context
- Design, character and form and impact on setting of listed building and parkland
- Car parking and highways issues

Policy context

4.5 The principle of building in this specific area has been established in the 10 year development plan for the school which was submitted with the 2009 applications and accords with the principle of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in relation to the School’s economic and social role. Consideration of the environmental role and impacts will be discussed later in this report.
4.6 The principle of development can also be supported under policy EMP6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) which relates to alterations and extensions to business premises. Environmental impacts need to be considered under policies ENV5 – listed parkland and under policy IMP15 relating to the setting of listed buildings. Due weight and consideration can be given to this policy as these remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The design, scale and layout needs to be assessed under policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS)

Design, character and form and impact on setting of listed building and parkland

4.7 These revised applications are now supported by an updated Heritage Statement and amended Design and Access Statement which refers to the Place-Making Guide. The proposed development has taken into account the relevant design principles, particularly on design quality and building performance and sustainability and meets the requirements of JCS policies, 1, 2 and 3.

4.8 The building has been repositioned so that it has a better relationship with the kitchen garden, which has been incorporated within the external envelope. This has allowed a larger external space to be created of relatively simple design, providing a better setting for the gardener’s cottage. The design of the building is to be commended and with its repositioned entrance and canopy feature gives a stronger visual prominence and with the use of a simple palette of materials creates a better relationship with the adjacent buildings. The proposal due to its design will not harm the setting or fabric of the listed building and accords with policy IMP15 of the SNLP and aims of the NPPF. The scheme, subject to the conditions in the recommendation is supported by the Council’s Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager.

4.9 The hard and soft landscaping proposals form an integral part of the application. The landscape officer supports the principle of the scheme submitted but requires further details to be submitted, by way of a condition.

4.10 English Heritage did raise concerns on the withdrawn scheme but do not offer any comments on this application provided it meets the requirements of national and local policies, which the proposal does for the reasons outlined above.

Car parking and highways issues

4.11 The Highway Officer has requested further clarification on the use of the proposed performing space (auditorium) and also stated that without knowing the full intended use of the building together with resolving the car parking issues associated with application number 2013/0150, is unable to fully assess the traffic impacts of the proposal.

4.12 Discussions have taken place and amended plans are expected to resolve the outstanding issues including an amended plan for the proposed car parking layout. Although separate applications have been submitted it would not be good planning to approve this scheme on the existing car parking area without resolving the car parking issues for the school and I am recommending this application is not issued without consent being granted for application number 2013/015. An update on the outstanding issues will be reported orally at committee.

4.13 A local resident has raised concerns about the proposed access and lack of provision for pedestrians and cyclists at the access point. This concern is also shared by the Parish Council but overall they support the principle of the development. The Highway Officer has confirmed in highway safety terms the existing access is acceptable and no improvements are required as part of this development and the proposal accords with policy IMP8 of the SNLP.
Other issues

4.14 The Historic Environment Services have confirmed the potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be present appears to be low and do not require any archaeological work to be carried out.

4.15 The O/S maps show the premises currently occupied by Langley School to include a site of former gas works. Environmental Services have advised that whilst development will not take place on the site formally occupied by the gas works, there is a potential that works from the gas works could be encountered, plus as the site was used as car parking there is potential to be polluted by hydrocarbons. A contamination land conditions is therefore proposed to be attached to any permission, to cover this issue.

4.16 To conclude, the proposal for the reasons outlined above is supported, subject to the outstanding car parking issues being resolved.

5. Reason for approval

5.1 The proposal is in accordance with the aims of the NPPF at sections 4, 7, 11 and 12, policies 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the JCS and policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP15, EMP6, ENV9, UTL 15 and ENV5 of the SNLP.

5.2 The proposal accords with the above polices as Langley School is an established private school and business and the new teaching facilities can be justified in this rural location as it will help sustain economic and social activity in the rural community whilst respecting the character of the area.

5.3 The siting, scale and design of the proposal is acceptable and incorporates energy efficient measures. The proposal will not harm the setting or fabric of the listed building or the character of the parkland and with the conditions outlined above will ensure the appropriate detailing of the scheme.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors 01508 533789
and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2013/0150/F  
**Parish**: LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY

Applicants Name : Langley School  
Site Address : Langley School Langley Park Langley Norfolk NR14 6BJ  
Proposal : Resubmission of planning permission 2012/1947/F - Installation of vehicle parking areas & associated lighting, parkland planting scheme and landscaping to front of mansion house

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. Programme of archaeological works  
4. Landscaping scheme, including area in front of main building and phasing programme  
5. Parking in front of main building to be restricted to 6 car parking places  
6. Materials to be agreed for surface treatment  
7. Details of surface materials  
8. Details of any external lighting

Subject to satisfactory plans to show amended parking layout, additional Landscaping and mitigation with respect to extant bank and earthwork

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)

2. **Most relevant planning History**

2.1 2012/1929  
Construction of new sixth form building consisting offices, teaching space, foyer, multi use hall and associated spaces. Construction of external landscaping and associated external lighting  
Withdrawn

2.2 2012/1947  
Installation of vehicle parking area and associated lighting  
Withdrawn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2013/0101</td>
<td>Resubmission of planning permission 2012/1929/F - Construction of new sixth form building consisting offices, teaching space, foyer, multi use hall and associated spaces. Construction of external landscaping and associated external lighting</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2013/0145</td>
<td>Construction of new sixth form building (subject to separate application in connection with 2013/0101/F) which involves utilisation of existing kitchen garden wall on two sides and formation of new fire escapes in existing wall</td>
<td>Pending consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2012/0448</td>
<td>Replacement infill area to kitchen yard, brickwork repairs, upgrading fire resistance to 4 existing sash windows and internal doors.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2012/0447</td>
<td>Replacement infill area to kitchen yard, brickwork repairs, upgrading fire resistance to 4 existing sash windows and internal doors.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2011/1299</td>
<td>Installation of netball courts</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2009/0512</td>
<td>Erection of two storey (15 classroom) teaching block, erection of bio mass boiler enclosure, re-location of oil/lpg tanks, material alteration to pottery room roof, external landscaping to courtyard and provision of an additional 15 car parking spaces.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2009/0511</td>
<td>Erection of two storey (15 classroom) teaching block, erection of bio mass boiler enclosure, re-location of oil/lpg tanks, material alteration to pottery room roof, external landscaping to courtyard and provision of an additional 15 car parking spaces.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2008/1193</td>
<td>New all weather surface pitch, removal of existing all weather surface pitch and reinstatement of part of formal garden</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Consultations

#### 3.1 Parish Council
- Approve
  - Is an improvement to educational facilities
  - Still concerned that no improvements are going to be made regarding vehicle access to the site

#### 3.2 District Member
- To be reported if appropriate
3.3 English Heritage

Recommend refusal, contrary to paragraphs 132, 134 and 137 of NPPF

- Developing car park to the full extent proposed would have far large and more harmful impact on setting of listed building.
- Would like to see better balance between creating new, informal parking areas and the character of historic setting, would not oppose drop-off lay-by

A copy of the full response is attached as Appendix 2.

3.4 NCC Highways

Recommend refusal

- Insufficient information to demonstrate level of parking proposed and represents a significant over-provision and contravenes the aims of sustainable development

3.5 Landscape Officer

Object conditionally

- Outstanding issue and point of design to be addressed, scope to improve the proposal
- Would be helpful to have copy of the historic planting scheme being produced

3.6 Conservation Officer

Conditionally support, subject to suitably amended plans to include mitigation measures to reduce adverse impact on setting

3.7 Garden History Society

No comments received

3.8 Norfolk Gardens Trust

No comments received

3.9 Historic Environment Service

- Site located within a designated heritage asset - Langley Park - and is in area previously not disturbed. Site laid out in 1738 and may be on site of medieval deer park.
- Prefer to see development moved to the north of the road with in area of previous development, however, as unlikely to be moved, we welcome the amended design.
- Development may have adverse impact upon the setting and significance of park.
- Temporary car park may have already damaged or destroyed the northern western extent of extant bank and ditch earthwork of post medieval plantation boundary - no works should extend into this area and no part destroyed should be re-instated.
- Previous drainage works produced a Neolithic flint axe with associated animal bones which show potential for heritage assets therefore if planning permission granted, archaeological condition required in accordance with paragraph 141 of NPPF.

3.10 Ecologist - NCC

To be reported

3.11 Environmental Services (Protection)

- Historic maps show that the premises occupied by Langley School include the site of a former gas works
- Recommend contamination land condition during construction

3.12 Norfolk Gardens Trust

No comments received
4 Assessment

4.1 The site relates to Langley School in Chedgrave, set within a grade 11 listed parkland, accessed from a long private drive which connects to Langley Road. The main school building is a grade 1 listed building. This is a full application for the creation of new car parking facilities for the school to the south of the access drive and within the listed parkland.

4.2 This application has been submitted following a previously withdrawn scheme where concerns were raised on the level of car parking and the lack of information submitted to mitigate any likely impacts on the parkland. A temporary car park has been created without the benefit of planning permission and this has impacted on an extant bank and ditch earthwork of a post medieval plantation boundary.

4.3 The School’s existing main car park is located to the north of the proposed site and access drive, within the former walled garden to the listed park. Parallel applications (2013/0101 & 0145) have been submitted to redevelop this part of the site with a new sixth form centre. These applications are being considered as Items 4 and 5 on this agenda. In planning terms the applications need to be considered at the same time to ensure satisfactory parking arrangements are achieved and delivered at the same time.

4.4 The main issues in considering this proposal are as follows:

- Impacts on the setting of the listed building, parkland and heritage asset
- Layout and scale of car park
- Mitigation and planning balance

4.5 Impacts on the setting of the listed building, parkland and heritage asset

The proposed location of the new car parking area is within a designated heritage asset (Langley Park) and this parkland is listed in its own right. An objection to the proposal has been received from English Heritage and is attached as Appendix 2. Concerns have also been raised by the Historic Environment Services (HES), listed at section 3 above.

4.6 The park was first laid out in 1738 and may be on the site of a medieval deer park. Capability Brown drew up plans for part of the landscaping in 1765, although it is unclear whether any of these were executed.

4.7 In accordance with paragraphs 132, 133, 137, and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and policies IMP15, ENV5 and ENV9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) due consideration and weight needs to be given to the impact of the development on the setting and significance of the park. When considering the impact the significance of the heritage asset and conservation should be balance against any potential harm. Paragraph 133 of the NPPF in particular states that if harm is identified it should be shown that any harm is necessary to address substantial public benefits that outweigh any harm. SNLP policies can be given consideration as they remain consistent/part consistent with the aims of the SNLP.

4.8 The HES would prefer to see the car park located within the developed area to the north of the proposed site but do acknowledge the improvements made to this application and welcomes the mitigation put forward with respect to the reinstatement of the historic features (extant bank and earthworks) and the proposed tree planting which will make an overall positive contribution to the park.
4.9 The applicant is submitting further landscaping plans to address the concerns raised by the Landscape officer which will improve the visual appearance of the scheme and will re-instate historical parkland features.

4.10 There will be an impact on the setting on the listed parkland and this needs to be balanced against the social and economic benefits of the scheme as whole and is assessed later in this report.

Layout and scale of car park

4.11 County Highways have raised concerns about the level of parking proposed. English Heritage also raise concerns over the lack of information submitted with the application with respect to the parking needs for the School and crucially what is lacking is the information on where cars are parked at present.

4.12 This additional information has been requested and in indicative plan tabled at a recent meeting shows that the number of parking spaces can be reduced. This is welcomed together with the enhanced landscaping mentioned above. An update on this will be reported orally at committee, including the Highway Officer’s updated views.

Mitigation and planning balance

4.13 English Heritage’s opinion differs to the Council’s Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager with respect to harm the proposal will have on the setting of the parkland and setting of listed building when assessing the benefits and mitigation of the scheme as a whole. This is the planning balance that needs to be assessed against the mitigation put forward by the applicant.

4.14 I conclude that the economic and social benefits of the scheme outweigh the potential harm to the Heritage Assets as a result of the mitigation put forward. Positive benefits include the removal of the parking in front of the grade 1 listed principal building (except for 6 visitor/disabled spaces) and re-landscaping of this area which will enhance its setting along with mitigation measures including the reinstatement of historical planting within the parkland to reduce the visual impact and the ability for the school to expand with a new sixth form centre on the existing car park area. The number of parking spaces has also been reduced.

5. **Reason for approval**

5.1 As mentioned at paragraph 4.14, subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans, the amendments put forward by the applicant mitigate any potential harm to the setting of the parkland and listed Grade 1 principal building. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the aims of the NPPF, JCS policies 2 and 6 and SNLP policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP15, ENV5 and ENV9.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Dear Ms Mellors


LANGLEY SCHOOL, LANGLEY PARK, LANGLEY, NORFOLK, NR14 6BJ
Application No 2013/0150

Thank you for your letter of 31 January 2013 notifying English Heritage of the above application.

Summary
This application proposes the construction of a large area of car park in the immediate setting of the grade I listed Langley Park, a grade II registered park. It was the subject of a previous, withdrawn application to which English Heritage objected. The present proposal raises similar issues concerning the setting of the house.

English Heritage Advice
In my advice to the Council dated 12th December 2012 we outlined the significance of the historic site and the role the application site plays in the immediate setting of Langley Park and it stable block. I also identified the harm to the significance of the listed buildings that would result from the proposed development and that it was contrary to policies 132, 134 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

This application is, in essence, the same scheme, although the proposed parking for the school minibus fleet has been change to an area on the north side of the access road. This is a welcome development, but the fact remains that a substantial amount of hard standing will be built on the Registered Park beyond the line of present development at the site. The harm to the significance of the listed building and registered park remains.

In documentation accompanying the application the Strategic Plan for the campus is...
mentioned. This document result from discussions, to which English Heritage was party, where the desirability of removing parking from immediately in front of the main building was identified and the possibility of some parking being created on the south side of the access road suggested. The Plan did not include a proposal for parking of the extent now proposed. Most significantly the plan states that the impact of possible new parking should be assessed. The Plan can be seen as an agreement that options for parking in this area should be explored, but not a justification for all the development proposed regardless of what impact it might have. Similarly, the desirability of removing a few vehicles from the immediate frontage of the main building should not be taken as a justification to centralize almost all parking in one place regardless of the effect on the historic building it would aim to enhance.

The Design and Access Statement included with the current application contains details of the School’s parking needs. What is crucially lacking from this assessment is any idea of where the vehicles are presently parked, for what duration and if all the spaces are ever used simultaneously. This makes it difficult to compare the present and proposed arrangements and so ascertain if the new parking would actually bring a visual improvement to the site.

As far as I am aware much of the present car parking provision is informal, with vehicles using verges and other spaces on an ‘as and when’ basis. This may be ‘untidy’, but has not resulted in actual new construction which is present even when the vehicles are not, as is now proposed. Also, the present arrangement does not concentrate vehicles together so they form a dense block, as will be the case with the new car park, but has a more diffuse impact. Finally, the present arrangement keeps the vehicles in the area already developed, rather than breaking out into the historic parkland, as is proposed. Considering all these factors together I remain unconvinced that the new car park would bring sufficient visual improvement to the setting of the historic buildings in some areas to offset the decided harm to it at the application site.

Part of the proposed car park has already been constructed, without the benefit of Planning Permission. I believe it approximately equates with the proposed student drop-off zone. While I would have preferred this facility to be formed by an enlargement of the existing carriageway this is at least a parallel roadway and not an area of open hard standing striking out into the historic park. Also, by its nature it is not an area which will be occupied by stationary vehicle for long periods. I would not, therefore, oppose the creation of the drop-off bay (adapted and developed from the unauthorized work, if possible) and would be keen to advise on the precise details. I would also be keen to look at the present parking arrangements and see how a better balance between creating new, formal parking areas and the character of the historic setting can be achieved. However, developing a car park to the full extent proposed
would have a far larger and more harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings and is still considered objectionable.

Recommendation
The current re-submission of the car parking proposals is improved by the relocation of the school minibus fleet, but the construction of such a large area of permanent parking in the grade II registered park and in the setting of the grade I and II listed buildings is harmful to their significance. It may be possible to look at the present parking arrangements afresh and consider creating a drop-off zone and a smaller formal parking area and finding a balance with impact on the historic park, but as the application stands it is contrary to paragraphs 132, 243 and 137 of the NPPF and I would maintain my earlier objection and recommend permission is refused.

Yours sincerely

David Eve
Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
E-mail: david.eve@english-heritage.org.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/1615/F  
**Parish**: FORNCETT

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Burroughs  
Site Address: Fourways Long Stratton Road Forncett St. Peter Norwich NR16 1AJ  
Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 detached houses and garages and ancillary works

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with approved details  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Tree planting (full applications)  
5. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
6. Retention trees and hedges  
7. Tree protection  
8. Access Gates - Configuration  
9. Provision of parking, service  
10. Surface Water Drainage  
11. Foul sewage connection  
12. No alterations to lose garage

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 16: Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0138 - Sub-division Of The Garden Of Millbank  
Norwich Road  
Pending Consideration  
Demolition of existing house, sub-division of plot and erection of 1 chalet bungalow, 2 houses and ancillary works
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Forncett Parish Council**

   Recommends refusal. The following issues have been raised:
   - Three homes is too many for this site and there is an accumulation of development in the area.
   - The development would significantly change the current low impact appearance which the bungalow provides for the entrance to Tacolneston and Forncett villages.
   - Highways safety issues associated with the busy crossroads and the erection of fencing and planting around the site.

3.2 **Tacolneston Parish Council**

   Recommends approval

3.3 **District Member**

   To be reported if appropriate

3.4 **NCC Highways**

   No objections subject to conditions

3.5 **Landscape Officer**

   No objections

3.6 **Environmental Protection**

   No objections subject to conditions

3.7 **Representations**

   There have been nine letters of objection submitted, these raise the following issues:
   - The density of development is inappropriate, two dwellings would be more in keeping.
   - The locality experiences flooding issues and this application introduces more impermeable surfaces.
   - The design of the houses is not in keeping with the development pattern of the locality as the houses are too close to the street and too close together. The massing is inappropriate to the street scene.
   - Loss of amenity in relation to overshadowing and overlooking.
   - If approved no extension to roof spaces or roof height should be allowed.
   - The houses are not adequately served for parking in relation to their size, this will lead to on street parking occurring.
   - The retention of both vehicular access points will compromise traffic safety.
   - Fencing and planting will restrict the view available to traffic users.
   - Broadband speeds need to be increased before more housing is allowed in the area.
   - Soakaways will not work on site.
   - Three houses are already approved for the garden at Millbank, with the house also to be developed. It would have been beneficial to see the overall development plan for this area from the start.
   - The site is not sustainable.
   - The site is an entrance way to the village and this development does not improve the current situation. The house designs are not acceptable in this prominent location.
   - Constructions noise.
   - No affordable units provided.
Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site is located within the development limits of Forncett End and Tacolneston. The site is located on the eastern corner of the Long Stratton Road/Norwich Road/Tabernacle Road/Common Road junction. The northern corner of the Fourways junction hosts the Austhorpe House Nursing Home. The western corner is occupied by the Jolly Farmers Public House and the southern area is agricultural fields.

4.2 The site is 0.18 hectares and contains a modest sized empty bungalow, the garden area around the dwelling is overgrown and there is only one tree of a significant size still located on the site. The property benefits from having two vehicle access points with dropped kerbs onto Long Stratton Road.

4.3 The care home is a substantial development with a two storey red brick frontage with double height bay window and a slate roof. The care home has a car park to the road frontage which is sat behind a small hedge and some mature trees. The care home has been substantially added to at the rear.

4.4 The Jolly Farmers Pub is a predominately two storey building of residential appearance, it is constructed of red brick and tile with car parking provided to on its southern boundary.

4.5 Immediately adjacent the application site to the east is a two storey residential property which is of 1930’s appearance with a high ridge line and hipped roof, the front garden area contains mature trees and the property is not any further forward than the bungalow.

4.6 Long Stratton Road has been subject to residential infill and garden grabbing type development which provides generally for bungalows to be on the frontage with further detached property to the rear. From the street the appearance can seem cluttered and dense with very little space between buildings.

4.7 To the rear of the application site is a residential property called Millbank, the dwelling is also abandoned and has a large garden area which has been subject to two separate planning applications. Both applications provide for three detached dwellings, one is approved and the other is pending consideration.

Proposal

4.8 The application proposes to demolish the existing bungalow and erect three detached four bedroom dwellings. The development would retain the two vehicle access points and the one remaining mature tree on the northern boundary.

4.9 The dwellings would all be two storeys with a mixture of brick, timber boarding, pantiles and UPVC. All of the dwellings have integral garages and substantial rear garden areas.

4.10 The main issues for consideration are the impacts of the development on the streetscene, character and form of the locality and the impact on residential amenity.

Principle of Development

4.11 JCS Policy 16 directs that development for small groups of dwellings and/or infills should be allowed in the development limits of Other Villages subject to considerations of form and character.

4.12 Saved Policy HOU7 also allows for small groups of dwellings to be developed within the development boundary on the provision that they would be in keeping with the character and form of the locality.
4.13 Therefore by virtue of the application site being located within the defined development limits for Forncett End and Tacolneston the principle of development is considered acceptable. The application should therefore be considered in relation to the development plan policies and any other material considerations.

Design and Landscape

4.14 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, and be located and designed to use resources efficiently. Additionally design guidance is also provided through the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD.

4.15 The dwellings are not proposed to encroach beyond the established building line of the neighbouring eastern house and the ridge heights proposed are of a similar scale to those houses situated along Long Stratton Road. The dwellings are not considered to be out of character with the locality in terms of scale, form, plot size and materials.

4.16 The dwellings all address the Long Stratton Road frontage in keeping with existing development along the road. The front of the houses are southerly facing and they have been designed to have large window openings and roof lights in the rear areas to maximise natural light into the houses.

4.17 The properties would be enclosed on the rear and the sides with 1.8m high close boarded fencing and the frontage would have a 1.2m high post and rail fence set inside the highway verge. The frontage would also be supplemented with landscaping, if approval is forthcoming the landscaping will be conditioned to ensure that the planting is not overbearing on the streetscene and compliments the development. The existing mature tree on the northern boundary would also be retained.

4.18 The development is considered to be in accordance with the Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS and NPPF Section 7 and Saved Policy IMP2 by virtue of the location, scale and form of development, the retention of existing vegetation and the introduction of new planting and the design of the buildings to be energy efficient.

Residential amenity

4.19 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.

4.20 The dwellings have been designed to have bathroom windows on upper side elevations, the glazing specification could be conditioned. The set back and orientation of the eastern most plot ensures that the adjacent existing dwelling would result in only a minimal loss of privacy towards the bottom of the rear garden area. It is not considered that this small amount of overlooking would be sufficient to warrant a refusal. The separation distance from the eastern most plot and the existing adjacent house is also considered sufficient to ensure that overshadowing would not occur to a significant degree.

4.21 The application is considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Pokily IMP9.

Highways

4.22 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.
4.23 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.

4.24 The application site provides for parking for each dwelling in accordance with the county parking standards and the retention of the existing access arrangements is considered acceptable. There has been no objection to the application from the Highway Authority and therefore the application is considered to comply with Saved Policies TRA19 and IMP8.

Drainage

4.25 Several of the objections to the application have included reference to existing drainage and flooding issues. The applicant has provided information regarding drainage, including percolation test results and should approval be forthcoming conditions regarding surface water and foul drainage will be attached. It should also be noted that the site is considered to be in Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of possible flooding.

Affordable housing

4.26 The site is less than 0.2 ha and would provide for less than 5 dwellings and therefore in accordance with JCS Policy 4 no affordable housing provision is required.

Conclusion

4.27 The application site is located within the development limits and would provide for a small group of dwellings in accordance with the JCS. The site is also considered to be in a sustainable location and deliverable.

4.28 The development of the site would not be significantly detrimental to any aspect of residential amenity that would warrant a refusal. The design, layout and scale of the development are considered acceptable in relation to the surrounding established development pattern.

4.29 The development is not considered detrimental to the functionality or safety of the highway network.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The scale of development is in accordance with the provisions of JCS Policy 16 and Saved Policy HOU7.

5.2 By virtue of the scale and orientation of the dwellings, the set back proposed and the upper gable elevation treatment the proposal is considered to be compliant with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7, Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS, and Saved Policy IMP9.

5.3 The retention of the existing access arrangement and the provision of off road parking is considered to satisfy the requirements of Saved Policies TRA 19 and IMP 8.

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

8. Appl. No : 2011/1698/F  
Parish : TACOLNESTON  

Applicants Name : Overplan Services Ltd  
Site Address : Land at 59, Norwich Road, Tacolneston NR16 1BY  
Proposal : Erection of 3 new dwellings and garages  

Recommendation : Refusal  
1. Insufficient archaeological information  
2. Loss of trees and impact on character of area  
3. Insufficient information relating to extended pond area

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 6 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
Section 7 : Requiring good design  
Section 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
Section 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Section 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and transportation  
Policy 15 : Service villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 7 : Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
IMP 8 : Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9 : Residential amenity  
IMP 10 : Noise  
IMP 13 : Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 15 : Setting of Listed Buildings  
ENV9 : Nationally and Locally important archaeological remains  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15 : Species protection  
ENV19 : Tree Preservation Orders

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1699/F  
Conversion of existing timber framed outbuilding to residential annex for use by family member. Part demolition of lean-to outbuilding.  
To be determined

2.2 2011/1700/LB  
Conversion of existing timber framed outbuilding to residential annex for use by family member. Part demolition of lean-to outbuilding.  
To be determined
2.3 2003/2333/LB  Proposed replacement like for like windows  Approved

2.4 2000/1740/LB  Removal of fireplace, replacement of windows, replacement of stud work and sole plate  Approved

2.5 1995/0882/O  Erect pair of two-storey dwellings  Refused

2.6 DE\4541\O  Residential development  Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  In relation to the initial submissions  Refuse

- Highway access is at a dangerous corner with poor visibility
- Within curtilage of a listed building
- No assessment of the effect on the listed building
- Impact on outlook and amenities of neighbours
- Impact on watercourse and drainage

On 20 March 2012 the Parish Council submitted a report on a proposed Conservation Area at Tacolneston.

Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports – Refuse

- Object to any tree protected by TPO being removed. There is no arboricultural reason for their removal. The appeal to the TPO should be considered before the planning application is determined. The oaks are referred to in the Tacolneston millennium book which includes much of the history of the village.
- An assessment should be undertaken of the impact on the setting of the listed building. Consider that paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF should be addressed. While the Conservation Officer considers the proposal does not detract from the setting of the Listed Buildings, this is contrary to the views of the CPRE. The loss of the trees and the impact on the setting of the listed buildings has not been considered.
- Question whether there is clear and convincing justification to permit development within the setting of the heritage assets; whether there is any public benefit to be weighed against the harm caused.
- An Archaeological Report is required prior to the consideration of any planning application. The pond is thought to represent a remnant of the moat associated with one of the three Tacolneston manors.
- An ecological survey is required to assess the impact of filling in a large part of the existing pond and the effect it might have on wildlife.
- Concern about ability of pond to accommodate flood water if reduced in size. The report only considers run off from the site and does not consider its relationship to wider drainage.
- The pond provides attenuation for water from the surrounding ditches and farm land.
- Flood attenuation measures are still not satisfied
- May be necessary to upgrade the highway culvert to accommodate additional flows
- Anglia Water have made representations to sites in the LDF and their comments would appear to be equally pertinent to this site.
- The extension of the site beyond the building line is unacceptable. While it responds to drainage concerns the solution will destroy the natural habitat and much of the village’s historic heritage
- The site is within a proposed conservation area
- The plans fail to show No 57 making it difficult to gauge the impact of the proposal on that property.
- Concerns regarding the size of the garages and its impact on No 57.
- The scheme offers no access to the remaining farm land. Access to this land would raise road safety concerns as well as the possibility of further development

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : In relation to the initial submissions
- Access is located on a bend but there is good forward and rearward visibility for a driver to safely turn into the site whilst easily being seen by other road users.

- Norwich Road forms part of the B1113 and is subject to 30mph speed limit and the 43m splay shown is the minimum standard for light vehicles. Taking account of an 85 percentile vehicle speed of 35mph requires visibility splays of 55m, with additional stopping distance for HGVs results in visibility splays of 59m. Given the type of road, the location of the access and vehicle speeds, a splay of 59m is recommended.

Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports
- The revised details show visibility splays of 2.4m by 59m as previously requested and access upgraded to 4.5m in width.
- As there is no footway on this side of Norwich Road in order that residents of the new dwellings can easily cross the highway a pram crossing feature will need to be installed on the footway opposite the site access. Amended details requested.
- Note that there are possible surface water drainage issues which are being considered by the Flood Risk Officer.
- Recommend conditions relating to the width of the access, provision of visibility, access gates, and provision of parking.

3.4 Environmental Services In relation to the initial submissions
- Recommend conditions relating to air source heat pumps, drainage and disturbance during construction.
Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports

- 2 options are proposed. Option 1 proposes a reduction in pond capacity by 37% (85.8 cu m) with the access road constructed from impermeable material. Option 2 proposes a reduction in pond capacity of 17% (46.7 cu m) with the access road constructed from permeable material.
- Would support option 2 provided it can be demonstrated that sufficient capacity is available within the reduced area of the pond to accommodate the new development.

Further details have been submitted which extend the pond area approximately 11.5 m north of the development boundary, together with further calculations. Comments from Environmental Services will be reported at Committee.

3.5 CPRE

Object

- Tacolneston lies within the Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland Area and the site lies at the heart of the proposed Conservation Area rich with listed buildings and historic sites.
- CPRE welcomes the recently published Place Making Guide which draws attention to the need to prevent a loss of individual village identity through the merging of settlements. This site plays a significant role in the landscape of Tacolneston, creating a strong separation between ribbon developments.
- The Place Making Guide also champions the setting of historic halls and moats. It is believed that the pond is the remnant of a Medieval moat and should not be destroyed.
- Support the proposed conservation area.

3.6 Historic Environment Service

In relation to the initial submissions

- The existing house and proposed development lie within a possible medieval moated enclosure and there is potential that heritage assets relating to medieval activity may be present.
- The development is located within an area with relatively low density of dwellings which lie between two areas of higher density 20 century housing to the north and south. The proposal will surround the existing grade 2 listed cottages. The density is inappropriate for this location and will adversely affect the setting and significance of this heritage asset.
- Any revised details should include a heritage statement and results of an archaeological evaluation.

Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports

- Reduction in number of dwellings reduces the impact on the adjacent listed building and support the Conservation Officer that the reduced scale is acceptable.
- Results of an archaeological evaluation have not been submitted. Request that the results of an archaeological trial trenching evaluation are submitted prior to the determination of the application.
A brief for the archaeological evaluation has been provided to the applicant. It is noted that the applicant do not wish to undertake this prior to the determination of the application. HES set out that their recommendation to undertake the evaluation prior to the determination of the application is in accordance with NPPF. The presence of a medieval moat is based on both interpretation of landscape evidence and reference in an academically edited publication.

If the site contains a medieval moat and significant buried archaeological remains survive it is possible that HES would recommend refusal.

3.7 Conservation Officer : Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports

The scheme has been subject to discussions in respect of the design, scale and layout of the dwellings. Plot 1 would be set forward of the listed house, but with plot 2 has a good alignment with the existing house, while plot 3 and the garage form a courtyard with the barn.

The design has been amended to reflect the simpler form of the listed building and kept to a similar scale with ancillary extensions to reduce the extent of the main building.

If well detailed and with traditional materials and care with boundary treatments, the scheme would not harm the setting of the listed building.

3.8 Ecologist : No objections.
- Does not anticipate there will be any ecological issues relating to the proposed development.

3.9 Landscape Officer : In relation to the initial submissions

A Tree Preservation Order has now been served. Initially had little concern regarding the scheme as it included the retention of many of the trees. However the highway requirements has resulted in doubt over the frontage trees. Further details were requested.

Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports – Object

- Can not support removal of trees. These are significant mature trees; whilst replanting is proposed it will be a long time before new trees attain a similar visual and ecological benefit.

3.10 Tree Warden : Concerned that trees on the boundary of the site, particularly four oaks on the road side are vulnerable from the development. Visibility proposal will affect these trees which play a great part in the "green lung" forming the rural character in the centre of the village. A Tree Preservation Order should be placed on the site.
3.11 Representations:
In relation to the initial submissions
12 letter of objection

- Dangerous access on blind bend
- Improvement to access would involve works to trees and wall to frontage of listed building
- Trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and their loss would affect the character of the area
- Previous application for 2 dwellings was refused in 1995 due to position of access on a bend
- Highway use has intensified since previous refusal
- Most school traffic, including pedestrians have to pass the access to the proposal
- Proposal is for family dwellings and should include provision of a footpath.
- Will result in refuse vehicles stopping close to the bend
- Suitability of access for construction traffic.
- Drainage is poor and results in pond flooding onto the road in the winter
- Could adversely affect drainage and flooding of neighbouring dwellings.
- Proposal to infill part of the pond together with additional development will exacerbate drainage problems
- Will resulting overshadowing and overlooking of neighbours.
- Potential for light pollution to neighbours
- Will increase noise to neighbouring properties, from gravel drives and parking areas
- Will be back land development which will affect the character of the area and set a precedent for similar developments. Other development in area is ribbon development
- Scale of properties inappropriate for area
- Within curtilage of listed building and pays no regard to the impact on this building or the setting of a group of listed buildings which a nucleus of this part of the village
- Will detract from open setting of existing buildings and result in an urban form of development
- Potential for damage to historic dwellings due to proximity of development and existing shallow footings
- Plans as submitted are inaccurate and misleading. Do not show No 57 or its extensions / outbuildings and boundaries are wrong
- Potential impacts on local ecology. Further surveys should be undertaken

Following reduction in number of dwellings and additional reports. 25 letters of objection:

- Re iterate above concerns
- This is a unique location of listed historic buildings based on a medieval manor, which represents an area which should receive conservation area status. There are two distinctive historic areas which should be valued. There are better sites in the village for this kind of property where their impact would be far less.
- No action has been taken to comply with the requirements of Historic Environment Services.
- Will impact on the historic context of the site. Refer to statements within the National Planning Policy Framework relating to safeguarding of heritage assets.
- Refers to comments from English Heritage and advice in the NPPF
- Potential impacts on fabric of adjacent historic buildings
Area has been suggested to be within a conservation area. While it is considered that the area proposed is already protected under the NPPF as it contains a cluster of Grade II listed buildings, it is questioned whether this protection will be afforded in practice.

The Parish Council made representations regarding the development boundary.

Drawings are still inaccurate.

The use of black tiles is inappropriate and the scale of the buildings will dwarf the listed buildings.

Plot 3 will result in overlooking of the existing dwellings.

Noise from revised garage position and access arrangements.

Although plot 4 has been removed it has been replaced by a large garage.

Existing drainage system is not able to cope. The drainage details submitted do not address concerns raised.

Concerned about stability of house being built on made up ground.

Drainage report does not take account of wider drainage issues.

Position of drainage overflows could affect neighbouring properties.

Ditch system flows from the north and south towards No 59, including overflow from the pond and then goes through a culvert under the B1113 and across the property opposite (No 74).

The drainage proposals now involve works outside the development boundary contrary to the Parish Council’s views requesting the Development Boundary to be reduced, not extended.

The extended pond position is on rising ground and will result in steep banks which will be detrimental to the safety of residents.

Revisions have not addressed highway concerns.

Provision has not been made for pedestrians to cross to the footpath.

Improved visibility will increase speed of vehicles around the corner.

Removal of trees should not be allowed. Their loss would change the character of the area and does not fully address the required visibility splays.

Railings to the frontage and neighbours’ hedge obscure visibility.

There should be archaeological and ecological surveys.

Concern that SNDC Ecologist raises no objections.

Tacolneston is a semi rural village with no shops and poor public transport. New housing should be concentrated in areas deemed suitable.

The site is a haven for wildlife and a green area.

Concerns regarding the administration of the application, the time to determine the application, the display of site notices and publicity, and consider that there is a conflict of interest due to the applicant being an employee of the Council.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application was initially submitted for the erection of 4 dwellings and associated garages and was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement and Arboricultural Assessment.

4.2 Following initial consultation responses, the scheme was amended and reduced the number of properties to 3 and revised their design, form and layout. In addition a revised planning statement (appendix 2) was submitted together with an updated Arboricultural Assessment and drainage reports. The scheme was further amended to increase the size of the pond towards the north and the applicant responded to comments raised in representations (appendix 3).
4.3 The site is within the Village Boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan and Tacolneston is identified as a Service Villages by Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. As such, the principle of development on the site is acceptable. Policy 4 of the JCS, HOU7 of the SNLP and section 6 of the NPPF relate to housing delivery in such locations. Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF promote good design while policies IMP9 and IMP10 of the SNLP seek to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring uses. The site is accessed off the B1113 and will involve works to an existing access point. Policy 6 of the JCS and Policy IMP8 of the SNLP seek to ensure that the proposal is served by a suitable vehicular access.

4.4 The site is adjacent to a listed building which forms part of a pair of properties. Policies in the JCS, SNLP and the NPPF seek to safeguard the character and setting of such heritage assets and for proposals to demonstrate how they have taken account of the context of them.

4.5 Within the site is a pond and a number of mature trees were made the subject of a Tree Preservation Order during the consideration of this application. Policies seek to ensure that proposals have assessed the ecological interests of the site and consider the merits of safeguarding landscape features.

4.6 The Village Boundary for Tacolneston forms two areas of development and the application site is located at the northern edge of the southern section. The western sides of the defined areas are characterised by frontage, ribbon developments with developments to the east being more of an estate format. The density of development to north of the settlement decreases and the area around the application site itself is characterised by more sporadic development.

4.7 The application site currently comprises a small holding which incorporates a number of outbuildings and includes a pond. The land is bordered by a mix of mature trees and wraps around the domestic garden areas of both No 57 and 59.

4.8 The three dwellings as now proposed are predominantly to the north of the existing properties, with land to the west of No 57 forming part of the curtilage associated with No 59. The form of the dwellings has been revised to incorporate a principle wing with a gable width and ridge height which relate to the adjacent listed building. The frontage property (plot 1) is orientated to face onto Norwich Road and has been designed to have an eaves and ridge height which is comparable to No 59 and lower than No 57 and the layout of plots 2 and 3 form a court yard arrangement which relates the outbuilding to the rear of No 59 (subject to 2011/1699, 2011/1700) and the proposed garage.

4.9 The layout retains space between the proposed dwellings and the listed building and the Conservation Officer considers that the form of the dwellings and the layout of the development as now proposed would not harm the setting of the listed building.

4.10 The site is not currently within a Conservation Area, however, the Parish Council had submitted a report relating to a proposed Conservation Area, which they considered should incorporate the application site and listed buildings in the vicinity. The considerations for development within a Conservation Area are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character of the area. This request has been considered by the Conservation and Design Architect together with English Heritage, but has not been supported.
4.11 While I recognise that the proposal will increase the built form on the site, I consider that the scale and form of the properties proposed is appropriate for the site and will not detract from the character of the locality.

4.12 The report submitted by the Parish Council also sets out that the pond on site is thought to be the remains of the original moat associated with Williams Manor. In addition, Historic Environment Services have commented that the existing house and proposed development lie within a possible medieval moat enclosure and have therefore set out that a heritage statement should be submitted together with the results of an archaeological trial trenching evaluation. The agents have responded that from a desk top study they are not aware of any definite evidence of archaeological remains and while they are happy for a condition to be imposed to require archaeological investigation to be undertaken, given the uncertainty regarding the status of the pond they do not consider that this should be undertaken prior to the determination of the application.

4.13 Historic Environment Services have responded that their recommendation to undertake the evaluation prior to the determination of the application is in accordance with NPPF and that the presence of a medieval moat is based on both an interpretation of landscape evidence and reference in an academically edited publication. They state that if the site contains a medieval moat and significant buried archaeological remains survive it is possible that HES would recommend refusal.

4.14 They consider that the field evaluation should be undertaken to establish whether a medieval moat or other heritage assets exist at the site; the condition and significance of such assets and whether the level of harm to those assets resulting from the development is acceptable and what level of archaeological mitigation would be required. The applicants have made it clear that they do not propose to undertake these works prior to the determination of the application and I therefore consider that in the absence of the details requested by HES it is not possible to fully consider the proposal.

4.15 The dwellings have been positioned and orientated to minimise the impact on the outlook of the adjacent dwellings and the internal layout and position of windows seeks to limit overlooking. Plot 2 will face towards the existing outbuilding associated with No 59, which is proposed to be converted to annexe accommodation (2011/1699, 2011/1700). Plot 2 will include first floor windows, however the openings in the north side of the proposed annexe are limited to roof lights and the annexe building will screen views towards the garden areas associated with No 59 and 57. Plot 3 is located to the rear of No 57 and 59 and will be visible in their outlook. The dwelling will be 20m from the rear of these properties and first floor windows have been limited to non habitable rooms for the section closest to the rear of the existing dwellings. I therefore consider that the proposal will not dominate the outlook of the neighbours or result in a significant loss of amenity.

4.16 To the rear of No 57 it is proposed to erect a detached garage which is shown to serve No 59 and plot 3. The garage will be approximately 11m to the rear of No 57 and will be orientated so that the gable faces that property. The gable will be 5.5m in width and 4.5m high. I recognise that this will be visible from the neighbours and that there will be some disturbance from vehicle movements, however I consider that due to its scale it will not dominate their outlook and the loss of amenity is not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.
4.17 The site will be served by the existing access onto the B1113 which is on the inside of the bend. Norwich Road is subject to 30mph speed limit and the 43m splay initially shown is the minimum standard for light vehicles at this speed. The Highway Authority set out that in view of the 85 percentile vehicle speed of 35mph, visibility splays of 55m would be required, with additional stopping distance for HGVs results in visibility splays of 59m. Therefore, given the type of road, the location of the access and vehicle speeds, the Highway Authority recommended splays of 59m.

4.18 The agent has submitted additional details relating to the to the provision of improved visibility splays of 2.4m by 59m and the access upgraded to 4.5m in width. They recognise that this would result in the removal of 3 mature oak trees on the site frontage and have proposed the planting of a hedgerow along the site frontage to reduce the visual impact from the loss of the trees.

4.19 In addition, they have submitted details of splays which could be achieved by the removal of fewer trees. With all the trees retained a splay of 35.6m can be obtained. By the removal of the tree closest to the access point, this can be increased to 50.5m, and with the removal of a second tree it increases to 54m.

4.20 The trees have been identified in the arboricultural report as worthy of retention and during the consideration of the application a Tree Preservation Order was served. The Highway Authority has clearly set out why they consider that a splay of 59m is necessary and I consider that the application should be determined on this basis. I consider that the removal of the trees will open the frontage of the premises and increase prominence of the proposed development which will detract from the character of the area.

4.21 The Highway Authority also commented that as there is no footway on this side of Norwich Road, in order that residents of the new dwellings can easily cross the highway, a pram crossing feature will need to be installed on the footway opposite the site access. Amended details were requested but have not been submitted to address this issue.

4.22 Within the site is a pond and the site is bordered by agricultural land and mature trees. Limited ecological information has been submitted with the application, however the Council’s ecologist has visited the site and set out that he did not anticipate that there would be ecological issues relating to the proposed development. A neighbour has commented that there is a “priority species” bird currently on the site and appears to be nesting on the site. While some of the trees are proposed to be felled, works could be conditioned to take place outside the nesting season. Due to wild foul on the site and the character of the pond it is considered to be of low ecological value.

4.23 Concerns have been raised regarding the implications of the proposal on local drainage patterns, particularly arising from the proposal to infill part of the existing pond to facilitate the siting of plot 1. Two options were submitted relating to varying reductions in pond capacity and provision of permeable surfacing. The Flood Defence Officer has indicated support in principle to the reduced scheme Drainage assessments were submitted for this reduced pond, provided it can be demonstrated that sufficient capacity is available within the reduced area of the pond to accommodate the ne development.

4.24 Further information and calculations have now been submitted which propose to extend the pond to the north of the Village Boundary by approximately 11.5m. The Flood Defence Officer has been consulted on these revised details and the drainage implications and comments will be reported verbally at Committee.
4.25 The extended pond area will be outside the defined village boundary and will involve engineering works into the adjacent field. This area does rise and details of finished sections and levels have not been submitted and as such it is difficult to fully assess the visual impact of this proposal. The area is partially screened from the road by existing hedgerows and as such its visual impact would be limited.

5. Reasons for refusal

5.1 The site has the potential to contain heritage assets with archaeological significance relating to a possible medieval moat. Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the potential archaeological impacts of the proposed development on heritage assets and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The works to the access to provide the required width and visibility spays (2.4m by 59m) will result in the loss of frontage trees which have been identified in the arboricultural assessment as worthy of retention. The removal of these trees to facilitate the development will remove a landscape feature within the streetscene which will detract from the character of the area contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.3 Insufficient information has been submitted with regard to the extended pond area to assess the visual impact on the character of the area or archaeological impacts. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy ENV9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Section 7 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

ADDITIONAL PLANNING STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY RE-SUBMITTED PLANS AND PROPOSALS FOR PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 2011/1698

In October 2011 we submitted a Planning Application on behalf of Overplan Services Ltd for the erection of four new dwellings at 59 Norwich Road, Tacolneston. The application was submitted following informal discussions and negotiations with the Planning and Conservation Officer. During the consultation stages of the application various concerns and objections were raised about the proposal both from local residents and consultees to the application. Following a meeting with the Planning, Conservation, Highway and Tree Officers it was agreed that amendments were required to the scheme which should address the issues and concerns raised before further consideration of the application could be made.

Following discussions with our client and following further meetings with the Planning and Conservation Officer we now enclose revised plans and additional Planning Statement outlining the revisions made to the proposals and how these have addressed the concerns and objections received by the earlier submitted proposals.

The main issues of concern raised were: -

- Layout, form and character, effect on character of Listed Building and possible overlooking.
- Drainage.
- Highways access.
- Trees.

We comment on these as follows: -

Layout

a) Concern was raised at a meeting with the Planning and Conservation Officers regarding the layout and density of the proposal and its effect on the setting of the Listed Building and possible overlooking issues. Of particular concern was Plot 4 which was tucked behind Nos 55 and 59 Norwich Road. The Conservation Officer felt that the design of the dwellings should be more appropriate to the style and character of the existing property.
b) In terms of layout this has now been very much simplified by reducing the numbers from four down to three dwellings and avoiding the area of garden immediately to the west of the existing dwellings, enabling the existing trees and vegetation to be retained in this area. Refuse truck and fire engine turning has again been incorporated in the plans. The design of the dwellings has been simplified and now sits more comfortably in relation to the existing Listed Building in both form and character. From a plot size aspect the following are achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing No. 59 retains</th>
<th>0.48 acres, approx.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plot 1</td>
<td>0.21 acres, approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 2</td>
<td>0.16 acres, approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 3</td>
<td>0.24 acres, approx.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of overlooking the reduction from four to three dwellings has obviously made this easier to address. Plot 1’s main windows now look mainly east towards the road west and north and should give no cause for concern with overlooking of adjacent properties. Plot 2 looks mainly south and west and does not overlook No. 59’s private curtilage as this is obscured by the existing annexe building. Plot 3 has been carefully designed with a bathroom window with obscure glazing in the south eastern corner to avoid overlooking of the existing property.

d) In conclusion we hope that the amendments made in terms of the layout and design have now addressed the concerns raised and that these are now considered acceptable in planning terms.

Drainage

a) Concerns locally have been raised regarding flooding from the road and issues with regard to reducing the size of the pond. The pond is not a natural pond. It has however been there for some considerable amount of time. Our client at some stage in the past enlarged it and made it slightly deeper in relation to keeping ducks and geese. It is fairly shallow and does not in any way cause problems with current flooding issues. The main reason for the flooding issues is the constant blocking of the road gullies in this area due to the leaves from the trees not allowing the water from the road to run off freely into the existing ditch system. We are not experts in the field of surface water drainage and so only pass on discussions we have had in the past with the client but in order to reassure concerned residents our client has had a comprehensive survey and report carried out by Bingham Hall Associates (copy enclosed) detailing the site surface water. It is proposed to incorporate in the design of each of the dwellings underground water tanks for re-use in car washing and garden watering. An overflow from these tanks will run into the soakaway system.
Highways/Access

a) Our original plans submitted with the application for four dwellings had shown 2.5m x 43m visibility splays in both directions. Following consultations with Highways this was requested to be increased to 2.4m x 59m. This was due to the road category being a Class B and used by HGV vehicles which require a greater stopping distance. In terms of the access location the Highways Officer was happy as long as the existing access drive width was increased to 4.5m in width so that two vehicles can pass each other.

b) Our revised layout shown on drawing 5131/301 shows the following highway requirement.

- Existing access drive increased to 4.5m in width.
- Entrance to highway constructed to NCC residential access specification.
- Fire engine and refuse truck turning provided within site.
- Adequate on site parking to each of the new dwellings (two cars).
- Adequate on site parking to the existing dwelling (two cars).
- On site turning to enable cars to exit the site in a forward gear.
- By trimming back existing vegetation in our client’s ownership a visibility splay of 2.4 x 59m in a southerly direction. All vegetation, etc within this vision line kept below 1m in height.
- By the removal of vegetation and three oak trees in our client’s ownership a visibility splay of 2.4m x 59m in a northerly direction. All vegetation etc within this vision line kept below 1m in height.

c) We hope that these revised proposals help to overcome the concerns raised by the objection in term of highway safety issues. This is an existing access at present to a residential property with unrestricted use in this respect. The dwelling sits in a large plot with additional paddock and meadow land. Goats, geese, ducks, etc are all currently kept on the site. It is considered by the Highways Authority to be an inadequate access for its current use. Although our client is proposing to provide an additional three properties off this access, the access will be improved and upgraded to current highways specification for four properties in total, both in terms of its construction and visibility requirements. By providing this upgraded access it not only improves the safety from the existing access, but by way of improving the visibility around the bend at this point in Tacolneston hopefully improves the situation for all users of the B1113, which is a concern that has been raised locally.

d) In conclusion we hope that the amendments made to the plan together with the reduction in number of dwellings on the site and improvement to the visibility lines around the bend overcome the concerns raised.
Trees

a) When our client appointed us back in April of last year to look at preparing this Planning Application the intention was very much to try and work with the existing site constraints, especially in regard to the trees and landscaping to ensure that on completion of the project the new dwellings fitted in well with the existing landscape set in mature plots, working with the trees rather than being detrimental to them. At the time none of the trees were covered with Tree Preservation Orders and the site located outside any Conservation Area. It is likely that these could have been removed without prior notification or approval. Over a number of years our client had become concerned with regard to the structural condition of some of the trees, especially along the road frontage. In strong winds tree debris had been known to fall onto the road. However, a scheme was prepared to retain these trees where possible. The initial proposals removed a number of the trees in the south western corner of the site in the locality of Plot 4 which can now be retained.

b) During the consultation stages of the application following the meeting with the Planning Officer and consultees it became evident that, mainly due to more onerous highway requirements, certain trees would have to be removed. The main concern being those on the site frontage which would become under pressure for visibility requirements.

c) Following various meetings our client had a Tree Preservation Order served on him to include four of the trees on site: three ash trees and a lime and frontage trees which included four oaks. The Tree Preservation Order has been appealed.

d) The revised proposal is to retain all the TPO trees on site. The new dwellings have been carefully located so as not to cause damage or put future pressure on these trees to be removed. They will be correctly protected during the construction period and appropriately designed foundation used in construction. Five trees will be removed in the area of Plots 1 and 3, none of which have Tree Preservation Orders. These trees are apple, three limes and an ash.

e) To achieve the 2.4m x 5.9m visibility splay required by the Highway Department three of the oaks are to be removed on the frontage. As previously mentioned our client has been concerned regarding the trees for some time with regard to their structural condition and their proximity and overhanging of the highway. A report was commissioned from A T Coombes arboriculturists based in Norfolk. The report was to include the naming and condition of each of the trees and to specify the category rating. The oaks being removed have been categorised as B3 trees. Trees are grouped into four main categories depending on their condition and contribution. Each category is then broken down into three sub groups, ie B1, B2 and B3 depending on their contribution.
The category rating is as follows:

"R = Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should in the current context be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.

(Trees that have serious, irremediable structural defects, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse including trees that will become at risk due to the loss of other R category trees).

A = Those trees of high amenity quality and value in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution. (A minimum of 40 years is suggested).

1. Trees that are particularly good examples of these species if rare, unusual or essential components of groups or formal or semi formal arboricultural features.

2. Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to view in or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance.

B = Those of moderate quality and amenity value; those in such a condition as to a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested).

1. Trees that might be included in the high category but are downgraded because of impaired condition (eg remediable defects).

2. Trees and woodland that forming distinct landscape features but do not form essential components.

3. Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.

C = Those of low quality and amenity value currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting is established (minimum of 10 years is suggested). OR trees under 150mm stem diameter.

1. Trees not qualifying in higher categories.

2. Trees present in groups or woodlands but not with a significantly higher landscape value and or offering low or temporary screening benefit.

3. Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.

Note: Category C trees will usually not be retained where they would impose significant constraint on development. Trees with a stem diameter under 150mm could be considered for relocation."
The three oaks are categorised as B3 trees. The tree survey schedule considers them to be of moderate structural condition with dead ivy growing up the stems and the physiological condition of fair to good. We feel that the benefits of achieving the better visibility from the access and around the bend outweigh the loss of these particular trees and hope that their removal can be seen to be acceptable in this particular circumstance.

The loss of any tree is disappointing, especially when starting out on this project the intention was to keep and work round them where possible. It has become evident that regrettably this is no longer possible. Our client is however proposing to carry out a fairly comprehensive scheme of replacement trees on his meadow land to the north and west of the site. The position of these areas of replacement is indicated on the plan. The loss of the three oaks will be replaced with nine similar trees to the north of Plot 1. These will be protected and allowed to mature over a number of years. The loss of the apple, three small limes and an ash will be replaced with smaller native trees.

The removal of these three trees and the unsightly hedgerow between enables the site to be visually opened up more and gives the opportunity to make a pleasing site frontage which will include the revamping of the existing pond and the provision of new appropriate small-scale native landscaping set back between the new vision lines and the pond. We are very happy for the proposed new landscaping to be controlled by way of a Planning Condition.

We have considered alternative approaches regarding the conflict between tree and highways requirements. The preferred solution is as submitted.

- To lose three oak trees but to achieve a 2.4m x 59m vision line in both directions.

We have looked at the other alternatives which are shown on two different drawings, 5131/601 and 5131/602, indicating visibility lines that could be achieved by removing fewer trees. They are as follows:

- To retain all trees and frontage visibility would be reduced to 2.4m x 36m in a northerly direction, south 59
  or 2m x 44m in a northerly direction, south 59.

- To remove just one oak tree the visibility will be reduced to 2.4m x 50.5m in a northerly direction, south 59
  or 2m x 52m in a northerly direction, south 59.

- To remove two oak trees the visibility would reduce to 2.4m x 54m in a northerly direction, south 59
  or 2m x 54.6m in a northerly direction, south 59.
As you can see we have looked at all different kinds of permutations to try and retain as many of the trees on site as possible which has been our goal from day one of this project.

The above shows options which could be considered if it was felt during the consultation stages of the application these will create a more preferable final scheme to the one submitted.

Conclusion

a) I hope that the re-submission of these amended plans can now been seen to address the concerns and issues raised during the initial consultation stages of the application. In summary we have now reduced the number of dwellings proposed, enabling a more appropriate site layout in terms of its location in close proximity to a Listed Building and removed any concerns of overlooking. The surface water drainage issue has been addressed by a comprehensive engineer’s report and we can now achieve the level of access and visibility requirements requested by the County Surveyor.

We believe the proposals will create a really attractive small scale development which will enhance this part of Tacolneston. By retaining as many of the existing trees on site as possible and with the addition of newly planted native species trees around the boundaries a successful development can be achieved within the existing residential development boundary of Tacolneston which retains much of the existing form and character. We hope that the application can be approved under current Planning Policy Guidelines.
Dear Mr Pontin,

I am writing to update you on the progress to date and how I would like to proceed with the applications. May I start by thanking you for all your help and advice over what has been a surprisingly complicated application. There have been a number of comments from local residents and certain professionals which have surprised and disappointed me. I wanted to address each issue and have attached some further information to support these.

**Access and Tree Removal**

A number of residents and the Parish Council have commented on how dangerous the existing entrance to the site is. I could not agree more. I understand you yourself commented on the entrance following a site visit. I am therefore baffled as to the level of objection to this application on the issue of road safety. I can only presume that the objectors have not fully understood the applications and the improvements they would bring. The solution I propose not only gives safe access to the three new proposed dwellings but also dramatically improves the safety of the access to the existing dwelling and land. As well as regular domestic usage the current site sees large agricultural vehicles and other HGV movements throughout the year. With the proposed enhancement of the site all future movements on and off the site could be carried out safely.

I accept that the removal of any tree is less than ideal however I question the opinion of those who object to the applications on the grounds of road safety but are then resistant to the removal of trees that will clearly resolve these issues, to the satisfaction of the Norfolk County Council, Highways Department. I think it important to reinforce the fact that local objection on road safety grounds can only be based on the existing issues and we support their concerns. The current access to the existing property and land is a daily danger to all road users. My proposal addresses these issues.

**Flood Risk**

The objections received regarding the flood risk have been made on the incorrect assumption that a number of local ditches flow into the pond. This is absolutely not true. Only one ditch flows directly into this pond and no one who could be affected by this ditch has raised this as a reason for objection. You will see from the enclosed documents I have addressed some concerns people have locally over potential flood risk issues. For the objectors peace of mind I will no longer be reducing the size of the pond. Importantly, please note that at no time throughout what has been one of the wettest periods for some time has the pond flooded or caused any problems in the immediate area. (This is due in part to the fact that the many of the ditches claimed to run into the pond do not! It is factually incorrect to say that any ditches from Hilltop Farm flow directly into the pond).

Following informal advice received by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer I trust all flood risk matters are now resolved to your satisfaction.

**Design**

13/03/2013
I trust that all matters in terms of design are resolved. I believe there are discussions ongoing around registering areas of Tacolneston, including land owned by Overplan Services Ltd, as a Conservation area. I am certainly not opposed to such status being granted and due to the three new dwellings proposed being close to a listed building I am comfortable with the sympathetic and appropriate design of the proposed dwellings.

Archaeological Dig
I am very troubled by the repeated insistence of an Archaeological Dig being carried out before a planning decision can be made. As such a requirement seems to be based on the reference to the possibility of a medieval fort having been present on the site and a few local residents also expressing an interest in this possibility, I request the following. That as a condition of planning permission no work can begin on the site until an Archaeological Dig is carried out to the satisfaction of the Council. It is my understanding that a number of other applicants in the District in similar circumstances have been given planning permission with this condition and that this has proven to be a satisfactory arrangement acceptable to all parties. I simply do not accept the fact that I should be treated differently. I am absolutely happy to carry this dig out as soon as practicable after planning permission is granted however to insist on costly works being carried before hand seem somewhat unfair, unreasonable but most of all unnecessary. I am assuming that should a dig uncover anything then as part of the condition Norfolk Archaeological Trust would advise on how best to proceed. I accept that may well lead to me being unable to proceed with the development as planned.

Site Enhancement
Despite the negative comments received on the Council’s on-line planning system I am aware of a number of people who are supportive of the application:
- I have spoken to many people who are very happy to see that I intend to improve the access to the site.
- A number of residents and road users have, over the years, asked me to remove the hanging trees as they cause debris to fall on the road and road users have been quite concerned at the potential damage and danger this debris could cause.
- I will be replacing the three lost trees with a considerably larger number of native trees. Whilst I recognise it takes time for new trees to become established the three trees in question have been deemed Category B from a ground survey, meaning they are expected to last no longer than 100 years. The new trees would be expected to last many hundreds of years.
- I am providing three new family homes very much in keeping with the type of housing provision in the village. I can think of a number of houses providing for similar needs nearby and it is rare for a house to remain on the market for long in Tacolneston, suggesting demand.

Barn Conversion
I also wanted to draw attention to the application to convert the barn, next to No.59, into an Annex. The Barn is in very poor condition, is no longer watertight and continues to deteriorate further each year. Financially it is not viable for me to repair the barn however converting it to residential use would be viable and would ensure the survival of this barn. I think it would be a shame to lose what has the potential to be quite an impressive barn. I therefore hope that regardless of your view towards the other applications the Council will be in a position to approve this application with little issue.

Finally
I think it is important not to lose sight of the fact this application is for three houses, reduced from the original four following discussions with planning officers, on a site within the development boundary. At no point during the recent Joint Core Strategy Consultation did the Parish Council ask for the boundary to be reviewed. In fact they made comment on their preferred choices for new sites. I therefore saw this as continued support for development in Tacolneston and therefore appropriate development on my site.

As mentioned above I hope that the matter may now proceed to its conclusion, without
further delay. I would respectfully request that any decisions on these applications are made at Development Management Committee - in light of the fact that my son is an employee of the Council for the purpose of openness and transparency. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and its enclosures.

Yours sincerely

William Hill
9. **Appl. No**: 2011/1699/F  
**Parish**: TACOLNESTON

**Applicants Name**: Overplan Services Ltd  
**Site Address**: 59 Norwich Road Tacolneston NR16 1BY  
**Proposal**: Conversion of existing timber framed outbuilding to residential annex for use by family member. Part demolition of lean-to outbuilding.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Barn Conversion - time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Annexe  
4. Extent of repair to be agreed  
5. Historic Building Recording  
6. Materials  
7. Window details to be agreed  
8. Boundary treatments  
9. Driveway Surfaces  
10. Full details of external lighting

10. **Appl. No**: 2011/1700/LB  
**Parish**: TACOLNESTON

**Applicants Name**: Overplan Services Ltd  
**Site Address**: 59 Norwich Road Tacolneston NR16 1BY  
**Proposal**: Conversion of existing timber framed outbuilding to residential annex for use by family member. Part demolition of lean-to outbuilding.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Listed Building - time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Extent of repair to be agreed  
4. Historic Building Recording  
5. Materials  
6. Window details to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
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 6: Access and Transportation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU 21: Annexes
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

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1698/F Erection of 3 new dwellings and garages. To be determined
2.2 2003/2333/LB Proposed replacement like for like windows Approved
2.3 2000/1740/LB Removal of fireplace, replacement of windows, replacement of stud work and sole plate Approved
2.4 1995/0882/O Erect pair of two-storey dwellings Refused
2.5 DE\4541\O Residential development Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
Access is at a dangerous corner with poor visibility
Submitted details of a proposed Conservation Area.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways No objection subject to annexe condition
Proposal is for an annexe and will tend to operate in much the same manner as adding 2 bed extension to the main dwelling.

3.4 Conservation Officer The barn retains some timber frame but the roof structure is essentially new and will need replacing to support pantiles. While the walls will need considerable attention, support the proposal to convert the building as it is a positive part of the group and the external works will vastly improve the appearance.

3.5 Historic Environment Services The proposal affects a designated heritage asset (a Grade II Listed Building). If permission is granted request a condition relating to historic building recording.

3.6 Tree Warden Concerned that the boundary trees, particularly the four oaks on the site frontage are vulnerable.

3.7 Representations 4 letters of objection
- Parking area adjacent to neighbouring dwelling will result in disturbance contrary to policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan. Cars currently park the other side of the dwelling so there will be a considerable increase in disturbance from noise, vehicle movements and lights.
- Impact from lighting associated with the use and external areas unless it is sympathetically located.
• There is an existing pump within the courtyard which should be safeguarded
• This is a smallholding and greenfield site
• Impact on openness of the area
• Extremely dangerous access on a blind bend
• Refuse collection will be close to the bend
• Drainage implications from works to pond
• Trees on the site should be safeguarded
• Application can not be determined independantly to 2011/1698

4 **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for the conversion of an existing outbuilding to annexe accommodation to the main house. The scheme will involve the re use of existing openings and provision of conservation rooflights. The works will require the replacement of the staircase and strengthening works to the walls and roof to enable clay pantiles to replace the existing metal clad roof. The building will be clad externally with black feather edge boarding.

4.2 The scheme will involve the removal of the lean to structure and the lowering of internal ground floor levels to improve head room and this may result in the need for some underpinning.

4.3 The site is within the Village Boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan and Tacolneston is identified as a Service Villages by Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. As such, the principle of development on the site is acceptable. Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF promote good design while policies IMP9 and IMP10 of the SNLP seek to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring uses. Policy HOU21 of the SNLP relates to the provision of annexe accommodation. Policy 6 of the JCS and Policy IMP8 of the SNLP seek to ensure that the proposal is served by a suitable vehicular access.

4.4 The site is adjacent to a listed buildings which forms part of a pair of properties. Policies in the JCS, SNLP and the NPPF seek to safeguard the character and setting of such heritage assets and for proposals to demonstrate how they have taken account of the context of them.

4.5 The building is currently in a poor condition but is seen in the context of the Listed Buildings and contributes to the setting of these buildings. The scheme as proposed retains the form and overall character of the building and the external cladding and use of pantile roof will enhance the appearance of the building. The Conservation Officer supports the proposal and I consider that the works to the building and removal of the lean to attachment will enhance the setting of the listed building.

4.6 The majority of openings are at ground floor which face No 57. There will be one landing window at first floor and while there will be some overlooking towards the adjacent dwelling I do not consider that it will result in a significant loss of amenity. Windows in the north elevation will look onto the adjacent small holding area which is also the subject of application 2011/1698, however I consider that the layout will not result in overlooking of properties which are part of that application.

4.7 The layout plan shows a shared courtyard area with the main dwelling and a parking area to the rear of the properties. The neighbour has raised concerns regarding disturbance resulting from this parking area. Parking currently takes place away from the neighbour and I recognise that this proposal will increase the level of activity, however as annexe accommodation, I consider that the level of activity associated with the use will not result in significant disturbance. Details of surfacing of this area could be agreed by conditions to reduce disturbance.
4.8 With regard to the access to the property, the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal subject to the accommodation being conditioned to be ancillary to the main dwelling. I consider that given the close relationship to the main house together with the highway concerns, that it is appropriate to limit the form of occupation.

5. Reason for Approval

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

5.2 The conversion of the building to annexe accommodation will safeguard the character and setting of the building without having a significant adverse effect on the outlook or amenities of the neighbouring dwelling or highway safety. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 6 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policies HOU21, IMP8, IMP9, IMP13 and IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, and Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2012/1574/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs Shirley Dennison  
Site Address: Sub Division Of Garden At The Bungalow Station Road Spooner Row NR18 9JR

Proposal: Proposed new residential development for 5 detached dwellings (4 four bedroom houses and 1 three bedroom bungalow) and double garage/car port in gardens of The Bungalow

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. Retention trees and hedges  
6. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
7. Details of foul water disposal  
8. Surface Water  
9. Ecological Management Plan  
10. External materials to be agreed  
11. parking, turning area details  
12. Visibility splays  
13. Provision of footpath

Subject to a Section 106 to provide for an affordable dwelling and provision of self-build homes

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural 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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1977/2270 Engineering Workshop Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Wymondham Town Council No objections

3.2 District Member: Cllr N Ward To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Planning Policy No objections.

The application site is in a service village within the Norwich Policy Area. The application states that it is self build scheme being proposed, the NPPF supports such schemes and looks to local planning authorities to promote a variety of housing types to meet needs.

The site is not in accordance with the draft Site Specific Allocations and policies document, however paragraph 49 of the NPPF is a key factor in determining the application. This paragraph states that where a local planning authority is unable to demonstrate a five year land supply for housing, relevant housing policies should not be considered up to date therefore the application must be determined in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

3.4 NCC Highways No objections subject to conditions and the provision of a footpath from the site to the existing footpath outside of the school.

3.5 Housing Strategy Manager No objections, subject to securing one dwelling for affordable housing.

3.6 Environmental Protection No objections subject to condition(s) regarding foul drainage

3.7 Representations Six letters of representation have been received. These letters are all in support of the application and raise the following matters:

- The development allows for self build projects for young people with a family connection to remain in the area.
- The site is a sustainable location within a service village
- Self build projects are promoted by government through the NPPF
- The development would provide for a more interesting approach to the village if the correct materials are used.
- This site is better than the preferred options
- The site benefits from water and gas services
- The Bungalow is the first house in the village and is considered to be very much part of the village.

4. **Assessment**

Site Context

4.1 Spooner Row is a village consisting of several clusters of development with the A 11 to the west and north and the railway line dissecting it. Wymondham is approximately 3 miles to the north.

4.2 The application site is located to the west of the village and has on its eastern boundary the village primary school and playing fields. The village hall and train station are also located within 400m to the west of the site and the village public house and church within 800m.
4.3 The application site is surrounded by mature vegetation and with hedging along its southern boundary. The site contains a bungalow and a series of outbuildings on its southern and eastern sides, the outbuildings have previously been used as a mechanics workshop. The remainder of the application site has been maintained as a large domestic garden. The northern and western boundaries of the site are adjacent agricultural fields.

4.4 The site is accessed from the southern boundary directly onto Station Road.

Proposal

4.5 The application proposes to retain the existing bungalow, remove the outbuildings, close the current access, create a new access point and provide for five further residential building plots. The plots are all of a substantial size and each are proposed to contain single detached dwellings with garden ground and parking for at least two vehicles.

4.6 The new access arrangement would require for a section of the garden hedge to be removed, but no other mature boundary trees or vegetation would be removed.

4.7 The applicant has proposed that the dwellings would all be self build projects for family members of the applicant. One dwelling would be for affordable rent, it is proposed that this affordable dwelling would be secured through a Section 106 which would allow for a person with both family and local connections to be the first occupier and after that the occupier would have to meet the standard local occupier tests.

4.8 The main issues for consideration are whether the proposal could be considered to be in a sustainable location, help to address the housing five year land supply shortage and the form and character impacts of the development upon the Spooner Row locality.

Principle of Development

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

4.10 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.

4.11 Spooner Row is identified within the JCS Policy 15 as a service village; these are considered appropriate for small scale developments ie 10-20 dwellings.

4.12 The site by virtue of its proximity to the village services is considered sustainable and due to part of the site being formerly used as a car repair workshop following planning permission in 1977, is considered to be ‘brownfield’ in character.

4.13 The application site is in a sustainable location in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and of an appropriate scale as required by the JCS. Furthermore, although only a minor number of dwellings are proposed they can be considered to count towards the housing land supply shortage in the NPA. The principle of development is therefore considered to be acceptable.
Development Management Committee

4.14 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.

4.15 The development would provide for a new cluster of housing by virtue of the school and playing fields to the east of the site separating the application site from the closest part of the village. Spooner Row consists of several pockets of development and this development would therefore create a new stand alone cluster. This is not the approach which has been taken through the Local Plan site selection process and while it is not considered an ideal solution to create a new cluster of development it would not be an unusual feature in the Spooner Row locality.

4.16 The application proposes that the development would provide for five dwellings, one of these would be an affordable bungalow on the southern boundary of the site which would be of a similar scale to the existing dwelling. The indicative site plan details that the remainder of the site would contain dwellings which are all proposed to be two storey dwellings with garages. Although the application proposes to retain the majority of the existing mature vegetation on the boundaries and that the smaller scale house is on the road frontage side behind a high hedge the roofs and glimpses of the dwellings will still be visible from the surrounding area. As the application is in outline form only and details of design and roof heights have not been provided. These details would be subject to reserved matters applications which would be determined to ensure that the development in terms of its form and materials would not have a severely detrimental impact on the character of the landscape setting.

4.17 The development of the proposed housing is considered to respect the existing character of the village as it would create a small cluster of housing which is a common feature of the locality; this is in accordance with the aims of JCS Policy 2 or NPPF Section 7.

Landscape and Ecology

4.18 The development would result in only a section of hedge being removed to create an access point; all other mature vegetation on site would be retained. The Landscape Officer has advised that the application site is considered to be garden ground and therefore the hedging and trees do not have any significant protection afforded to them unlike on agricultural grounds. The application is considered to comply with the Saved Policy IMP2 by virtue of the vegetation retention proposed.

4.19 The application site is not known to have any ecological constraints and the application has not been submitted with any ecology survey however it is considered that if approval were forthcoming then conditions requiring an ecological survey to be undertaken to guide the hedge removal and building work would be sufficient to ensure that the development met with the requirements of the Saved Policies ENV14 and ENV15.

Highways

4.20 The application has been referred to the Highway Authority who have not objected but requested that a footpath be provided to the school along the highway verge. Should approval be forthcoming then a condition requiring this and the necessary visibility splays and construction standards would be attached.
Residential amenity

4.21 The application site by virtue of its separation distance from other dwellings will not create any issues associated with the loss of residential amenity as required by saved Policy IMP9.

Self build

4.22 The application proposes that the development would result in five dwellings being self build projects. The NPPF does advise that local authorities should support such schemes. Although commendable, further agreement will be needed for the Council to ensure that the units will be self build and then occupied as such.

4.23 If approval was forthcoming a condition to secure the self build and occupation by the builder would be unenforceable. The applicants have advised that they are willing to enter into an agreement of this nature and it will be further examined in conjunction with NP Law.

Conclusion

4.24 The balance of judgement is between the presumption to promote sustainable development in the absence of an up to date local plan against any harm to the landscape and character of the locality. In this case, the latter does not outweigh the principle of development on a site which is brownfield in part with no detrimental impacts in relation to the highway functionality or residential amenity. Furthermore, through the use of appropriate conditions the landscape and ecological qualities which the site possesses could be retained. The creation of a new cluster of housing not within or directly abutting the development boundary is not considered an ideal solution. However, the site location and context are sustainable and there is no reason to believe that the development is not deliverable. The detailed design of the dwellings and their impacts can be fully addressed through the reserved matters stage. Therefore on balance the application is considered to be acceptable.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The application site is considered to be in a sustainable location and the development proposal can be delivered within five years this is in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and JCS.

5.2 The quantity of housing proposed is considered acceptable and in accordance with the direction provided by JCS Policy 15.

5.3 The visual impacts of the development can be mitigated through detailed design and the retention of the existing vegetation in accordance with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2, Saved Policy IMP2 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

5.4 The proposed development would not impact negatively on the residential amenity of any occupier in the locality in accordance with Saved Policy IMP9.

5.5 The provision of a footpath and further conditions will ensure that the highway safety is maintained and enhanced in accordance with Saved Policy IMP8.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly 01508 533674 and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2012/1758/CU  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr M Lambert  
Site Address : Three Gates Farm Fen Street Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AQ  
Proposal : Retrospective change of use of barn to include retail and parking arrangements as well as private residential accommodation ancillary to house  

Recommendation : Refusal  

1. Highway safety  
2. Not a sustainable location for retail  

Enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of any part of the site for retail purposes.  

No enforcement action be taken against the interior design studio element of the proposal.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (Part Consistent)  
SHO 8: Local and rural shops and services  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 13: Corridors of movement  
TRA 17: Off site road improvements  
TRA 19: Parking standards

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1749/A Free standing road-side direction signs Pending consideration

2.2 2012/1830/F Retrospective application for variation to condition 2 of planning permission 2009/1536/F to substitute drawing No.s BGS/68H; BGS/69H; BGS/120F and BGS/125B for drawing No.s 8/11753/SR/71C; 3GFA/115E; 8/11753/68C and 8/11753/69C Approved
Development Management Committee

27 March 2013

2.3 2013/0140/LB Listed Building- retention of alterations and extension of outbuildings to annexe, new car port and store, new double garage and alterations to house

Approved

2.4 2010/0416/AG Proposed steel portal frame agricultural shed.

Prior approval not required

2.5 2009/1537/LB Amendments to previous consents - 2004/0423/F, 2006/0777/F & 2006/1497/F - Alterations and extension of outbuildings to annexe, new car port & store, new double garage and alterations to house.

Approved

2.6 2009/1536/F Amendments to previous consents - 2004/0423/F, 2006/0777/F & 2006/1497/F - Alterations and extension of outbuildings to annexe, new car port & store, new double garage and alterations to house.

Approved

2.7 2006/1497/F Car port.

Approved

2.8 2006/1496/LB New car port and alter modern roof.

Approved

2.9 2006/1126/H Proposed replacement double garage

Withdrawn

2.10 2006/1125/LB Proposed replacement double garage

Withdrawn

2.11 2006/0777/F Amendments to previous approval W07/04/0423/F - for alterations of outbuildings to ancillary domestic accommodation plus farm office and garage. Amendments to approved swimming pool building.

Withdrawn

2.12 2005/2089/LB New swimming pool building as ancillary accommodation to main house

Approved

2.13 2005/2088/H New swimming pool building as ancillary accommodation to main house and alterations to garage and lean to out building

Approved

2.14 2004/2282/LB Demolition of existing barn and erection of new linked building to house indoor swimming pool

Approved

2.15 2004/2281/LB Demolition of existing barn and erection of new linked building to house indoor swimming pool

Approved

2.16 2004/0423/F Resubmission of W07/04/0167/F for the proposed conversion of outbuildings to ancillary residential accommodation plus stables and garage

Approved

2.17 2004/0167/F Proposed conversion of outbuildings to ancillary residential accommodation plus stables and garage

Approved
2.18 2003/2446/LB  Single storey rear extension and new porch  Approved
2.19 2003/2445/H  Single storey extension and new porch  Approved
2.20 2003/1280/LB  Proposed alteration and first floor extension to dwelling.  Refused
2.21 2003/1279/H  Proposed alterations and second floor extension to dwelling  Refused
2.22 1999/0911/LB  demolition of derelict single storey extension formerly designated for conversion to snug and office and rebuilding with new  Approved
2.23 1999/0910/H  demolition of single storey derelict extension formerly designated for conversion to snug and office and rebuilding with new  Approved
2.24 1997/1669/H  Alterations & extension to dwelling and demolition of outbuildings  Approved
2.25 1997/1650/LB  Alterations & extension to dwelling and demolition of outbuildings  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Approve
Concern over large lorries on narrow lanes

3.2 District Member  Delegated if Officers are minded to approve.
Conversion of defunct barns to commercial is preferred option of Central Government.
Creates employment in countryside.
In keeping with national and SNDC Policy.

3.3 NCC Highways  Original Submission:
Recommends refusal
- Road serving the site is inadequate to serve the development proposed due to poor alignment, restricted width, lack of passing provision, substandard construction.
- Likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety
- Contrary to IMP8
- Remote from local service centre provision conflicting with aims of sustainable development
- Contrary to NPPF
- Contrary to Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan Connecting Norfolk Policy 5
- Would inhibit the through flow of traffic and create a significant hazard on a Primary Route

Following submission of additional information:
Location unsuitable for retail development in highway terms and transport sustainability grounds.
3.4 Conservation Officer

Internally the showroom uses have enabled the open spaces to be retained uncluttered by partitions and floors. In that respect the use has a positive impact. Use would not harm the setting of the listed houses provided there was not external storage. No objections to the use.

3.5 Planning Policy

Guidance in NPPF should be primary consideration. NPPF paragraphs 25, 28 and 34 should be referred to. Policy 5 of JCS relevant. Policy 17 of JCS relevant. Relevant New DM Policies are 1.1, 1.3, 2.4, 2.10, 3.10 and 3.11. Little weight can currently be attached to these.

3.6 Health And Safety Executive

Do not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission

3.7 Representations

Letters have been received from/on behalf of 4 properties objecting to the proposal and making the following comments:

- Retail should not be sites in a quiet country land among homes
- Only way to visit shop will be by car
- Additional traffic will cause deterioration to the lane
- Concern about setting precedent
- Request sign to deter use to west entrance to fen Street to access site
- Lane cannot sustain increase in heavy goods traffic
- Should remain a peaceful residential area Furniture show rooms should be in retail parks or industrial estates
- Outside development area
- Should be refused as was 2005/2105
- Description of proposed use is unclear, does not state proposed uses
- Annexe should be omitted from application to avoid separate dwelling in countryside or use as retail
- Extent of retail floor area needs to be clarified
- Applications poorly conceived and inadequately presented.
- Recognise appropriate commercial use of rural buildings accords with Policy.
- Applicant has not addressed policy issues or other material considerations.
- Retail element is not just complementary to the interior design consultancy, it is a dedicated retail outlet.
- There are suitable alternative premises in sustainable locations.
- Concern about future growth of business and traffic generation
- Unsustainable
- Road not suitable for traffic.
- Contrary to Policies IMP8, SHO8, EMP2, EMP3
- No need to be located in this location
- Contrary to NPPF The 2007 appeal that was dismissed in respect of Oak Tree Farm Fen Street is a material consideration.
- Has been set up without planning permission
- Contrary to barn conversion policy
- Damage to unstable road surface
- There are vacant retail premises in the near vicinity
- No mains sewerage
- No public transport
- Traffic should only use eastern access
Letters have been received directly from 2 businesses supporting the application and making the following comments:

- Applicant has provided us with business
- Generate/provide work for local businesses
- Provide local employment
- Retail space raises profile of interior design business
- May provide more employment as business grows
- Loss of retail would have a knock on effect on employment on other local business.
- Will not cause detriment to other residents of Fen Street
- Road already use for commercial business and by large vehicles
- The ambience created by the barns could not be replicated if the business was situated on an industrial estate.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for change of use from residential use ancillary to the main house to use as an interior design studio/showroom and retail unit. The application is retrospective. The use has been in operation since mid 2012. Planning permission was previously granted for change of use of the whole barn to domestic purposes ancillary to the house. This current application is for change of use of part of the barn to commercial use. The remainder of the barn would remain as an annexe to the house, this element is outside the scope of the current application.

4.2 The LPA are currently considering a retrospective advertisement consent application for signage at the junction of Fen Street and the A1066 to serve the business the subject this planning application. This application is undetermined.

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

4.4 The main issues in this case are: the principle of the use in this location; highway safety; impact on the heritage assets; and residential amenity.

Principle of the proposed uses

4.5 The site is located outside of the Development Limits designated in the Development Plan. JCS Policy 17 supports home working, and commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified. SNLP Policy EMP3 permits the use of rural buildings for employment purposes subject to a number of criteria including the road access being sufficient for the proposed use and the proposal not prejudicing the vitality of local towns and villages. SNLP Policy SHO8 states proposals for retailing outside Development Limits will be considered where there is a local need, there is not an adverse impact on existing local facilities and there is adequate access to the local transport network.

4.6 The most up to date adopted policy is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), including the following: at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development; that planning should not be an impediment to sustainable economic growth; to facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit; that the sequential approach to the location of town centre uses should not be applied to other small scale rural development; support for economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development; support for sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas; and promoting the retention and development of local services such as local shops.
4.7 There are two elements to the submitted proposal: the interior design studio element and the retail element.

**Interior design studio use**

4.8 The interior design studio use would appear to be limited in scale attracting a limited number of visiting members of the public whilst enabling the operator of the business to partially work from home. Such a proposal would not be contrary to the policies in the NPPF or undermine the aims of the Development Plan.

**Retail use**

4.9 The site is not in a sustainable location as it is not accessible by means other than private car. The retail element is likely to increase the number of visiting members of the public attracted to the site. In floor space terms the retail element is significant when compared to the interior design element. In addition the nature of the goods offered suggests a wide catchment area and not just a local service. Therefore, the use is likely to generate longer journeys and there is no justification for it to be located in such a remote rural location. The applicant states that the retail element would be operated in association with the interior design business and could be conditioned as such. However, it is doubtful that independent retail sales (sales to persons not using the Design Service) could be prevented and therefore such a condition would not be enforceable.

4.10 The retail use is not sustainable development in this location and as set out below, the highway access is unsuitable. Therefore, the harm caused by the retail use in terms of unsustainable travel and highway danger would outweigh the benefits to the rural economy. Consequently the proposal taken as a whole is an unsustainable form of development contrary to adopted policy.

**Highway safety**

4.11 Fen Street is a very narrow highway, of a very light construction which consists of a number of layers of surface dressing only which has been an issue in the past. It is designated as a quiet lane and is signed as unsuitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles. There are no footways. Fen Street is able to cater satisfactorily for small vehicles only on a single way working basis. Larger vehicles may have problems using the road owing to the narrow width and tight bends. Fen Street does not have any formal passing places. Passing opportunities are restricted to gateways. In places the surface of Fen Street is lower than the neighbouring land. Therefore the highway verges are formed as banking which precludes the overrunning by vehicles. Therefore, the road is not suitable for increases in traffic that would result from a commercial use or a use that attracts visiting members of the public.

4.12 Fen Street has a give way junction onto the A1066. Traffic along this section of the A1066 can travel at the national speed limit of 60mph. The presence of the Fen Street junction to drivers on the A1066 is not clearly evident. There are hazard markings to discourage overtaking on this part of the A1066. The application proposal will increase the traffic visiting the application site. This will increase the number of slowing, stopping and turning movements at the Junction of Fen Street and the A1066 which would have a detrimental effect upon the safe and free flow of traffic along the A1066. Consequently, there is an increased risk of an accident occurring. Given the traffic speeds the severity of any personal injury is likely to be high.

4.13 For the above reasons the site does not benefit from a safe and suitable access. Due to the rural location and lack of alternative access methods, the development is reliant on the use of the private car. Consequently a proposal in this location that attracts visiting members of the public would result in a hazard and inconvenience to users of the public highway. The
interior design studio use is relatively low key, the nature of the use requires the business to take its services to the customer, and deliveries are likely to be made directly to the customer. Therefore, it could be difficult to justify a refusal based on the increase in traffic likely to be caused by this element of the proposal. However, with the addition of a retail element which will cause deliveries to the site and by its nature attracts customers to the site there will be an increase in the use of Fen Street and the Junction with the A1066 to a material extent. The impacts of which would be unacceptable for the reasons set out above.

Impact on heritage assets

4.14 The building is curtilage listed. The uses have enabled the open spaces of the barn to be retained uncluttered by partitions and floors. Therefore, the use has a positive impact on the character of the heritage asset. Subject to there being no external storage the use should not harm the setting of the grade II listed farmhouse.

Residential amenity

4.15 The use would be sufficiently far from the nearest existing residential properties not to have a significant or unreasonable impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of those dwellings. Similarly the means of access to the site is also sufficiently far from those dwellings not to have such an impact on the residential amenity of those properties to warrant refusal in this case.

Conclusion

4.16 For the above reasons the proposal as a whole constitutes an unsustainable form of development that would be cause a hazard and inconvenience to users of the public highway. Consequently, the application is recommended for refusal.

Enforcement

4.17 The application is retrospective and the use is currently operating from the site. Therefore, it is necessary to consider whether or not it is expedient to take enforcement action in respect of the unlawful use being carried on at the site. Had the application been solely to retain the interior design studio element of the scheme then the application would be recommended for approval based on the low key impacts of that element on the site and the surrounding area. Therefore, it is recommended that subject to legal advice no enforcement action be taken against the interior design studio element of the proposal. However, the retail element is primarily the reason for the recommendation of refusal on the planning application. Therefore, it is recommended that subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of any part of the site for retail purposes.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The unclassified road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its poor alignment, restricted width, lack of passing provision and substandard construction. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 Policy IMP8.
5.2 The proposed development would lead to additional vehicles waiting to turn right on a Primary Route at a point whereby they would inhibit the through flow of traffic and create a significant hazard. Contrary to South Norfolk local Plan 2003 Policy IMP8.

5.3 The site is not in a sustainable location. If operated in a viable manner the retail element is likely to increase the number of visiting members of the public attracted to the site. There is no overriding justification for retailing such products from a rural location. The retail use in this location does not constitute sustainable development. Contrary to the NPPF, Joint Core Strategy Policies 6 and 17 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy SHO8.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2012/1919/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr J Zygmunst  
Site Address: Land North Of Right Up Lane Silfield Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: 6 dwelling units

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Details roads and drainage  
4. Laying out access parking turning  
5. External materials to be agreed  
6. Slab level  
7. Hard and soft landscaping  
8. Tree protection  
9. Notify Network Rail  
10. Construction of footings near railway  
11. Piling  
12. Surface water drainage  
13. Water efficiency  
14. Contaminated land during construction  
15. Remediation of ground contamination  
16. Protection from noise  
17. Affordable Housing  
18. Remove PD Rights for windows north, east and south elevations

---

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 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

---

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1415 Screening opinion  
EIA not required

2.2 2012/0168 Proposed residential development of 6 dwellings, works to include reduction of site level (removal of hoggin)  
Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Original plans: Approve subject to satisfactory determination of contamination, highways and sewage.
First Revision:
Do not wish to see planning permission granted until concerns over highways and drainage have been resolved.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Original Plans:
- No objection in principle.
- Lack of turning provision for emergency vehicles and between plots 4 and 5.
- Plots 5 and 6 will not meet building regulations due to distance from the public highway and lack of emergency vehicle turning.
- Car parking spaces for plots 4, 5 and 6 too small.
- Surface water drainage details required.
- Amended layout required.
First Revision:
- Recommends conditions regarding detailed plans of roads and drainage and laying out of access, parking and turning area.

3.4 Network Rail (South East) Original Plans:
- No objection in principle.
- Request amendment to plans regarding step access to Rightup Lane.
First Revision:
- No objection.
- Concern over landownership near site entrance.
Second Revision:
- Other than land ownership issues, have not objection in principle.
- Concern over the site layout consequences for the operation of the railway.
- Request conditions regarding notification of commencement of development, excavation of footings, piling, drainage, future maintenance.

3.5 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager

Original plans:
- 1 No 3 bedroom house will be acceptable.
- If developers wish to negotiate viability of affordable housing provision they should provide financial evidence.
First Revision:
- No objection
- Meets requirements of JCS Policy 4.
- Request affordable house is conveyed to a housing association for rent.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) Original plans:
- Advice regarding protection of noise from rail line.
- Recommend conditions regarding ground contamination.

3.7 Landscape Officer Original plans:
- Removal of lesser willow trees not unreasonable.
- Contrary to JCS2, IMP2 and BS5837
- Object.


- Layout not acceptable
- Access within RPA of TPO Monterey Pine.
- Future pressure to fell southern vegetation due to shading of plots 1, 2, 5, and 6.

First Revision:
- Previous objection remains
- Second Revision:
  - Comments based on new version BS5837 which came into effect on 30 April 2012.

3.8 Kelly Lunness - Operations Manager
See assessment

3.9 Mrs Shirley Bishop
Original plans:
Surface and foul water advice.

3.10 Representations
Letters from 2 properties on Highbanks making the following comments:

Object
- Highbanks will lose all privacy to the rear of the property
- Highbanks houses bedroom, en suite, sitting room and gardens will be overlooked
- Question finished level of site
- Loss of winter sun and loss of light to Highbanks
- Reorientation of house layout would lessen impact for Highbanks
- Access too narrow for emergency vehicles
- Lack of parking
- Reduce number of dwellings to four
- There is an existing water run off problem in this location
- Loss of trees/wildlife habitat
- Should be more tree planting on site
- Proximity to noise and disturbance from railway line
- Trees should be planted between houses and railway line
- Should include a bungalow for people with disabilities

4 Assessment

4.1 The site benefits from planning permission under application ref 2012/0168 for 6 dwellings. The approved layout showed the dwellings fronting east with the side gables facing north and south.

4.2 This current application is for a revised layout and design for 6 dwellings. The properties will be orientated such that they front the railway line with the side gable elevations facing approximately east and west.

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

4.4 The main issues in this case are: principle of development in this location; character and appearance of the area; residential amenity; highway safety; ground contamination; and servicing.

Principle of development in this location

4.5 The site is located within the development limit for Wymondham. Therefore, the principle of development in this location accords with Development Plan Policy.
Affordable housing

4.6 The proposal includes one two bedroom affordable house. Therefore, the proposal complies with JCS Policy 4. This can be secured by condition.

Character and appearance of area

4.7 The site is linear in form. The site is bordered to the north by the railway line. Beyond the railway line are dwellings and a public house on High Banks, these are built at a lower level than the site. The site is elevated above the level of Right Up Lane to the south, especially at the western end adjacent to the railway bridge. On the opposite side of Right Up Lane are the recently constructed Exige Way dwellings, these are elevated above the level of the application site. The proposed dwellings are similar in scale and mass to other properties in the locality and will not be unduly prominent from longer views from the north. The southern boundary of the site is bordered by semi-mature landscaping which helps to soften the appearance of the site.

4.8 Although the proposal does not meet the current standards expected in terms of tree protection, the proposed development should have a less significant impact on the existing trees than the already approved scheme.

4.9 Therefore, the proposal should not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area.

Residential amenity

4.10 The dwellings will be adjacent to the railway line. Therefore, the properties could be affected by noise and disturbance resulting from the use of the railway line. The site benefits from planning permission for dwellings which is subject to a condition regarding noise mitigation. The current proposal shows the accommodation within the dwellings arranged such that there are non-habitable rooms between the railway line and the habitable rooms. Therefore, the proposed dwellings will offer the residents a satisfactory level of residential amenity subject to a condition regarding noise.

4.11 The accommodation has been arranged such that the windows facing the properties on Highbanks opposite serve non-habitable rooms. In other respects the dwellings would be sufficiently far from neighbouring dwellings not to result in overlooking of those dwellings. Therefore, the proposal will not result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Highway safety

4.12 The proposed layout of the site provides adequate access, parking and turning arrangements. Therefore, subject to the conditions the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

Ground contamination

4.13 The proposal is for a development sensitive to pollution on a brownfield site. A desk top study and site investigation report have been submitted with the application. The submitted site investigation report recommends some limited remediation work takes place to safeguard the future residents. This remediation work can be secured by condition.
Servicing

4.14 The proposal includes provision for refuse collection. Network Rail have been consulted and subject to the conditions the proposal should not impinge on the safe operation of the railway. The site already has planning permission for 6 dwellings. The drainage aspects of the current proposal could be dealt with in a similar manner.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU4, IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal has been designed to take account of the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring uses and has a suitable access to the highway network.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14. **Appl. No**: 2012/2081/H  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY  
Applicants Name : Mr K Jones  
Site Address : 4 Santolina Close Costessey Norfolk NR5 0EP  
Proposal : Installation of roof lights in south west and north east elevations of roof slope  
Recommendation : Approval with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 20: Extensions to existing dwellings, overlooking

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0055 Patio doors on Plots 3 & 5 to be increased APPROVED from 1200mm wide, as on approved plans 2009/0259/F, to 1500mm wide  

2.2 2009/0259 Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site with 5no dwellings, garages and ancillary works APPROVED

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Recommend refusal due to cramped site and overlooking of neighbouring properties  

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate  

3.3 Representations 4x letters of objection received in total with 1x objection subsequently withdrawn following amendments to the scheme:

- rooflights [to the front] will look straight into the rear garden and rooms & take away small privacy property currently has  
- garden will be overlooked and we value our privacy  
- we currently leave outside lights on which may have consequences for applicants if the roof space becomes living quarters  
- when original scheme approved for development was no further roof lights to be permitted after the houses were built
Assessment

4.1 The application dwelling is a modest detached single storey property located within the Development Limits of Costessey. The application property is part of a small development granted planning permission in 2009 (2009/0259), sited to the rear of 45 Norwich Road. No. 4 Santolina Close is to the south west of the development and abuts the rear gardens of properties situated along Sunny Court, Sunny Close and The Drive. The ground levels change across the site, rising to the rear of the dwelling.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, the Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that development does not harm the character or appearance of the existing dwelling and does not result in material harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, including in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 Condition 5 of planning permission 2009/0259 removed permitted development rights for the insertion of additional windows or other openings in the east and west elevations of the current application dwelling in order to enable a full assessment of such a proposal should rooflights be required.

4.4 The scheme has been amended during the course of the application to realign and reduce the number of proposed rooflights. The amended scheme has resulted in the deletion of the front elevation rooflights and the reorganisation of the internal floorspace. The amended scheme represents an improvement to the original submission and has resolved the concerns of those neighbours adjacent to the front of the site (although not all of these objections have been formally withdrawn).

4.5 Concerns have been raised about the overlooking and loss of privacy resulting from the proposed rooflights however due to the separation between the application dwelling and the closest neighbouring properties to the rear of the site (a minimum of 24 metres to the rear of no. 19 Sunny Close) the development is not considered to result in overlooking of these properties to a detrimental degree. There will be some views towards the rear gardens of these properties however it is not considered that this will be to an extent that would justify the refusal of planning permission. It is therefore considered that the development accords with the principles of those policies set out above.

Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP09 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The amended scheme is considered to be acceptable following the removal of the rooflights from the front elevation of the property and the realignment of those in the rear elevation. Due to the separation distance between the rear of 4 Santolina Close and those properties closest to the rear of the site the addition of the rooflights is not considered to result in overlooking or loss of privacy to a degree that would be harmful to the residential amenities of those occupiers.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Kate Fisher 01508 533985
and E-mail: kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
15. **Appl. No**: 2012/2180/F  
**Parish**: SHELFANGER

**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Costley  
**Site Address**: Church Farm Barn Church Road Shelfanger Norfolk IP22 2DG  
**Proposal**: Proposed temporary standing of static caravan and installation of private treatment unit

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
HOU 22: Mobile homes  
UTL 15: Contaminated land

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0306 Proposed conversion and partial reconstruction of redundant barn to dwelling Pending Consideration

2.2 2013/0308 Proposed conversion and partial reconstruction of redundant barn to dwelling Pending Consideration

2.3 2012/0812 Extension of time limit of planning permission 2011/0541/F - Conversion of redundant barn into residential dwelling Approved

2.4 2011/0541 Extension to time limit of planning permission 2009/0335/F - Conversion of redundant barn into residential dwelling Approved

2.5 2009/0335 Conversion of redundant barn into residential dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Recommend approval

3.2 District Member Decision may be delegated
3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)  Note temporary nature of application therefore do not consider it practical to require implementation of remedial works set out in site investigation report. Recommend conditions limiting the period of the planning approval to 2 years and prohibiting growing of fruit and vegetables on site to containers containing clean soil.

3.4 Environmental Services (Drainage)  No comments received

3.5 Environment Agency  Application falls outside scope of matters for which EA are statutory consultees therefore will not issue a response to the application.

3.6 Landscape Officer  No objection

3.7 Historic Environment Service  No implications for the historic environment and would not therefore make any recommendations for archeaological works.

3.8 Representations  No comments received

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located outside the Development Limits of Shelfanger and is within the curtilage of a listed building. There are a number of agricultural buildings on the site in various states of repair. Church Farm House is located immediately to the east of the caravan. There is a protected tree adjacent to the vehicular access to the site. The site currently benefits from an extant planning permission for the conversion of a barn to a residential unit (2012/0812/F and 2012/0814/LB).

4.2 Ownership of the barn that is subject to the existing consent has recently been transferred and the current owner has installed a static caravan on the site for residential purposes. The applicant seeks to retain the static caravan on the site for a period of two years in order to allow sufficient time for the determination of a further planning application on the site and the subsequent renovation of the barn. A package treatment plant has also been installed on the site for use by the occupiers of the caravan however in time this will serve the occupiers of the barn, in accordance with the earlier planning permission.

4.3 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that development is of an appropriate form and scale, does not result in material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and does not prejudice the safe and free movement of highway traffic. Policies also seek to preserve designated heritage assets. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 The caravan has been sited to the rear of the barn that has been approved for conversion, as well as the existing residential dwelling, utilising the previously approved access for the site. It is partially screened from public vantage points by an existing hedgerow and there are restricted views only of the caravan within the wider streetscene.

4.5 Additional information has been submitted by the applicant relating to the site drainage and as a result the initial objection has since been withdrawn. Issues have previously been raised regarding the discharge from the package treatment plant however they have not been repeated as part of the current application and discharge from the plant falls outside the remit of the planning system.
4.6 The Environmental Protection Team has also noted the presence of ground contaminants on the site but have noted that due to the temporary nature of the consent the implementation of remedial works would not be appropriate at this time. It is noted that these will be undertaken as part of the conversion works to the barn. A condition has been suggested for the growing of fruit and vegetable in clean soil to address any potential concerns relating to this issue.

4.7 On balance therefore, as the proposal is for a limited time period only I consider the installation of the caravan for residential purposes to be acceptable and recommend the application for approval. The caravan has a greater separation from the closest residential property than the barn proposed for conversion and I do not consider that its temporary occupation will have an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

4.8 However in order to ensure that the accommodation remains associated with the conversion of the barn, as set out in the justification for the application, it is appropriate to restrict the occupation of the caravan to the owner of the barn that benefits from the extant planning consent.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies JCS01 and JCS02 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU22, IMP9 and IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 Planning consent has been granted for a temporary period only in order to facilitate the conversion of an adjacent barn to a residential dwelling. The caravan has been sited towards the rear of the site and is not a prominent feature within the streetscene, nor within views of the adjacent Listed Building. The siting of the caravan will not have an adverse impact on the amenities of the nearest residential occupiers or highway safety. The presence of on-site contamination has been noted and is to be addressed as part of the associated barn conversion works.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Kate Fisher 01508 533985
and E-mail: kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
16. **Appl. No**: 2012/2191/F  
**Parish**: THURTON  
Applicants Name: Mr Paul Byrne  
Site Address: Sub-division Of The Garden Of 33 Ashby Road Thurton Norfolk NR14 6AX  
Proposal: Erection of one dwelling & garage, new double garage for the existing house and alterations and re-surfacing of the existing drive  
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 15: Service Villages

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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/0677 Proposed residential development comprising 4no. new dwellings & garages and one replacement garage (and ancillary works)  
Refused  
Appeal Dismissed

2.2 2008/2392 Proposed residential development comprising 5 dwellings and garages and one replacement garage  
Withdrawn

2.3 1983/2376 New bungalow  
Refused  
Appeal Dismissed

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve  
- Subject to building being single storey only

3.2 District Member  
To be determined by committee  
- Many divergent local opinions over a considerable period of time, during which several differing applications have been made for the site development and two appeals  
- Current proposal fundamentally changes the approach being a much reduced development with modified access
- These changes need to be considered in the context of IMP9 and whether the proposal now meets the policy requirements in the context of effect on neighbouring properties and effect on character and appearance of immediate area.

3.3 Environmental Services - protection

Conditional support

3.4 Representations

4 letters of no objection in principle, however:
- Soakaways and surface water drainage should not affect our land
- A hedge of appropriate height should be retained and properly maintained
- Should there be plans for the dwelling to be extended upwards that we are consulted
- Note patio area comes very close and perhaps unnecessarily close to our border
- This is the only proposed dwelling and it does not set a precedent for any future development on this site
- Legal covenant is placed on the height of the bungalow, so that in the future no extension can be made into the roof space
- Height lowered to no more than 5 metres
- Convent placed on bungalow preventing any windows in the roof
- More details of the garages
- Details of ownership of land and who would be responsible for ensuring tree’s don’t get too high
- Clarification to what the unlabeled area serving bedroom 1 to 3 would be used for
- What is the white area to rear of new bungalow
- Where will cars park for the existing property

No additional responses have been received to reconsultation on the garage plans

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a bungalow and garage, also including a replacement garage for the existing property, at land to the rear of 33 Ashby Road, Thurton. The site currently a large private rear garden to 33 Ashby Road. Residential properties surrounding the site to the north, east, south and west

4.2 The site falls within the development boundary for the village of Thurton and is identified as a Service Village under 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 has been subject as can be seen from the planning history to a number of applications over the years, the most recent being in 2009 for 4 dwellings which was refused by committee and dismissed at appeal. I attach a copy of the inspectors appeal decision for member’s information as appendix 2.

4.4 The main issues raised by the proposal are as follows:
- The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties via noise and disturbance
4.5 The immediate surrounding area to the site is characterised by single storey and two-storey properties with large gardens. To the north is a cul-de-sac with detached dwellings either side of the estate road. The proposed development is to the rear of the existing bungalow without road frontage, which is not in keeping with the development in the area. Whilst this application reduces the number of dwellings to one bungalow, this type of development is out of character with the general grain of the existing area, which would result in a development that does not relate to the existing pattern of development. The proposal is contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy together with advice in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Also design principle 3.4.1 of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide requires new development to relate well to the character of the local area which this proposal does not do. The planning inspector equally concluded that 'the proposal for backland development would not be in keeping with the characteristic layout of dwellings in the area'. Also 'due to the lack of road frontage, long access and layout of the proposed development, the proposal would not be in keeping with the overriding pattern of development to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.'

4.6 The proposed access to serve the proposed bungalow is via the existing driveway to No33. This will mean that the traffic accessing the site has to pass immediately adjacent to the existing dwelling and in close proximity to 1 Mill Road and its rear amenity space. Also the new garage for the existing dwelling and the access drive runs adjacent to the boundary of 7 Foxglove Close. Existing residential properties and their private amenity spaces surrounds the existing rear garden. Whilst this application reduces the number of dwellings and therefore the number of vehicles, the development would still give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers, contrary to policy IMP9 of South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. This proposal like the previous one proposes to use bitmac driveway and landscaping to reduce the impact of noise, however as the inspector concluded there is insufficient space to provide adequate landscaping to be effective and no acoustic details have been provided.

4.7 The design and access statement submitted with the application gives examples of other dwellings which have been granted consent in the village and have been compared to this application. Due regard has been given to these, but the application has been assessed on its individual merits. I consider the proposal is unacceptable for the reasons set out above and therefore recommend that the application be refused.

5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The erection of dwellings on the site proposed, behind existing dwellings, lacking a proper road frontage and served by a long inconvenient access, amounts to an unacceptable form of backland development, contrary to the principles of good planning.

5.2 The proposed development to the rear of an existing bungalow would be out of character with the general grain of the existing area, resulting in a development that does not relate to the existing pattern of development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy together with advice in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Also design principle 3.4.1 of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide requires new development to relate well to the character of the local area which this proposal does not do.

5.3 The development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers by reason of noise and general disturbance from the passage of vehicles along the access serving the development, contrary to the provisions of policy IMP9 Residential amenity of The South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

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

Site visit made on 29 March 2010

by Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons)
DipTP MRPS
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/09/2119049
33 The Poplars, Ashby Road, Thurton, Norwich, Norfolk NR14 6AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr P Byrne against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
- The application (Ref 2009/0677/F), dated 30 April 2009, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2009.
- The development proposed is residential development comprising four No. new dwellings and garages, one replacement garage (and ancillary works).

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr P Byrne against South Norfolk Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

3. I consider that there are two main issues:

   - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area; and
   - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with particular reference to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Saved Policy IMP 1 in the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) seeks new development of a high standard of design and in keeping with its surroundings. Saved Policy HOU 6 allows residential development in Thurton of no more than ten dwellings if singly or cumulatively the development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting.

5. The appeal site lies within a primarily residential area characterised by single and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings set within generous gardens. Developments of higher density within cul-de-sacs primarily have dwellings fronting both sides of the road that serves them. The appeal proposal, by contrast, would have a long access road behind the rear gardens of existing dwellings with dwellings being accessed from only one side.

6. From my observations, I consider the proposal for backland development would not be in keeping with the characteristic layout of dwellings in the area. The
proposed dwellings to the rear would appear displaced from the street scene giving the appearance of a disjointed form of development. In my opinion, due to the lack of road frontage, long access and layout of the proposed development, the proposal would not be in keeping with the overriding pattern of development to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved Local Plan Policies IMP 1 and HOU 6.

7. As regards the density of the proposed development, I do not consider that the proposal would create a cramped form of development. There would be ample private amenity space for future occupiers, which would create a sense of openness between dwellings. However, due to the reasons stated above, I do not consider that this matter justifies allowing the proposal.

8. In reaching my conclusion on this matter, I have had regard to other examples of development in the village. However, I consider the overriding character of layout of development is frontage development and in particular for cul-de-sacs to have frontage development on both sides. I have considered the appeal before me on its individual merits.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed access driveway into the appeal site would be between two existing dwellings and particularly would run close to the side of No. 33 The Poplars. I note that additional landscaping and acoustic fences would be provided and the road surfacing would be a Bitmac quiet surface. However, I have not been provided with acoustic details to satisfy me that such measures would significantly reduce noise and disturbance to the neighbouring residents and in my opinion, I do not consider that there is sufficient space to provide adequate landscaping to this effect.

10. As the access driveway would be so close to existing dwellings either side of the entrance, due to the amount of traffic likely to be generated from the comings and goings associated with four dwellings, I consider that vehicles and pedestrians entering and leaving the proposed development would create unacceptable living conditions for occupiers of the dwellings at the entrance, due to noise and general disturbance.

11. The access driveway would be close to the rear gardens of dwellings in Foxglove Close. Even though they would be separated by existing mature landscaping and additional thick screen planting, due to the close proximity of the proposed driveway, I consider that occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in Foxglove Close would experience significantly unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance from the comings and goings of vehicles associated with the proposed dwellings. This would make those rear gardens less pleasant places to use.

12. As regards everyday activity within the curtilages of the new dwellings, I do not consider that the levels of noise and disturbance would be any greater than that likely to be experienced by many neighbours' activities in similar close proximity elsewhere in the village. However, due to the reasons stated above, I do not consider that this matter justifies allowing the proposal.
13. For the reasons stated above, I conclude on this matter that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved Local Plan Policy IMP 9, which does not allow new development if it has a significantly adverse impact on residential amenity.

**Conclusion**

14. In conclusion, I have found that the proposal would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would have an adverse effect on living conditions. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all other matters upon which I have not specifically commented I dismiss the appeal.

*Janet Cheesley*

INSPECTOR
17. **Appl. No:** 2012/2312/F  
**Parish:** TOPCROFT

**Applicants Name:** Saffron Housing Trust  
**Site Address:** Land South East Of 12 Church Road Church Road Topcroft NR35 2BH

**Proposal:** Proposed development of 5no. new affordable dwellings

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Details of foul water disposal  
5. Tree protection  
6. Implement landscaping scheme  
7. Standard Estate Road details  
8. Affordable housing secured through S106  
9. Contaminated land during construction

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*

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
*Policy 2: Promoting good design*  
*Policy 16: Other Villages*  
*Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside*

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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
*South Norfolk Place Making Guide*

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve, but comment that the roof line of plots 4 and 5 is not liked, and that the pumping station located near plot 1 may be better located further away from the existing and proposed properties.

3.2 District Member  
Can be a delegated decision - not keen on the roof line of plots 4 and 5.

3.3 NCC Highways  
To be reported.

3.4 Ecologist  
None received.

3.5 Design Officer  
No objection to amended plans.
3.6 Housing Strategy Manager  Support - Will help to meet the affordable housing needs of local people within Topcroft.

3.7 SNC Env. Services  No objection.

3.8 Representations  One letter of objection received from the adjoining property at no 12 Church Road
- Has raised concern with the location of the foul water pumping station and the character of the properties being out of keeping.

4 Assessment

4.1 The applicant proposes the development of 5 affordable two storey dwellings on a site that includes a part garden plot adj. no 12 Church Road and an agricultural field separated by an access track leading to an Anglian Water treatment station. The neighbouring dwellings to the north-west of the site are ex-local authority housing stock, typical of the 1950's, constructed out of red brick with Norfolk pan tiles, simple window forms and hips to the roofs. Access to the development would be via a new access off Church Road. The site is partly located on land owned by South Norfolk Council, although the Council is not the applicant.

4.2 The proposal would result in dwellings being located outside the development boundary, contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. However, where affordable housing is proposed to meet a specific local need, JCS Policy 17 allows a departure from the general presumption against new development in the open countryside, particularly where sites are adjacent to villages and are in sustainable locations.

4.3 The recently published National Planning Policy Framework states that in rural areas authorities should be ‘responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs’. Local needs affordable housing helps to sustain and enhance small villages and to promote sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF requires 'housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities'. In my view, the application fully accords with these aims.

4.4 JCS Policy 16 allocates Topcroft Street as an 'other village', and is therefore considered to have limited facilities, and where development of this type would not normally be permitted within the village. However JCS Policy 17 allows small scale development adjacent villages where a local housing need can be demonstrated. The Housing Enabling Officer has confirmed that the proposed scheme will help to meet the needs of local single people, couples and families within Topcroft. Each home will be legally protected by means of an Affordable Housing Section 106 Agreement to ensure it is made available first and foremost to households who have a local connection to Topcroft and who are in need of affordable housing; and also that the homes remain affordable in perpetuity.

4.5 Taking the above into account I feel that the proposed development accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 17 and is acceptable in principle.

The remaining issues to be considered are:

- Design, layout & impact on the character of the area;
- Highway Impact, and;
- Impact on residential amenity.

Design, Layout & Impact on the Character of the Area
The site is located to the west of existing ex-local authority housing and successfully follows its building line and scale. The architectural style proposed is in keeping with the existing dwellings on Church Road and incorporates both chimneys and hipped roofs, both of which are strong contextual features. As the site has a fall in levels from NW to SE, the houses step down to suit the ground levels, and therefore better respond to their surroundings.

The design of the proposed dwellings has been amended by the application to take account of the concerns raised locally, as well as issues created by the sloping nature of the site. The revised plans have an improved roof line and now better reflect the site conditions and its context. The dwellings will achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 and have been designed to Lifetime Homes standards, and incorporate the use of air source heat pumps. Each property has 2 parking spaces in curtilage, and adequate turning space has been provided.

The Design Officer now supports the amended plans, and I feel that the design, siting and layout of the proposal, and its relationship with adjoining development is considered acceptable and in accordance with JCS Policy 2 and the South Norfolk Place making Guide.

Highway Impact

The highway impact of this proposal has been assessed by NCC: Highways, who consider that, although not in a particularly sustainable location in highway terms, the proposal would not give rise to significant levels of traffic, and therefore do not raise any concerns in respect of highway safety. The application therefore accords with the requirements of saved policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal follows the existing building line on Church Road and generous separation distances are afforded to the neighbouring property to the west, and therefore there will be no significant impact on their amenity. However, the concerns of the neighbour and the Parish Council in respect of the location of the pumping station were noted, and the amended plans have addressed this concern by relocating the pumping station to the rear of the site, further away from no. 12 Church Road.

I am satisfied that there will not be a significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the application accords with saved policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Reason for Approval

The proposed development of affordable housing is in a sustainable location, adjacent to a village, and provides affordable housing for a defined local need. The proposal therefore accords with Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011). The design, siting and layout of the proposal, and its relationship with adjoining development is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011), saved policies IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic), and IMP9 (Residential Amenity) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, and sections 1 and 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number   Gary Hancox 01508 533841
and E-mail:   ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee
27 March 2013

18. Appl. No : 2013/0023/F
Parish : TOPCROFT

Applicants Name : Mr P Rout
Site Address : Land South Of The Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street Topcroft Norfolk NR35 2BJ
Proposal : Stationing of a residential caravan for a temporary period of 1 year (retrospective application)

Recommendation : Refusal

1 Insufficient justification for a dwelling in countryside location

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0890 New field access for agricultural use Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve
• The parish council are disappointed that this application was made retrospectively

3.2 District Member Can be delegated
• Should be assessed against policy
• This is a temporary solution

3.3 NCC Highways Conditional support

3.4 Representations 1 letter of no objections from the occupier of The Hut (The Wooden Bungalow)
1 letter of support
1 letter of objection
• Planning permission was applied for a field access for agricultural purposes - this was obviously not the actual intention
• Temporary structures place at least 2 months before planning application was submitted
• Mobile units were supplied with water and electricity sourced from the small house
• Drive laid by specialists
• Retrospective application was not submitted until after the enforcement officer visited the site, following it being brought to the Council's attention by Topcroft residents
Not in keeping with Topcroft and potentially attracts wandering travellers
Plans already drawn up for a large residential property to be built
Gateway on a blind bend and could be hazard to traffic

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the retention of a mobile home, portakabin used for storage and site office and a storage container for Mr Rout at land south of The Wooden Bungalow, Topcroft Street.

4.2 Under the Joint Core Strategy Topcroft Street is identified as Other Village and therefore under the New Local Plan a development boundary is proposed. The mobile home is however located outside this preferred development boundary for the village and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). The NPPF promotes the presumption in favour of sustainable development, however the site is beyond the proposed development limits and as such countryside policies prevail. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies of the SNLP referred to above because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The material planning considerations that have been put forward by the agent in the design and access statement is that a full application will be submitted for the replacement of The Hut (which is a modest single storey timber building) with a replacement dwelling and therefore temporary consent for 1 year should be given. Pre-application discussions have taken place, which have raised concerns with the potential replacement of the existing dwelling, in that the whole site is in flood zone 2 and 3, which will be subject to a sequential test and exception test. The existing property and its modest site is constrained by trees and therefore the applicant is looking to site a dwelling away from the existing one, in a more open location. At the time of writing the report no application has been submitted.

4.4 The Hut which has residential status is presently being occupied and as a consequence there are effectively two residential units on the land.

4.5 I consider the proposal is unacceptable for the reasons set out above and therefore recommend that the application be refused. As this application is for the retention of the mobile, it is requested that subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of the land for residential purposes and remove the static caravan/mobile and associated containers/portable buildings from the land in its entirety. In recognition that the applicant is looking to apply for planning consent for a replacement dwelling, I would also request that a compliance period of 1 year is given to enable him to pursue this.

5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The site is located in a countryside location where policies seek to restrict new dwellings including mobile homes to those required to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
19.  **Appl. No**: 2013/0085/H  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD  
**Applicants Name**: Mr D Baldwin  
**Site Address**: 70 Colney Lane Cringleford Norfolk NR4 7RG  
**Proposal**: Single storey annexe abutting rear garden wall  
**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 21: Annexes  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/0063 Proposed 2 storey rear extension to provide new living room and bedroom  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Recommend refusal  
- appears to be a dwelling rather than an annexe  
- no reference to building materials  
- overdevelopment of the site & detrimental to neighbouring properties  
- concerns over proximity to trees at no. 68 that are not shown on the plans  

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate  

3.3 Landscape Officer  
No objection  

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  
ASHP appears to be sufficient distance away from neighbouring properties although close to boundary wall. ASHP unlikely to cause any significant noise disturbance.  

3.5 Representations  
3x letters of objection:  
- triangular constructions on the roof will be visible from no. 72  
- construction noise  
- the historic walls should not be disturbed & damage to the wall during construction is quite possible  
- noise produced by the ASHP  
- not possible to read dimensions on online plans
due to location and aspect privacy and right to quiet enjoyment of no. 68 impaired due in particular to large glass windows facing no. 68
overall size too large for garden
overdevelopment and infill of site - annexe appears larger than existing dwelling
not in keeping with character of surrounding walls and buildings & old feature brick wall will be obscured
large beech tree close to rear fence could be affected by the groundworks
difficult to access for emergency services
parking on Colney Lane an issue - where would resident park?

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is a semi-detached dwelling located within the Cringleford Development Limit. The property has previously been extended to the rear with a two storey gable end extension (2008/0063). Parking is to the front of the dwelling and a narrow passageway affording access to the rear garden is located between the adjoining dwellings, nos. 68 and 70. There is a large shed within the rear garden of the application dwelling and the garden forms an 'L'-shape around the rear of no. 68 Colney Lane.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, the Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that development is of an appropriate form, scale and design, does not have an adverse impact on the existing parking and access arrangements for the property or material harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. Annexes must be ancillary to the use of the main dwelling. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The proposal is for a detached single storey annexe to be situated adjacent to the feature wall that bounds the rear of the site. The annexe is of contemporary design in contrast with the wall and many of nearby dwellings however it is to the rear of the application dwelling and will not be visible from public vantage points or within the wider street-scene. The development includes a number of sustainable features including a sedum roof, PV panels, and an air source heat pump. The annexe will extend above the former ice-house on the site.

4.4 The proposal has been subject to amendment during the course of the assessment, including a reduction in the overall height of the structure as well as the angle of the PV panels and setting the annexe away from the boundary wall. The footprint of the annexe has not been amended. The annexe will consist of modest accommodation, including a kitchenette and living room. There is no separate designated parking or garden amenity space proposed for the annexe. Access to the annexe will be via the passageway between nos. 68 and 70 Colney Lane. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the annexe will provide ancillary accommodation for visitors to the main dwelling.

4.5 The scale and form of the annexe is considered to be acceptable in relation to the proposed use and the size of the application site, as well as its proximity to the main dwelling and the boundaries of the site. The overall height is not excessive and has been reduced in order to limit views of the building above the rear wall. The PV panels will still be partially visible due to the stepped height of the wall.

4.6 Concerns have been raised about the scale of the development and its impact on the neighbouring properties and it is not considered that the amendments will significantly address the comments that have been received. Due to the relationship between the
properties the annexe will face towards the rear of no. 68 Colney Lane. The annexe is single storey and whilst a large glazed frontage is proposed for the south elevation due to the low height of the annexe, the separation between the buildings, and the height of the boundary fence to the rear of the private amenity space associated with no. 68 Colney Lane, the development is not considered to result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupier. Although it is unfortunate that the annexe will restrict the existing views of the rear wall from no. 68 it is not considered that it will result in material harm to the outlook from this property.

4.7 It should be noted that the large shed that is currently adjacent to the rear boundary of no. 68 has been shown on the plans as being adjacent to the south east boundary as the applicant intends to relocate it to this position in due course. The agent has confirmed the overall height of the shed and this is within the sizes allowed as permitted development. The setting away of the annexe from the wall is not considered to materially alter the impact of the development on the neighbouring dwellings due to the distance between the properties.

4.8 The size and use of the building is considered to be commensurate with the principle of Policy HOU21 however should planning permission be forthcoming a condition restricting the future subdivision of the site in terms of ownership and occupation should be imposed in accordance with Policy HOU21. The sustainable aspects of the scheme also accord with Policy UTL13.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development will provide ancillary accommodation for the property known as 70 Colney Lane and has been sited to the rear of the property. It will not be visible from public vantage points. The annexe has been sited so that it may only reasonably be used as an annexe to the existing dwelling. It is acknowledged that the annexe will increase the development on the site however the overall scale of development is not considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the plot. Whilst the outlook from no. 68 will be affected by the development it is not considered that it will be to a detrimental degree. Due to the single storey form of the annexe, its distance from the neighbouring dwellings and the boundary treatment between the annexe and in particular no. 68 Colney Lane it is not considered that the development will result in material harm to the residential amenities of the adjoining properties.

5.2 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU21, IMP9 and UTL13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Kate Fisher 01508 533985 and E-mail: kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
20. **Appl. No :** 2013/0091/CU  
**Parish :** DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

Applicants Name : Mr Jack Smith  
Site Address : Land West Of South View Harleston Road Rushall Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for change of use from keeping of pigs to keeping of horses in the same building

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. No generators, air handling plant  
4. No external lighting  
5. Removal of manure  
6. Siting of muck heap  
7. Stables for personal use only  
8. Retention trees and hedges

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Policy 3 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
LEI 14: Keeping of horses for recreational purposes (Part Consistent)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/7240 Retrospective application for change of use from keeping of pigs to keeping of horses in the same building  
Withdrawn

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse  
- on grounds of animal welfare  
- the condition of the buildings and their state of repair is unfit for then habitation of horses  
- concern over the proximity to the road if the horses should escape

3.2 District Member  
Delegated decision.
3.3 NCC Highways No highway objections
- It is recommended that the use be for the benefit of the applicant/owner only.
- Should public stabling or livery be required the means of access serving the site would need to be upgraded and parking/onsite turning facilities provided.

3.4 Public Right Of Way No comments.

3.5 Conservation Officer No objection, no issues to raise.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection, conditions recommended
- Removal of manure
- No generators/ air handling plant
- Advisory note re Surface water drainage

3.7 CNC Building Control The buildings look untidy and in need of some general maintenance, but the buildings do not seem of an immediate danger, we cannot judge any period of structural stability but the buildings appear to be suitable for horses. I would agree that because of the plant growth on the roof and gutters as well as the broken windows etc it looks worse than it probably is, but the internal pictures show block work and roof structure that does not look too bad.

3.8 Representations Three letters of objection expressing the following concerns:-
- Application site wrongly addressed as Brook Farm instead of South View
- Hazardous materials including asbestos are present on the site which make the buildings unsuitable for live stock and dangerous
- Building works undertaken on site buildings
- Waste from the site polluting nearby ditches
- Stable accessed from land which is part of the emergency access to another property and subject to an legal easement
- No consultation from either the Council or the owner of the site
- Poor condition of access makes the easement virtually impassable
- Access users passing close to the front of the stables could alarm unsupervised horses
- Suitability of the buildings for the use and concern about the hazardous nature of the rest of the disused piggery
- Manure stored adjacent to access to Brook Farm and effluent leaking into the environment
- Impact on the amenity of the adjacent listed building
- Number of horses and movements at the site suggest a commercial concern
- Rats present at the site
- Poor appearance of the site

Comments requesting clarification:-
- Lack of information about the number of horses on the site and whether it is for private or commercial use
- Safe removal of wasted from the site and no burning of waste materials
One letter of support from tenant:-

- Muck heap in process of being moved and will be removed when access can be used by a tractor without rutting
- Oil deliveries to Brook Farm have been undertaken across the site recently. If an access exists it is for emergency use and not for everyday traffic
- Horses have been stabled previously at a busy yard and are used to traffic. They are exercised on the roads and would not be afraid of traffic using the emergency access
- No evidence of rats, poison cages are placed around the farm as a precaution
- No heavy vehicles have used the site since the horses were transferred from their previous livery; the horse trailer is stored at another site and parking is on land next to the house and away from the emergency access

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is a detached stable building which is part of a larger former piggery unit and associated bungalow set to the northern side of Harleston Road in Rushall. The site includes a stable building and a field to the west of the property known as South View extending between Harleston Road and Pack Lane to the north. South View itself and the remaining dilapidated piggery buildings to the east of the access track do not form part of the site under consideration. An amendment to the description of the site has been agreed by the Applicant and consultations re-issued to reflect its link to the property knows as South View which is in separate ownership from Brook Farm to the north of the site.

4.2 This is a retrospective application for the change of use of a small stable unit to the west of the former piggery site for horse keeping. The application also covers the change of use of a single field to the rear of the stable (west) from agricultural land to horse keeping associated with the use. The application does not involve any building works and relates purely to the type of livestock using the building and land. The site is rented out as a single unit by the applicant to a tenant who uses all of the stables and the field to the rear. There is no commercial livery or use of the buildings by multiple horse owners. The number of horses using the site is self limiting within the accommodation proposed.

4.3 Three letters of objection have been received about the proposal raising a number of issues. Concerns relating to the materials used in the structure of the building including asbestos, the appearance of the site overall, use of the emergency access easement with Brook Farm, concerns about the safety of the wider site and possible rodent problem are not within the scope of this application. No building works are proposed at the stables which are a discreet area of the site as a whole, the emergency access and its usage is a legal matter between the owners of the respective sites and the possible presence of rodents is not a planning consideration. Issues relating to possible pollution from horse manure on the site would be a matter for the Environment Agency.

4.4 Regarding building works being undertaken at the site without consent there is no evidence of new works on the site and no alterations are proposed to facilitate the change of use. Internal works to the stable block would not require planning permission. The safety of the buildings for the proposed use was however raised as part of comments received. A consultation was undertaken with CNC Building Control to establish if the buildings were dangerous and if the proposed change of use was viable without major works. As a result of this consultation a response was received that the buildings were suitable for the keeping of horses. The safety of buildings on the site is covered by Building Control Officers and is not within the remit of a planning application.
4.5 The proposed stable block is set some distance from the boundary with Brook Farm to the north (the nearest neighbouring residential property) and as such the use is not considered to have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of that property complying with policy IMP 9 if the SNLP. The Highways Officer has no objections to the use of the stables for a single occupier without the need to make alterations to the access to the site.

4.6 In assessing the application the stables are still to be used for livestock and planning permission is only required as the animals to be housed are horses and not agricultural stock. The stabling is within an existing built up site and is set away from other dwellings. Conditions are proposed relating to the use of the stables by a single individual to address concerns about the possible use of the site as livery together with conditions relating to the storage and removal of muck to minimise the impact of the use on the wider area, preventing the use of a generators and external lighting.

4.7 As such the proposal conforms to the above policies within the National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan. The proposals particularly allow for diversification on the former piggery site in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPPF and involve the reuse of redundant agricultural buildings supporting the sustainability aims of the JCS. The keeping of horses within the rural area is acceptable as a rural pursuit within policy LEI 14 of the SNLP and this has been achieved without negative impact on the character of the area. The application is therefore recommended for approval as compliant with established policy, subject to conditions.

5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, IMP 25 and LEI 14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with the above policies as the proposal is for a recreational activity which demands a rural location. The re-use of an exiting stable building within the site minimises the impact of the proposal in the rural environment and the development has a minimal impact on the amenity of surrounding area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Cross 01508 533780 and E-mail: hcross@s-norfolk.gov.uk
21. **Appl. No**: 2013/0161/F  
**Parish**: EASTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr D Rosembert  
**Site Address**: Chez Denis 76 Dereham Road Easton Norfolk NR9 5EJ  
**Proposal**: Conversion of restaurant area 'A3' to form additional guest rooms 'C1' and a two storey rear extension to provide guest flats 'C1'  

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings and amended parking layout plan.  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Cease use of restaurant  
5. Full details of external lighting  

Subject to the receipt of amended plans for the parking spaces.

1. **Planning Policies**  
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
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  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**  
2.1 2012/0869 Conversion of restaurant area 'A3' to form additional guest rooms 'C1' and a two storey rear extension to provide guest flats 'C1'  
Refused  

2.2 2010/0894 Retention of advertising boards, 5no fascia signs (4 of which are to be illuminated). 1no illuminated hanging sign and 1no free standing sign.  
SPLIT  

2.3 2002/1950 Ground floor extension to restaurant with two storey extension to residential dwelling  
PCO  

2.4 2002/0581 Erection of first floor infill extension  
Approved  

2.5 2000/0542 Erection of two storey extension comprising of 6 ensuite bedrooms for visitors accommodation  
Approved

3. **Consultations**  
3.1 Parish Council  
Approve but remain concerned over provision of parking spaces
3.2 District Member  No comments received

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections

3.4 NCC Highways  Support subject to amended plans for additional and revised parking layout, and cessation of restaurant once construction work starts on the extension.

3.5 Representations  2 letters of support
   Much needed additional local guest accommodation.
   No issues with nuisance outside premises over last 11 years.

4  Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the conversion of the existing restaurant (now closed) to additional guest accommodation, with a two storey extension to the north of the existing building providing a wing which makes provision of further guest accommodation. The premises as altered and extended will provide a total of 5 additional guest flats. The existing first floor of the main building will continue to be used as accommodation by the applicant and his family.

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

4.3 The building has historically been a public house (Easton Dog) until the current owner purchased the business in 1997 at which time it underwent refurbishment and opened as a restaurant and guest house. Unfortunately the restaurant has in recent years declined and has now closed, however the guest accommodation has continued to be successful. The applicant’s intention to ensure that the business remains viable and continues to provide guest accommodation in the area requires the conversion of the existing restaurant space and the extension for the additional guest accommodation.

4.4 The site is close the Easton College which has no overnight provision for visitors and is within walking distance of the Royal Norfolk Show Ground which hosts many events throughout the year. Accommodation in the area is limited to the hotel adjacent to 'The Showground Pub' opposite the Royal Norfolk Show Ground and the existing guest house the subject of this application. The proposal makes a positive contribution to the tourist accommodation in the locality which supports not only the business which is the subject of this application, but also other businesses and tourist attractions located in the surrounding area.

4.5 A previous scheme for an extension to provide the additional guest accommodation was refused due to the scale and bulk and its visual impact on the character of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposed scheme addresses the bulk by reducing the overall length of the extension and includes a section of the eaves and ridge line which is lower, further reducing the bulk closest to the properties in Pegg Close. The scheme as amended is now acceptable in terms of its visual impact when viewed in the context of the existing building and the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.
4.6 The other aspect which raised concern on the previous scheme is the potential overlooking to neighbours from first and second floor windows of the proposed extension. The reduced scale of the extension significantly improves this aspect of the scheme. The windows to the front (East) elevation do face the rear garden of No 74 Dereham Road which is a single storey dwelling, the boundary treatment of 74 is a 1.8 metre brick wall. Although there may be some loss of privacy from first floor windows of the proposed extension, it could be argued the garden is already overlooked to a degree by other first floor windows of the existing properties in Pegg Close. Although I acknowledge that there may be some additional loss of privacy from the extension, this is not so significant as to justify refusal on loss of privacy and amenity grounds.

4.7 Although the Parish Council have supported the application they have raised concern on the parking facilities available. This issue is also raised by the Highways Authority. At present there are 10 spaces shown on the plan, with the number of rooms available and available spaces for the owners a total of 14 spaces are required. The Highways suggest that amended plans be submitted to turn the spaces on the east of the site by 90 degrees to provide additional spaces and improve access to the rear of the site where there are additional parking spaces. These plans have been requested but at the time of the report not received, an update will be provided verbally at committee.

4.8 Subject to the receipt of the amended plans to provide adequate parking spaces, the revised scheme accords with the above policies and provides additional accommodation to provide the opportunity to make the existing business more viable while providing additional tourist/guest accommodation in the locality.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and EMP6, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The conversion of the existing restaurant to additional guest accommodation, and the extension of an additional accommodation wing are acceptable in terms of scale and design and provides the existing business with the opportunity to diversify from restaurant business into the guest accommodation business which is more viable in this location. The scheme accords with policy EMP6 of SNLP. The loss of privacy to neighbouring properties is not significant to justify refusal and subject to the revision of parking layout accords with the requirements of the Highways Officer.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
22. **Appl. No** : 2013/0248/RVC  
**Parish** : WORTWELL

Applicants Name : Mr Steve Hayes  
Site Address : Sub-division Of The Garden Of 109 High Road Wortwell Norfolk IP20 0EG  
Proposal : Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1818/F - A change of layout & appearance to plot 1 & 2

Recommendation : Approval 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. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
6. No alterations to lose garage  
7. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
8. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
9. Surface Water  
10. New Water Efficiency  
11. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
12. Provision of parking, service  
13. Residential drive surface  
14. Obscure glazing to front gable window

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 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
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 2012/1818  
Extension of time limit to planning permission 2009/1356 - Proposed 2no. 4 bed roomed dwellings and associated site works (access from Willow Close)  
Approved

2.2 2009/1356  
Proposed 2no. 4 bedroomed dwellings and associated site works (access from Willow Close)  
Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**
- The Parish Council have no view on the overall design of the property, but feel the velux windows should be the same height and both near the ridge of the roof to give neighbours privacy.
- Development should be started as soon as possible to ease the uncertainty and to stop the site being used as a dumping site.
- Important that existing trees on site particularly closest to Willow Close are retained.

3.2 **District Member**
To be determined by committee if for approval
- Increase in height of dwellings means they are two and half storey in cul-de sac of bungalows
- Potential overlooking
- Red tiles and grey metals windows do not fit into local scene
- Much soil will need to be excavated, will lead to disturbance during excavation and removal
- Root disturbance caused by construction
- Is car parking and turning space adequate

3.3 **NCC Highways**
No objection

3.4 **Environmental Services (Protection)**
Conditional support
- Satisfactory contamination report has been submitted
- Imported soil must not in contaminated

3.5 **Representations**
Six letters of objection
- Not in keeping with other properties in Willow Close and out of character with the area
- Would make the houses more dominant
- Red roofs will make the properties very dominant
- Question use of materials and metal windows and doors
- Over looking to properties opposite
- Boundary with plot 2 has changed and there will be less space for parking and turning
- Access and turning area looks very narrow
- How will tree roots be protected as trees will be retained
- Would it be better to build one house in the bottom of the pit
- Needs to do something soon as what the plot is being used for a the moment is not suitable for the neighbourhood
- Concern about the removal of soil
- Letters all refer to previous concerns which include; emergency vehicles will be blocked, road already has subsidence problem, over development, the site is not suitable for residential development, insufficient car parking and potential flooding problems from increase surface water run off

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to the rear/side garden of 109 High Road, Wortwell which has its vehicle access from Willow Close. This part of the garden has a considerable change in levels from the main garden of 109 and also has a considerable drop from Willow Close - creating a 'pit' like appearance (Willow Close as whole being a former quarry site). Willow Close is a small cul-de-sac of modest bungalows with a dwelling house (111 High Road) to the north of the site. The site is located within the development limits of Wortwell.
4.2 Permission was approved in 2009 for two four bedroom dwellings and detached garages on the site; this was a committee decision contrary to officer recommendation. The approved dwellings have two storeys at the rear but would be single storey on the road frontage. The time limit was extended on this permission earlier this year, application number 2012/1818. This application proposes to change the design, scale and site layout of the dwellings.

4.3 The site is within the development limit for Wortwell so there is a presumption in favour of the development. Policy HOU7 in the South Norfolk Local Plan however, is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, so has been given no weight in this decision. The principle of new development within existing development boundaries however, is carried forward in the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. Policies IMP8 requiring development not to adversely affect the safe and free flow of traffic and IMP9 which seeks to protect residential amenity are consistent with the NPPF and therefore have been given due weight. The principle of development has already been established by the current permission on the site, which has been given material weight in considering this application.

4.4 This application originally proposed two larger dwellings over three floors with one and half storeys on the road frontage. The proposal has now been amended to reduce the height of the dwellings, so they are single storey on the frontage. The dwellings will be slightly taller than the previously approved dwellings, but plot 1 will be the same height as 11 Willow Close above road level (4.9 metres) and plot 2 will be 4.7 metres above road level. The scale of the dwellings in terms of the road frontage is now more in line with the existing bungalows in Willow Close.

4.5 The approved scheme reflects more strongly the design of the existing bungalows, whereas the proposed dwellings have a more contemporary design with a canopy hanging over the front floor, glazing to the front gable, aluminium windows and areas of cedar boarding. There is no objection to a more contemporary approach to the design and it is not considered necessary or beneficial to replicate the seventies design of the existing bungalows. Concern has been raised over the use of materials in particular the red tiles and aluminium windows. The roof materials within the locality are largely darker in colour and although replicating the existing tiles in Willow Close would not be appropriate, a darker colour tile would be more in keeping. The applicant has removed the reference to a specific tile and is happy to agree the precise materials as a condition. The use of aluminium windows reflects the more contemporary design of the dwellings.

4.6 The design of the dwellings includes a glazed area to the gable fronting the road. Concern has been expressed regarding potential over looking from this. On the original proposal this was in front of a void within a gallery landing so it would have not caused significant overlooking, with the amended proposal the gable will form part of a vaulted ceiling over the hall so it will not be possible to see out of it. The amended drawing however, now shows this area as being obscured glazed. Concern has also been raised regarding over looking from the velux roof lights. The amended plans reduce the number of roof lights the remaining roof lights serve the ensuite bathroom and staircase and look towards the front garden of the neighbours which is not a private space. Due to the design and positioning of the dwellings and garages the proposal will not result in a significant loss of amenity to surrounding properties.

4.7 It is now proposed to dig the dwellings into the site which will result in areas of soil needing to be excavated and removed from the site. Concern has been raised regarding the additional disturbance caused by the excavation and removal of the earth. Although there may be some additional disturbance this will not be significant enough to warrant refusal.
4.8 Concern has been raised with previous applications regarding the narrowness of the road and adequacy of car parking on the site. The Highway Officer has not objected to this application but the layout has been amended to increase the size of the turning/parking areas which will provide additional space and aid turning within the site.

4.9 It is proposed to retain the trees as shown on the plan. However, these will need to be trimmed to accommodate the dwellings and garages. These trees are not of sufficient quality to be subject to a tree preservation order so we cannot insist on their retention. Although it is intended to retain the trees as part of the development given the proximity of the dwellings it may not be possible to do this, the applicant has offered to replant any trees if any have to be removed.

4.10 A contamination report has been submitted with the application which shows there is no contamination present on the site. The Council’s Ecologist was consulted on the original application and considered that it was not necessary to submit an Ecology report.

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, Policy 2 – Water and energy and Policy 15 – Service Centres of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP8 – Safe and free flow of traffic and IMP9 – Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Policies IMP8 and IMP9 are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework so have been given due weight. Policy HOU7 however is not consistent with the NPPF so has not been given any weight in this decision.

5.2 The proposed dwelling have been designed to reflect the scale of dwellings within the existing area and will provide additional dwellings within the development limit for Wortwell without adversely affecting the amenity of surrounding dwellings or the safe and free flow of traffic.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833 and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applicants Name: Vello Limited
Site Address: Land At Windmill Public House Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal: Demolition of part of existing public house and out building.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Planning Policies

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/2309 Proposed residential scheme for the erection of three new 2 bed bungalows with garages and conversion of public house into a 3 bedroom property with double garage and garden space and new access

2.2 2010/0181 Retrospective application for continued use of portacabin as storage. Alterations to create smoking area. Replacement of windows in UPVC to front elevation to timber, continued use of UPVC windows to side and rear elevation and fascias & gutters (UPVC)

2.3 2009/0035 Retrospective application for continued use of portacabin as storage. Alterations to create smoking area. Re-placement of windows in UPVC frames to include upvc fascias, gutters and cladding.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Should be approved subject to the views of the conservation officer.

3.2 District Member Should be determined by Committee. Reason: situated within a conservation area.
3.3 Conservation Officer The Windmill building is a building of townscape significance in the Wymondham Conservation Area appraisal.
No objections.
Involves removal of flat roof additions which make no positive contribution to the building or conservation area.

3.4 Representations None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application is seeking conservation area consent to demolish the existing modern additions to the public house building.

4.2 There is a full planning application for conversion of the remainder of the public house building to a dwelling and erection of three bungalows to the rear currently being considered.

4.3 The existing public house is identified as a building of 'townscape significance' in the Wymondham Conservation Area Appraisal.

4.4 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.

4.5 The main issue in this case is the impact on the character and appearance of Wymondham Conservation Area

4.6 The more recent flat roofed additions to the building that are proposed to be demolished do not make a positive contribution to the building or the conservation area. The loss of those additions without replacement would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. However, it will be necessary to ensure that the part of the building to be retained is made good in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The more recent flat roofed additions to the building that are proposed to be demolished do not make a positive contribution to the building or the conservation area. The loss of those additions without replacement would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. The conditions should ensure that the part of the building to be retained is made good in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications Referred Back to Committee

Parish : MULBARTON

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

Recommendation : Approval as per the report attached as appendix 2 and subject to a Section 106 agreement as detailed in this report.

1. Introduction

1.1 The above application was considered at the Development Management Committee of 5 December 2012. The recommendation as proposed by officers was accepted by committee subject to the formation of a Section 106 agreement to secure several contributions and obligations.

1.2 Further to that meeting, NP law were instructed to progress the Section 106 agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms supplied by the applicant. These Heads of Terms and a detailed note of how each contribution/obligation had been derived have formed part of the application submission since 11 October 2012 and were part of a package of details which had been re-advertised and notified to neighbours and consultees.

1.3 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations clearly state that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

1.4 The committee report had a statement below the recommendation advising of Sec 106 matters. However, the report did not distinguish between obligations which met the statutory test and those which did not specifically state that any of the contributions were a determining factor. The Council’s solicitors have advised that offered contributions which do not meet the CIL Regulation requirements should not be taken into account in the Committee’s decision making.

2. Obligations and Contributions

2.1 Over the page is a tabular assessment which details each contribution/obligation, how it has been derived and whether it has been considered to be material factor within the officers recommendation.
### Obligation/Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer Contributions</th>
<th>Derived</th>
<th>Is it CIL compliant and can it be taken into account?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, library and community contributions totalling £500,000</td>
<td>NCC obligations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable housing</th>
<th>JCS Policy requirement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 33% of the total housing for affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Open Space</th>
<th>SNC Local Plan policy and forms part of the application description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.56 ha of public open space to be managed at the applicants cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Forms part of the application description and the local allotment society has confirmed a requirement for them.</th>
<th>Yes, because it is included within the description of development proposal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of two parcels of allotments totalling 0.61 ha. Allotments to be created with utilities and access and provided to Mulbarton Parish Council for £1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctors Surgery</th>
<th>From negotiations with the Humbleyard Doctors Surgery. This has not been requested by any consultee and will be provided through a separate legal agreement between the Doctors surgery and landowner. The present Section 106 agreement will not deal with this matter at all.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of relocation of the existing doctors surgery to the application site, subject to fixed term land reservation and subject to obtaining of a future planning permission, for £1. The current doctors surgery land would then be ceded to the applicant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mulbarton Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Is Material Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£150,000 for various works, which could include new gates, upgraded parking and footpath areas, mobile classrooms, general improvement works to the school.</td>
<td>No. standard education payment required by NCC Obligations. It has been secured by the school through negotiations with the applicant. It has not been requested by any statutory consultee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 At the Council’s request the applicant supplied an indicative plan detailing how the surgery could be accommodated within the development while still providing for 180 dwellings and all the other elements in the application. Within the recommendation this was the only material consideration given to this contribution. Due to the existing doctors surgery being outside of the application site this contribution will be subject to a separate legal agreement between the Humbleyard Doctors Surgery and the land owner, it will not form part of the Section 106 agreement to accompany this application.

2.4 Should the agreement between the doctors surgery and landowner materialise such development would be subject to a full planning application. The outline application demonstrates that the doctors could be accommodated on site but a full application would need to demonstrate the principle of the development and evaluate the impacts of it.

The extra money to be provided to the Mulbarton Schools is not derived from any statutory need. The money would be provided in three instalments concurrently with the phases of the development and would be at the discretion of the board of governors to spend. Any improvement works which they identify to spend the money on could be subject to further planning approvals and/or other consents. This monetary contribution is not a material consideration and never formed any part of the officers determination of a recommendation. Although it does not comply with the CIL regulations requirements it can be included within the Section 106 agreement provided that it is not considered to be a material consideration in the determination of the application by committee.

Conclusion

3. The Council’s solicitors have advised that all of the matters contained in the table above and the mechanisms to secure them should be brought to members attention.

3.1 Although the report appended is clear as to which issues had weight in the determination of the application and set out the developers contributions, it is considered necessary that clarity is given with regard to the CIL regulation requirements.
3.3  This report does not alter any of the matters previously considered and does not impact on the overall officer recommendation. Members should not take account in their determination the extra £150,000 being provided to the Mulbarton Schools nor the potential relocation of a doctors surgery to the application site.

4  Recommendation

4.1  Subject to the contents of this report approve with conditions as per officers recommendation of 5 December 2012 in the report as attached as Appendix 2 and subject to a Section 106 agreement as detailed within this report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  
Ian Reilly, 01508 533674

and E-mail:  ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. 
Appl. No : 2011/2093
Parish : MULBARTON
Applicants Name : Welbeck Strategic Land - Mr Erik Pagano
Site Address : Land East Of Long Lane Mulbarton Norfolk NR14 6AW
Proposal : Development of 180 dwellings (Use Class C3), access, allotments, public open space and associated infrastructure.
Recommendation : Approve

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

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

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 15: Service Villages
Development Management Committee

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

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

2. Planning History

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

3. Consultations

3.1 Mulbarton Parish Council

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

Fordon Parish Council

Concerns regarding the possible increase in traffic down Long Lane.

Swardeston Parish Council

No comments received

3.2 District Members:
Cllr N G M Legg

The application should be determined by committee, as it is a major development outside of the development boundary.

Cllr J Herbert

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer

No objections

3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection subject to conditions

3.5 Environment Agency

No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.6 English Heritage

No objections

3.7 Environmental Services

No objections subject to EA conditions being imposed

3.8 Historic Environment Service

No objections. Conditions recommended

3.9 Housing Strategy Manager

No objections subject to securing the affordable housing provision through a section 106.

3.10 Landscape Officer

No objections

3.11 Natural England

No objections
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.12</th>
<th>NCC Highways</th>
<th>No objection subject to conditions and agreements secured through a Section 106.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>NCC- Planning Obligations</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Public Right Of Way</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Police Architectural Liaison Officer</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Play And Amenities Area Officer</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>The application (for 180 dwellings) is on the site of our preferred site in Mulbarton. Preferred sites have emerged after assessment against sustainability criteria during the site selection process. However, we are currently in the middle of a public consultation on our preferred sites, and additional evidence received at this time could affect the 'preferred' status of a site. Our preferred site is smaller than the application site, and we have suggested 150 dwellings as a limit, subject to suitable access/highways work. However, there is currently a shortage of housing supply in the Norwich Policy Area. Other constraints on the site include surface water drainage, water supply and sewerage capacity, with water mains crossing the site. A draft policy consideration is that the development of this site should contribute towards B1113/A140 junction improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>The Ramblers (Norfolk Area)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.19  | Local Residents | The application has been subject to 151 letters of representation. There have been 149 received objecting to the development. The objections raise the following issues:  
- Increased flooding  
- Increased urbanisation of the locality  
- The density of the development is too high  
- The development is contrary to Saved Policies ENV8 and IMP8  
- The village is only supposed to have a further 15 - 20 dwellings  
- The development is contrary to the aims of NPPF as it is not sustainable  
- Loss of privacy for neighbouring dwellings  
- Increase in noise pollution for neighbouring dwellings  
- Light and CO2 pollution from cars  
- The rural character of the route in and out of the village will be lost  
- The lack of a five year land supply is not a good reason to approve the development  
- Currently inadequate road and footpath/cycleway system which will be come worse with increased traffic and the proposals to increase provision are not sufficient |
The new junction proposed at Long Lane, The Rosary and Cuckoo field Lane is inadequate.

Community consultation event was misleading.

The relocation of the surgery will lead to increased traffic on The Rosary.

The development is in the wrong place, if a new development is required it should be to the north of the village where there are better roads.

Traffic concerns regarding construction traffic and workers and cars.

There is no need for a mini roundabout adjacent Mulbarton Hall it would restrict rather than improve flow of traffic and damage the rural amenity and environment of Mulbarton Common.

Highway work impacts on the conservation area and the listed Mulbarton Hall.

The development will not result in any modal shift occurring.

The relocation of the surgery will fragment the existing services encouraging people to drive rather than walk.

The Hopkins development is unfinished and has houses still for sale.

The current services would not be able to cope with extra demand.

No parking for allotment holders to the north.

Concerns regarding when traffic count took place.

A letter of support has been received from the Humbleyward Doctors Surgery it advises that:

- The current surgery building is at the end of its useful life and has been identified as requiring to be replaced.
- Th building cannot be given any further significant extensions which would allow for the provision of further medical staff to meet the demands of the growing population of Mulbarton and surrounding localities.
- The current proposals represent the best chance the doctors surgery has of being able to meet the current and future demands of the area.

A letter of support has been received from the Chair of Governors of Mulbarton Primary School on behalf of the two Mulbarton Schools. It advises the following:

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

**Site Context**

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

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

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

**Proposal**

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

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

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

**Principle of development**

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

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

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

4.10 The application proposes to develop the site for up to 180 dwellings, which is larger than the suggested amount given by JCS Policy 15. However, given the amount of dwellings required within the NPA, as stated in JCS Policy 9, and the direction provided by the NPPF regarding the 5 year land supply issue the principle of development is considered to be acceptable. Therefore the development should be considered on its sustainability merits, impacts on the existing locality and its potential to be delivered within 5 years.
4.11 It should also be noted that the application site encompasses Site No 1148/S0141 which has been identified through the South Norfolk Council Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document for residential development with a suggested land use of 150 dwellings.

Sustainability

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Highway Impacts

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

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

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

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

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

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

Design

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

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

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

Deliverability

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

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

**Residential amenity**

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

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

**Conclusion**

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

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

4.34 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application.

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

5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application.

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

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Ian Reilly 01603 533674
ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### PLANNING APPEALS
Appeals received from 15 February 2013 to 14 March 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/0959</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON Meadow View The Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane</td>
<td>Mr R Brown</td>
<td>Retrospective application for retention of mobile home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1860</td>
<td>FRAMINGHAM EARL 9 Long Road</td>
<td>Miss Francesca Savino</td>
<td>Proposed garden gates and wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appeal decisions from 15 February 2013 to 14 March 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>2012/0951</td>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY Landlords Flat at Kings Head Inn The Street</td>
<td>Mr Graham Scott</td>
<td>Removal of condition 3 of planning permission 1998/1012/F - to allow flat to be either sold or leased separately from the public house</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1009</td>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY Kings Head Inn The Street</td>
<td>Mr Graham Scott</td>
<td>Block up two toilet windows on west elevation</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed (note refused on lack of justification principle acceptable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1478</td>
<td>DISS 105 E R A S Ltd Providence Court Denmark Street</td>
<td>Mr Alex Pearce</td>
<td>Replacement of the front windows</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEDGRAVE 29 Norwich Road</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Bush</td>
<td>Proposed rear extension</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUNWELL Wood View Wood Lane</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs S Sullivan</td>
<td>Proposed extensions, detached garage and road access</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>