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 (Chairman)</td>
<td>Mr T East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Blake (Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that planning application Item Nos 1-5 will be heard from 1pm onwards.

Planning application Item Nos 6-12 will be heard from 3pm onwards.

Pool of Substitutes

To be appointed | To be appointed

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

12.00pm – 12.30pm | Biomefield Room

Date

Wednesday 22 May 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 to 5, and arrive at 3.00 pm if you intend to speak on items 6 to 12.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance.

Large print version can be made available.
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

**THEREFORE** we will:

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

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

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 24 April 2013; (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters; (attached – page 23)
   To consider the applications as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013/0092/O</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land South Of Ringwood Close Little Melton</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/1836/O</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/0086/O</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land South East Of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/0087/O</td>
<td>BRAMERTON</td>
<td>Land North Of Church Farm The Street Bramerton</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/1122/F</td>
<td>ALBURGH</td>
<td>South Farm Alburgh Harleston</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/0357/CU</td>
<td>DITCHINGHAM</td>
<td>Dark Hole Toad Lane Thwaite</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/0419/F</td>
<td>SWAINSTORPE</td>
<td>The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/0420/LB</td>
<td>SWAINSTORPE</td>
<td>The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013/0495/H</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013/0496/LB</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2013/0523/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Diss Garden Centre Victoria Road Diss</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2013/0563/CU</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Tatters 6 St. Nicholas Street Diss</td>
<td>84</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 88)

8. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 19 June 2013  **10.00 am**
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>Fire alarm</th>
<th>If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

B Does it directly affect me, my partner or spouse’s financial position, in particular:

- employment, employers or businesses;
- companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value or more than 1% of nominal share holding
- land or leases they own or hold
- contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

YES

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

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

NO

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?

YES

NO

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

Have I declared the interest as another 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?

NO

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

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

Briefing Note and Introduction for the following three reports on applications 2012/1836/O, 2013/0086/O and 2013/0092/O at Little Melton.

Site Address:
- 2012/1836: Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk
- 2013/0086: Land South East Of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk
- 2013/0092: Land South Of Ringwood Close Little Melton Norfolk

Proposal:
- 2012/1836: Outline application for residential development (20 Dwellings) and associated infrastructure works
- 2013/0086: Outline application including means of access for residential development and ancillary works
- 2013/0092: Outline application for up to 20 residential units and associated highways works with all matters reserved

1. Policy Background.

1.1 Little Melton is classed as a Service Village in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The JCS allocates Little Melton 10-20 dwellings plus consideration of additional development to help deliver the smaller sites NPA allowance. During the early stages of the Site Specific Allocations a group of sites for 50 dwellings were identified based on advice received from NCC Highways to allow a comprehensive transport masterplan. This group of sites formed the basis of the Preferred Options consultation in autumn 2012.

During the consultation NCC Highways made a more detailed assessment of the options and concluded that Mill Road and the Mill Road / Burnthouse Lane crossroads can only accommodate a further 20 dwellings (see below). This limits the total scale of development off Mill Road.

The sites in Little Melton have been reconsidered and a Preferred Option for 20 dwellings has been identified (part of the Ringwood Close site), and this is currently out for consultation until 5pm on 22 May.

2. Comments from NCC Highways

2.1 Constraints on local highway network that will limit scale of development. School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction side road visibility is substandard on both side road junctions, particularly to west where a property wall and hedge reduces drivers’ view.

2.2 In principle it is possible to improve visibility, but third party land would be required. In the absence of junction improvements, the allocation should be constrained to 20 dwellings to avoid unacceptable increases in traffic on School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction.

2.3 Any proposal beyond a maximum of 20 dwellings should include:
1. Improved visibility to the side roads that gain access on to the priority route at School Lane/Burnthouse Road/Mill Road/Great Melton Road junction;
2. Mill Road carriageway widened to 4.8m to provide adequate passing provision;
3. 1.5m wide continuous footway on Mill Road on at least one side;
4. 20mph speed limit on Mill Road; and  
5. Resolution and accommodation of surface water drainage deficiencies in Mill Road.

2.4 Approval of any of the applications will contribute to additional traffic movements that will be detrimental to pedestrian safety and flow along Mill Road and generate additional traffic movements at School Lane/Burnhouse Lane/Mill Road/Great Melton crossroad increasing potential for traffic accidents.

2.5 Unlikely to object to where the total number of dwellings is limited to 20 units and where drainage and other issues are resolved. Any development above this number should be conditional upon the provision of items 1 to 5 above.

3. Comment

3.1 All the sites are located outside the saved SNLP adopted Development Limit for Little Melton. Applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the adopted Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development where the Development Plan is out of date (including where the Plan does not identify a 5 year residential land supply as is currently the case in the Norwich Policy Area).

3.2 The Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD Proposed Amendments to Preferred Options that is currently out to consultation has concluded that all three Little Melton sites under determination are acceptable in principle, but a preferred site for 20 dwellings in Little Melton (site 619a, the northern part of the Ringwood Close site) has been identified.

3.3 The Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD has not reached the Pre-Submission stage, so little weight can be given to the document in the determination of the three Little Melton applications. However the assessment of the sites undertaken is a material consideration.

3.4 The cumulative impact of development in terms of highway safety is set out above in the NCC Highways comments. The constraints resulting from the poor quality of the highways and the crossroads junction do not appear to be easily remedied. The necessary widening and other improvements would require additional land from private owners. While a comprehensive improvement scheme might be possible, this would be likely to take a considerable time to achieve and in the current land supply situation it is appropriate to determine the applications as soon as possible. In the absence of the more extensive highway improvements, the highway advice is that no more than 20 additional dwellings should be approved with access via Mill Road.

3.5 Because there is not currently a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, the refusal of any of the applications purely on the basis that the site falls outside the current adopted Development Limit would be difficult to justify.

3.6 The following three reports assess the site specific merits of each application. It is usually the case that each planning application is considered solely on its own merits and the relative merits of other sites is not a material consideration. An unusual situation has arisen in this case however, where we have three applications before us, but highway constraints suggest that no more than one of them (20 dwellings) should be approved. In these particular circumstances it is reasonable to assess the relative merits of the three sites at the same time and to choose which one (if any) is preferred for approval. The other two then fall prey to the highway capacity constraint.

3.7 Having considered the merits of each case and being restricted to a limit of 20 dwellings, marginally and on balance, 2013/0092 (Ringwood Close) is being recommended for approval by Officers. However, Members are advised to consider the merits of all three applications before deciding which (if any) should be approved.
1. **Appl. No** : 2013/0092/O  
   **Parish** : LITTLE MELTON

   **Applicant’s Name** : Mrs J Grady  
   **Site Address** : Land South Of Ringwood Close Little Melton Norfolk  
   **Proposal** : Outline application for up to 20 residential units and associated highways works with all matters reserved

   **Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

   1. Outline permission time limit
   2. Reserved matters
   3. In accordance with submitted drawings
   4. External materials to be agreed
   5. Slab level to be agreed
   6. Location of existing trees on site (outline)
   7. Boundary treatment to be agreed
   8. Full details of external lighting
   9. Water efficiency
   10. Surface water drainage scheme
   11. Contaminated land
   12. Retention of vegetation along western boundary
   13. Further reptile surveys
   14. Ecological management plan
   15. Maintenance of amenity areas/structural landscaping
   16. Construction work
   17. Tree protection
   18. Fire Hydrant
   19. Detailed plans for roads and footways
   20. Construction of roads and footways
   21. 20mph speed limit along Mill Road

Subject to a S106 legal agreement for: Affordable housing; County monitoring charge; Primary and High School provision; Library; Maintenance of biodiversity areas and Play space

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 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
   - NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
   - 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
   - Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside
   - Policy 20 : Implementation
1.3  **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 17: Off site road improvements  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4  **Supplementary Planning Document**  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2.  **Planning History**

Some are part and some are all of the application site

2.1 1990/0286/O 12 Residential plots Refused
2.2 1986/0139/O 2 dwellings Refused
2.3 1983/2440/O Dwellings Withdrawn
2.4 1976/2919/O Residential Development Refused

3.  **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Original Submission:  
- PC committed to minimizing scale of new development because of 2006 Parish Plan and inadequacy of roads within village.  
- JCS designated 10 to 20 houses.  
- Cannot understand why 68 proposed.  
- Mill Road is a limiting factor.  
- Highways have stated cross roads can only sustain 20 additional houses.  
- PC considers Mill Road can only sustain 30 new houses in total.  
- PC suggests only 15 houses on this site, only 10 before cross roads are improved.  
- Submitted traffic forecasts do not accord with observed behaviour.  
- Poor provision of public transport.  
- High ratio of car ownership.  
- Mill Road is single track in parts.  
- Mill Road carries traffic to events at Village Hall, Church, Playing Field, Business Park, Hethersett.  
- Events at these venues can coincide attracting 100 cars and causing traffic jams and parking problems.  
- Mill Road poorly drained, prone to flooding and ice.  
- Cumulative impact of development already approved at Hethersett and NRP.  
- Concern about visibility, junctions, speed and volume of traffic exiting Little Melton at Rectory Lane and Green Lane.
- PC request funding from development to provide measures to discourage rat running via School lane.
- Mill Road should have 20mph speed limit.
- School, pub and shop have associated traffic problems.
- Concern about future maintenance of play areas, ecology buffers and open space.
- Should not have street lighting.
- Unacceptable burden on residents of Ringwood Close
- Should be no provision for development on adjoining plots.
- An exit onto Great Melton Road for some houses would mitigate the effect on Mill Road and Ringwood Close.

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environment Agency  
Original submission:
- Object.
  - FRA does not comply with paragraph 9 of NPPF Technical Guide.
  - FRA fails to adequately consider infiltration drainage.
  - Recommend condition regarding contaminated land
  - Recommendations regarding sustainability

Revised proposal:
- Remove objection subject to condition regarding surface water drainage scheme

3.4 Planning Policy  
Original submission:
- JCS allocates Little Melton 10-20 dwellings plus consideration for additional development to help deliver the smaller sites in the NPA allowance.
- During the Site Specific Allocations process a group of preferred sites was identified in Little Melton partly due to highway considerations which could accommodate 50 dwellings.
- The application is one of the group of sites preferred at that stage.
- The Highways Authority have taken a more detailed look at sites during the recent Preferred Options consultation and consequently the sites in Little Melton have been reconsidered.
- The northern part of this site (site 619a) is now the only Preferred Option site for Little Melton, albeit that this decision is currently out for consultation until 5pm on 22 May 2013.
- The NPA does not have a five-year supply of housing land.

3.5 Conservation Officer  
Revised Proposal:
- Solely in relation to impact on setting of grade II* listed St Mary and All Saints Church.
- Do not feel key views of the Church or from it would be adversely affected.
- Retention of existing vegetation along western boundary will be key to maintaining existing setting.
- Can support an outline application with conditions regarding retention and enhancement of western boundary, limit ridge heights, layout to respect and enhance views of church.
- Development could add to church setting by designing in new views and enhancing the relationship.
- Do not agree with the line taken by English Heritage.
3.6 Design Officer

Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored: 10 greens, 2 ambers.

3.7 Historic Environment

Service

Original Submission:
- Potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest may be present.
- Applicant was advised at pre-application to submit an archaeological evaluation.
- Request application be withdrawn in accordance with NPPF para 135 because an archaeological evaluation has not been submitted.

Following submission of additional archaeological information:
- Lack of archaeological features identified in trial trenching.
- Do not require any further work.

Revised Proposal:
- No comments.
- Require no further archaeological work.

3.8 NCC: Ecologist

Revised Proposal:
- Ecology report is fit for purpose.
- Great crested newts and hedgehogs may be using the site.
- Further reptile surveys are recommended and should be undertaken before the reserved matters stage.
- Recommend conditions regarding reptile survey, ecological management plan and tree buffer to be adopted by appropriate authority.

3.9 Environmental Services (Protection)

Original submission:
- No objection to principle.
- Recommend condition regarding contaminated land investigation, lighting and construction work.

3.10 Landscape Officer

Revised Proposal:
- No objection.
- Concern regarding long term management of vegetation.
- Request conditions regarding management of boundary vegetation, tree protection and landscape design and implementation.

3.11 Norfolk County Council Flood & Water Management

No comments received

3.12 NCC - Planning Obligations

- S106 Monitoring charge of £600 plus possibly a transport monitoring charge.
- The High School is considered as full.
- Contributions will be sought towards primary and High School provision.
- Request condition requiring provision of a fire hydrant.
- Seek £60 per dwelling towards the cost of library provision.
- A commuted sum to cover future maintenance of biodiversity areas may be required.
3.13 Play And Amenities
Area Officer

Revised Proposal:
- Preference for payment in lieu of provision of play equipment and 400sqm minimum space plus the expected commuted sum.
- Would be allocated to parish Council to enhance and improve play facilities at local parish play area.
- Total in lieu of provision would be £65418
- Requirement for open space/ green area on site.

3.14 Flood Defence
Officer

Original Submission:
- Recommend condition regarding surface water drainage.

3.15 Anglian Water
Services Ltd

Original Submission:
- Request informative re Anglian water assets
- There is capacity for foul water drainage flows
- Environment Agency should be consulted
- Surface water should be to soakaway

Revised Proposal:
- No comment.

3.16 Housing Strategy
Manager

Original Submission:
- Accords with current policy requirements in terms of the number of affordable dwellings.
- Unable to support the proposed type and tenure mix for the affordable housing.
- Request 3 x 1 bed for rent; 4 x 2 bed for rent; 1 x 3 bed for rent; and 1 x 2 bed for shared ownership.

Revised Proposal:
- 33% should be affordable.
- Equates to 7 dwellings.
- Support the mix of affordable.

3.17 NCC Highways

Recommends refusal
- Restricted visibility at junction of Ringwood Close and Mill Lane
- Restricted visibility at junction School Lane Burnthouse Lane.
- Therefore, scale of development in Little Melton should be limited to 20 dwellings.

Revised Proposal:
- Number of dwelling reduced to 20.
- Applicant propose planning condition to reduce speed limit to 20mph.
- Recommends permission be granted subject to conditions regarding provision of roads and footways and a 20mph speed limit on Mill Lane.
- Not in favour of a footway link to Great Melton Road.

3.18 English Heritage

Revised Proposal:
- Has potential to cause harm to setting of Grade II* listed St Mary and All Saints Church.
- Detailed application should be required.
- Some scope for development of the site.
- Concern about height and location of dwellings.
- Recommend LPA request a detailed application and refuse outline application.
3.20 Representations

1 letter raising questions.

1 letter of support making the following comments:
- Would stop rubbish dumping on field
- Would make area tidy
- Will stop thieves using it as an escape route

Letters from 9 properties objecting and making the following comments:

- Additional traffic
- Mill Road needs drastic changes to accommodate traffic
- Floods in Mill Road
- Narrow piece of road with poorly designed footpath that cars park on that has caused minor shunts
- Grass verges are currently destroyed due to narrow road
- Lack of visibility when exiting properties onto Mill Road
- Concrete kerbs should be put in along grass verges to protect verges
- Traffic could go through to Great Melton Road
- Ringwood Close too narrow for construction traffic
- Ringwood Close and Mill Road junction difficult to negotiate/lack of visibility
- Existing on street parking problems
- Nuisance, danger and delays to road users
- Traffic speed on Mill Road needs controlling
- Crossroads junction unsuitable and inadequate to support further development.
- Additional traffic near schools
- Cars mount footpath
- Access should be via Great Melton Road
- Access should not be from Great Melton Road
- Ringwood Close could be widened
- Road for new development should link up with Mill Road site
- Loss of view
- Social housing will devalue present properties
- Noise and disruption to present residents
- Improved bus service should be provided
- Concern about location of play area
- Concern about future maintenance of play area and landscaping
- Density too high. Should be no greater than that of village
- Drainage
- Concern about heights of proposed development
- Concern that development will not be in keeping with character of village
- Overlooking of garden of Orchard House Great Melton Road
- Loss of beech trees along The Brambles boundary
- Removal of woodland
- Village school already full
- Contrary to Local Plan
- Piecemeal part of a larger development
- Loss of rural amenity
- Greenfield site should not be developed
- Brownfield sites should be used
- Where is the planning gain
- Village should get mains gas
- Properties should be carbon neutral
- Properties should have solar panels
Development Management Committee  22 May 2013

- Small plots will be a cause for social concern
- Existing sense of space should be maintained
- Contrary to JCS Policy 15
- Outside development boundary
- Loss of amenity/privacy to Ceol Mor Great Melton Road
- There should be no further removal of vegetation on the boundaries of Ceol Mor Great Melton Road
- Bungalows should be built
- Devaluation of property

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is approximately 1.7ha and is located to the south of Ringwood Close on the edge of the existing built up area. To the north of the site are the existing dwellings on Ringwood Close, to the east and west is open land. To south are dwellings and Great Melton Road with open land beyond.

4.2 The application is in outline with all matters reserved. Therefore, the matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are all reserved matters.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The general principle of residential development in this location is set out in the introductory report.

4.6 In this case the northernmost part of the site is the preferred site in the Proposed Amendment to Preferred Options document which is currently out to public consultation. However, because the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD has not reached the Pre-Submission stage, little weight can be given to the current choice of this site (619a) in the determination of the three Little Melton applications.

4.7 Policy 4 of the JCS expects 33% affordable housing be provided. This would equate to seven affordable dwellings. The applicant has confirmed that they are prepared to meet the affordable housing requirement and mix set out in the consultation response from Housing Strategy. This can be secured by S106 agreement.

Deliverability

4.8 The applicant states in the submitted application that the applicants have vacant possession of the land and it is available for development immediately. It is the applicant’s intention to submit a reserved matters application immediately following the grant of outline planning permission. Significant detailed design work has already been undertaken on the project. The design has been worked up in close consultation with Lovell. Private developers have approached the applicant and expressed an interest in developing the site. Outline planning permission would enhance the prospects of delivery of the site, given the increased attractiveness it provides to developers. The flexibility of outline consent will enable a preferred developer to bring forward a development which is in accordance with their own bespoke model. Lovell has undertaken development appraisals to ensure the development is viable. The proposed development site is completely viable and will be delivered within 5 years.
Character and appearance of area

4.9 The development forms a natural extension to Ringwood Close by continuing the incremental growth of the village within the existing field boundaries between Ringwood Close and Great Melton Road. A significant area of informal scrub land located to the south of the site has been retained that helps to provide a strong visual link and natural transition between the proposed development and the countryside. A number of design principles have also been established that combine traditional building forms such as large gables, pitched roofs and dormer style windows with contemporary finishes that remain sympathetic to the local vernacular. The application also provides some 'indicative parameters drawings' that show how the scale and massing of buildings could relate to the surrounding character of the site.

4.10 The Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored 10 greens and 2 ambers, which is considered acceptable at this outline stage.

Heritage Assets

4.11 St Mary and All Saints Church, a grade II* listed building is located to the north-west of the site on the edge of the main built-up part of the village, with open land between the existing development and the church. The churchyard is bordered by hedges and trees that lessens the visibility from many viewpoints from the surrounding area. The application site proposes a hedge/tree border on the west side, which will help to screen the impact of the existing housing. Therefore, the principle of development of the site for residential purposes will not cause such harm to the heritage asset to warrant refusal in his case.

Highway safety

4.12 If the speed limit in the vicinity of Ringwood Close/Mill Lane junction is reduced to 20mph then this reduces the visibility distances required at this junction. Subject to this reduction in the speed limit and the number of additional dwellings taking access off Ringwood Close being limited to 20, the intensification of use of the access should not result in hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

4.13 The cumulative impact of development in Little Melton on the local highway network is covered in the introductory report.

Residential amenity

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

Biodiversity

4.15 The southern part of the site has habitat that is suitable for reptiles. Therefore, additional surveys will be required to ascertain the use of the site by any protected species and adequate mitigation provided if necessary. Given the size of the site, the number of dwelling proposed and the information already submitted with respect to biodiversity, in this case any necessary mitigation for protected species or their habitat could be achieved by condition.
Infrastructure

4.16 The Local Planning Authority is aware of concerns by a number of parties regarding the adequacy of the surface water drainage facilities in Little Melton. Surface water drainage proposals have been submitted with the application. The Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Defence Officer have been consulted on the submitted information. The application has demonstrated that it is possible develop the site for housing whilst ensuring that there is no increased flood risk to Little Melton.

4.17 The existing policies require provision of play space for a development of this size. In this case Little Melton has an existing parish play area that could be improved to meet the needs of the residents of the proposed development. Therefore, in this case a commuted sum is sought in lieu of provision to meet the play space needs generated by the development.

4.18 Norfolk County Council has confirmed the infrastructure needs generated by the development in terms of education, library and fire hydrant provision. The fire hydrant can be secured by condition whilst the other matters can all be secured by S106 agreement.

4.19 The applicant has confirmed their agreement to provide the above matters by condition and S106 agreement as relevant.

Servicing

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

Conclusion

4.21 The principle of additional development in Little Melton outside of the currently adopted Development Limit is set out in the introductory report. The application has demonstrated that the site is in principle suitable for a development of 20 dwellings. The location of the site would enable the existing character and pattern of development in Little Melton to be maintained.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, the subject to the agreement of the reserved matters, development of the site would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Adequate access and other infrastructure and services can be secured by condition and legal agreement. The development could be designed so as not to unacceptably harm the amenities of existing residential properties, the setting of heritage assets and the ecology of the area. In these circumstances the development is consistent with JCS policies 15 and 20 and SNLP policies ENV/14, ENV/15, IMP/8, IMP/9, IMP/15 and LEI/7. Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No** : 2012/1836/O  
**Parish** : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Timewell Properties Ltd  
Site Address : Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline application for residential development (20 Dwellings) and associated infrastructure works

Recommendation : Refusal

1. Detrimental to highway safety and free traffic flow, contrary to Policy IMP8 of SNLP

---

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 15 : Service Villages  
Policy 20 : Implementation  
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 7 : Supporting Communities

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 19: Parking standards  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1988/0144 Residential mobile home park Refused
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Original submission:
- Reasonable mix of housing
- Outside development boundary
- Not a preferred site
- Concern that Mill Road unable to cope with cumulative traffic volume
- Street lighting out of character with remainder of village
- Concern about future development due to road structure proposed
- Concern about maintenance responsibility for buffer zone and roads
- Concern that there is a gap in the cycle path between Hethersett and NRP.
- Developer contribution should be used to provide off road cycling provision
- Disagree with TRICS figures
- Traffic on Mill Road has doubled between 2007 and 2012.
- Increased traffic in Little Melton due to developments at Wymondham and Hethersett.
- Committed to minimising new development because of Parish Plan and roads within village inadequate. Mill Road is a limiting factor.
- Should be limited to 15 houses on this site. Only 10 before the crossroads are improved.
- Poor provision of public transport. Traffic forecasts do not accord with observed behaviour.
- Mill Road carries traffic to village hall, church, playing field, business park and Hethersett.
- Events at hall, playing field and church can coincide and attract 100 cars causing a traffic jam.
- Mill Road is poorly drained, icy, prone to flooding
- Little Melton will suffer additional traffic due to development at Hethersett
- Rectory Lane and Green Lane junctions with B1108 are dangerous.
- Would like funding to discourage rat running.
- Mill Road should have 20mph speed limit.
- Request clarity regarding maintenance of play areas, ecology buffer and open space.

3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Landscape Officer

Original submission:
- No objection.
  - Trees to be removed are young.
  - Proposed tree removal is not sufficient grounds to object.
  - Layout around the two retained silver birch trees is too tight.
  - Agree with submitted visual assessment
  - Do not envisage significant impact on landscape character subject planting of boundaries.
  - Concept is acceptable.
3.4 Environment Agency

Original submission:
- Object due to absence of surface water FRA.
- Poses low risk to controlled waters with respect to contamination.
- Will not provide detailed site specific advice or comments regarding land contamination.

Revised Plans:
- Have reviewed Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy sketch.
- Remove our previous objection on flood risk grounds
- Require condition regarding surface water drainage scheme

3.5 District Ecologist

Revised Indicative layout:
- Applicant will have to apply for a great crested newt licence from natural England.
- Following receipt of an amended indicative plan:
  - Wider ecological buffer is an improvement
  - Ecological Management Plan would be appropriate.
  - The indicative master plan incorporates, ecological buffer, landscaping, housing and play provision.
  - Recommend conditions regarding mitigation for breeding birds, bird boxes and bat boxes, an ecological management plan and minimum ecological buffer of 15m width.

3.6 NCC- Planning Obligations

S106 Monitoring charge of £600 plus possibly a transport monitoring charge.
- The High School is considered as full.
- Contributions will be sought towards primary and High School provision.
- Request condition requiring provision of a fire hydrant.
- Seek £60 per dwelling towards the cost of library provision.
- A commuted sum to cover future maintenance of vegetation on highway land and biodiversity areas may be required.

3.7 Housing Strategy Manager

Original submission:
- Unable to support application
- Application does not state the proposed affordable housing provision
- Requirement for 7 affordable dwellings
- Not aware of any informal discussions between applicant and Housing Strategy and Enabling Team
- Affordable housing provision should be clarified prior to determination of outline application
- Seek: for affordable rent, 2x1 bed unit, 3x2bed unit and 1x3bed unit. For shared ownership 1x2bed unit.
- Query contradiction between DAS and Planning Statement submitted
- Require clarification of the Code for Sustainable Homes level that the affordable housing units will meet
- Applicant should engage with a Registered Provider at the earliest opportunity

3.8 Historic Environment Service

Do not wish to comment.
3.9 Planning Policy

Original submission:
- JCS allocates Little Melton 10-20 dwellings plus consideration for additional development to help deliver the smaller sites in the NPA allowance.
- During the Site Specific Allocations process a group of preferred sites was identified in Little Melton partly due to highway considerations which could accommodate 50 dwellings.
- The application site is not one of the group of preferred sites.
- The Highways Authority have taken a more detailed look at sites during the recent Preferred Options consultation and consequently the sites in Little Melton have been reconsidered. This site is not proposed for allocation, albeit that this decision is currently out for consultation until 5pm on 22 May 2013.
- The NPA does not have a five-year supply of housing land.

3.10 Flood Defence Officer

Original submission:
- Where infiltration drainage is proposed, percolation tests should be carried out to demonstrate effectiveness
- Lack of information regarding off site drainage
- Receiving drainage system should be investigated and allowances made for storage capacity
- Preferred option for surface water drainage is SuDS
- Proposal does not fully embrace objectives of true SuDS
- Lack of information regarding future management
- Early engagement with Anglian Water essential

Following Revised drainage plan:
- Concur with EA comments on revised plans and request conditions as per EA comments.

3.11 Design Officer

Original Submission:
- Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored: 3 greens, 7 ambers and 2 reds.

Revised Plans:
- Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored: 8 greens and 4 ambers. No red.

3.12 Play And Amenities Area Officer

Preference for payment in lieu of provision of play equipment and 400sqm minimum space plus the expected commuted sum. Would be allocated to parish Council to enhance and improve play facilities at local parish play area. Total in lieu of provision would be £65418

3.13 NCC Highways

Original Submission:
- Recommends conditions regarding detailed plans and implementation of roads, footways and drainage.
(Note objection to cumulative impact over 20 dwellings)

3.14 Norfolk County Council Flood & Water Management

No comments received
3.15 Anglian Water Services Ltd

Original Submission:

- There is capacity for foul drainage flows from site at Whitlingham STW.
- The sewerage system has available capacity for these flows.
- Request surface water disposal strategy conditioned.

3.16 Representations

Letter from 5 properties objecting and making the following comments:

- Unable to park outside 7 Homecroft
- Residents of Homecroft pay to maintain road
- Road subsidence due to collapsed drains
- Increased traffic / congestion
- Extra traffic using / flow along Mill Road

Inadequate roads

- Tail back of cars emitting fumes in Gibbs Close
- Mill Road floods
- Vulnerability of pedestrians on Mill Road
- Lack of Visibility on Mill Road
- Foul drainage always a problem particularly after heavy rainfall
- Endorse comments made by PC
- Outside development boundary
- Comparatively large development for village
- Street lighting will be out of place with reminder of village
- Playspace in Gibbs Close not suitable
- Children need somewhere to play
- Concern about future development into open countryside
- Additional development could spoil essence of village
- Village has few amenities
- Cumulative impact of development
- Tree felling on site

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is approximately 1.33ha and is located to the north of Gibbs Close on the edge of the existing built up area. To the south of the site are the existing dwellings at Homecroft and Gibbs Close. To the east of the site is open countryside, with a pond adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. To the north and west is open countryside.

4.2 The application is in outline including the matter of access. The matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are all reserved.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The general principle of residential development in this location is set out in the introductory report.
4.6 The application site is not a preferred site in the Proposed Amendment to Preferred Options document which is currently out to public consultation. However, because the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD has not reached the Pre-Submission stage, little weight can be given to the current choice not to allocate this site in the determination of the three Little Melton applications.

4.7 Policy 4 of the JCS expects 33% affordable housing to be provided. This would equate to seven affordable dwellings. The applicant has confirmed that they are prepared to meet the affordable housing requirement and mix set out in the consultation response from Housing Strategy. This can be secured by S106 agreement.

Deliverability

4.8 The applicant states in the submitted application that the site is within a single ownership, is unencumbered in all respects and that they consider the site can be built and ready for occupation within 5 years.

Character and appearance of area

4.9 The design principles put forward at this stage show an opportunity to provide a scheme that responds to its local context by retaining and reinforcing existing features and creation of a strong landscape structure. The location of the site will result in built form intruding into the landscape to some extent. However, the requirement to make provision for biodiversity interests will necessitate an area of open space or vegetated space around the edge of part of the site. This arrangement will help to provide a visual link to the countryside and reinforce existing connections by creating a rural edge to the development where the site meets the countryside. This will provide a transition between the urban and rural interface and will allow sufficient landscape mitigation for views towards the site from adjacent countryside and break up the appearance of the built form.

4.10 The Building for Life evaluation scored 8 greens and 4 ambers. The reason for the slightly high number of ambers relates to a lack of details submitted at this stage. However, the application is in outline and the additional details will need to be submitted and fully considered at the reserved matters stage. Therefore, the Building For Life is acceptable at this outline stage.

Highway safety

4.11 Subject to the number of additional dwellings taking access of Mill Lane being limited to 20 dwellings, the additional traffic generated development of the site for residential use should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

4.12 The cumulative impact of development in Little Melton on the local highway network is covered in the introductory report. Note objection to more than 20 in total.

Residential amenity

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

Biodiversity

4.14 Due to the proximity of the site to existing ponds, it is very likely that the site is used as terrestrial habitat by great crested newts. The indicative layout proposes an ecological buffer around part of the site to provide a habitat corridor for wildlife.
4.15 The indicative site layout submitted demonstrates that it will be possible to accommodate the proposed dwellings and associated infrastructure and servicing on the site whilst still allowing sufficient space to provide adequate mitigation for biodiversity interests.

Infrastructure

4.16 The Local Planning Authority is aware of concerns by a number of parties regarding the adequacy of the surface water drainage facilities in Little Melton. Surface water drainage proposals have been submitted with the application. The Environment Agency and the Council's Flood Defence Officer have been consulted on the submitted information. The application has demonstrated that it is possible develop the site for housing whilst ensuring that there is no increased flood risk to Little Melton.

4.17 The existing policies require provision of play space for a development of this size. In this case Little Melton has an existing parish play area that could be improved to meet the needs of the residents of the proposed development. Therefore, in this case a commuted sum is sought in lieu of provision to meet the play space needs generated by the development.

4.18 Norfolk County Council has confirmed the infrastructure needs generated by the development in terms of education, library and fire hydrant provision. The fire hydrant can be secured by condition whilst the other matters can all be secured by S106 agreement.

4.19 The applicant has confirmed their agreement to provide the above matters by condition and S106 agreement as relevant.

Servicing

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

Conclusion

4.21 The principle of additional development in Little Melton outside of the currently adopted Development Limit is set out in the introductory report. The application has demonstrated that the site is in principle suitable for a development of 20 dwellings. However, the application is recommended for refusal due to the highway implications of cumulative development as set out in the introductory report.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 There are constraints on the local highway network. Specifically the School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction side road visibility is substandard on both side road junctions. The proposal would result in unacceptable increases in traffic on the School Lane / Burnthouse Lane junction. The proposal would contribute to additional traffic movements that would be detrimental to pedestrian safety and the flow of traffic along Mill Road. Therefore, the proposal would cause a hazard and inconvenience to users of the public highway and is contrary to (Saved) Policy IMP8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2013/0086/O  
**Parish**: LITTLE MELTON  

Applicants Name: Mr I Clark  
Site Address: Land South East Of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk  
Proposal: Outline application including means of access for residential development and ancillary works  

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Detrimental to highway safety and free traffic flow, contrary to Policy IMP8 of SNLP.

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 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15: Service Villages  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 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 9: Residential amenity  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 17: Off site road improvements  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

All or part of site

2.1 2001/0125  
Erection of stable and field shelter  
Approved

2.2 1999/0213  
Dwelling and garage  
Withdrawn

2.3 1998/1790/O  
3 dwellings  
Approved
2.4 1988/3648/O Residential development and access Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Original Submission:
- PC committed to minimizing scale of new development because of 2006 Parish Plan and inadequacy of roads within village.
- JCS designated 10 to 20 houses.
- Cannot understand why 68 proposed.
- Mill Road is a limiting factor.
- Highways have stated cross roads can only sustain 20 additional houses.
- PC consider Mill Road can only sustain 30 new houses in total.
- Submitted traffic forecasts do not accord with observed behaviour.
- Poor provision of public transport.
- High ratio of car ownership.
- Mill Road is single track in parts.
- Mill Road carries traffic to events at Village Hall, Church, Playing Field, Business Park, Hethersett.
- Events at these venues can coincide attracting 100 cars and causing traffic jams and parking problems.
- Mill Road poorly drained, prone to flooding and ice.
- Cumulative impact of development already approved at Hethersett and NRP.
- Concern about visibility, junctions, speed and volume of traffic exiting Little Melton at Rectory Land and Green Lane.
- PC request funding from development to provide measures to discourage rat running via School lane.
- Mill Road should have 20mph speed limit.
- School, pub and shop have associated traffic problems.
- Concern about future maintenance of play areas, ecology buffers and open space.
- Should not have street lighting.
- Drainage inadequate. Existing drainage problems.
- Concern about future maintenance of drainage proposals.
- Creation of staggered junction with Gibbs Close will lead to accidents.
- Existing on street parking problems in vicinity of Gibbs Close junction.
- Infilling the open space on Mill Road with a junction leading to an estate will have a detrimental effect on the rural character of the village.

3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Flood Defence Officer

Original Submission:
- Site currently has poor drainage.
- The existing piped and ditch system for surface water drainage is in poor condition with inadequate capacity for additional flows.
- Connection to this system is likely to increase flood risk to the proposed development and elsewhere.
- Further investigation of the downstream ditch network should be undertaken.
- Proper assessment of the system is required and demonstration that any additional flows will not increase flood risk.
Recommend Anglian Water be approached regarding adoption and future maintenance of the proposed surface water drainage features.

Recommend condition regarding future ownership and management of drainage features.

Consideration should be given to existing flooding issues on site and on Mill Road.

Request conditions to address above concerns

Second Revised Drainage Submission

No objection to roof drainage from all dwellings except one and the highway drainage discharging to SuDs.

Request details of future maintenance and management for parts of SuDs.

Recommend condition regarding future management.

There are concerns about the integrity of the downstream systems. Responsibilities rest with riparian owners. Provided discharge from the site is no greater than the Greenfield run-off rate concerns are beyond remit of this development.

Developer should consider vulnerability of blockages within the downstream watercourse and any potential increase in flood risk to site.

Surface water flows should not put a burden on the highway drainage.

Highway drainage in Mill Road is compromised by levels in the downstream watercourse at the Allotment Gardens and Great Melton Road.

The road drainage will be subject to Highway Authority approval.

Recommend conditions regarding SuDS with controlled discharge no greater than 1 l/sec, adoption and management of on-site drainage, highway drainage should consider the impact on the receiving watercourse and be subject to Highway Authority approval.

3.4 Norfolk County Council Flood & Water Management

No comments received

3.5 NCC- Planning Obligations

S106 Monitoring charge of £600 plus possibly a transport monitoring charge.

The High School is considered as full.

Contributions will be sought towards primary and High School provision.

Request condition requiring provision of a fire hydrant.

Seek £60 per dwelling towards the cost of library provision.

A commuted sum to cover future maintenance of biodiversity areas may be required.

3.6 Environment Agency

Original Submission:

Object.

- Within Flood Zone 1.
- No considered to be at risk of flooding from river or sea.
- Proposed use is a ‘more vulnerable’ use
- Needs to pass Sequential Test and be accompanied by a FRA.
• LPA needs to apply the Sequential Test.
• The Exception test is not required.
• FRA not compliant with paragraph 9 of Technical Guidance to NPPF.
• Additional information on surface water drainage required.
• Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted.
• Appropriate Code/BREEAM assessment should be submitted.
• Resource efficiency should be considered.
• Opportunities for net gains for nature should be considered.
• Should be designed to minimise energy demand.

First Revised Drainage Proposal:
Object
• Lack of information regarding capacity of ditch network, permission for works, future responsibilities, rate of water run off, attenuation.
• Need to be satisfied that development will not be affected by existing water that stands on site.
• Condition regarding future maintenance essential.
• Future run off rate should be restricted to current runoff.

Second Revised Drainage Proposal:
• No objection subject to SNC being satisfied with ongoing drainage network to south of site and that highways sewer provider confirms acceptance of inflow.
• Recommend conditions requiring surface water drainage scheme.
• Should reduce some of the existing flooding issues at Mill Road junction.

3.7 NCC Highways Original Submission:
• Recommends refusal
• Lack of full details regarding surface water drainage
• Inadequate visibility at the site access.
• Visibility is substandard at junction of School Land Burnthouse lane. Therefore, scale of development in Little Melton constrained to 20 dwellings.

Following Revised Plan:
• Withdraw reason for refusal regarding visibility splay.
• Recommends refusal.
• Lack of full details regarding surface water drainage
• Visibility is substandard at junction of School Road/Burnthouse Lane. Therefore, scale of development in Little Melton constrained to 20 dwellings.

Second Revised Drainage Proposal:
• To be reported.

3.8 Landscape Officer No objection.
• Concern regarding long term management of vegetation.
• Request conditions regarding management of boundary vegetation, tree protection and landscape design and implementation.
3.9 District Ecologist Original Submission:
- Recommend conditions regarding section 7.3 of ecology report; planting scheme; ecological management; design of sustainable drainage system and lighting scheme.

3.10 Housing Strategy Manager Original Submission:
- 7 affordable dwellings are required.
- Proposal is for 6 affordable dwellings
- Affordable housing provision is 1 dwelling short
- No objection to bungalows
- Mix of type and tenure required: 3 x 1 bed for rent; 1 x 3 bed for rent; and 1 x 2 bed for shared ownership.

Revised submission
Support

3.11 Planning Policy Original Submission:
- JCS allocates Little Melton 10-20 dwellings plus consideration for additional development to help deliver the smaller sites in the NPA allowance.
- During the Site Specific Allocations process a group of preferred sites was identified in Little Melton partly due to highway considerations which could accommodate 50 dwellings
- The application site is one of the group of sites preferred at that stage.
- The Highways Authority have taken a more detailed look at sites during the recent Preferred Options consultation and consequently the sites in Little Melton have been reconsidered. This site is not proposed for allocation, albeit that this decision is currently out for consultation until 5pm on 22 May 2013.
- The NPA does not have a five-year supply of housing land.

3.12 Play And Amenities Area Officer
- Preference for payment in lieu of provision of play equipment and 400sqm minimum space plus the expected commuted sum.
- Would be allocated to Parish Council to enhance and improve play facilities at local parish play area.
- Total in lieu of provision would be £65,418
- Requirement for open space/ green area on site.

3.13 Design Officer Original Submission:
- Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored 6 green, 5 amber and 1 red.

Revised Submission:
- Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation scored 9 greens and 3 ambers.

3.14 Anglian Water Services Ltd
- No assets owned by Anglian Water within site
- There is capacity for foul drainage flows at waste water treatment works.
- Foul sewerage network has capacity for flows
- Request condition regarding surface water disposal.

3.15 Historic Environment Service
- Original Submission:
- Potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest may be present.
• Request application be withdrawn in accordance with NPPF para 135 because an archaeological evaluation has not been submitted.
• Provided brief for archaeological work.

Following completion and submission of the geophysical survey:
• No further work required on site prior to development.

3.16 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection in principle.
• Request conditions regarding ground contamination investigation, external lighting and construction work.
• Request further information at detailed stage regarding heat pumps.

3.17 Representations

One letter raising questions.

Letter from 12 properties objecting and making the following comments:

• Insufficient road capacity to cope with additional vehicle movements
• Road safety
• Mill Road not suitable for traffic
• Previous applications for building on the site were refused due to highways
• Restricted width of Mill Road
• Creating additional cross roads on Mill Road would be dangerous/hazard
• Mill Road floods between the Allotments and Ringwood Close
• Increase in traffic/Additional traffic
• Mill Road needs drastic changes to accommodate traffic
• Mill Road/Burnthouse lane/Scholl lane Junction is a death trap due to
• Narrow piece of road with poorly designed footpath that cars park on that has caused minor shunts
• Grass verges are currently destroyed due to narrow road
• Entrance to Gibbs Close is used as a car park
• Lack of visibility when exiting properties onto Mill Road
• Concrete kerbs should be put in along grass verges to protect verges
• Traffic could go through to Great Melton Road
• Drainage on allotments cannot cope
• Current traffic speeds along road
• Used as rat run from :Heathersett
• Roads need resurfacing
• Existing on street parking problems
• Speed limits and routing signs ignored
• Heavy lorries use Mill Road to access business park
• Cars drive over the footpath
• Access should be from Great Melton Road
• New road for this development should join up with Ringwood Close
• Contrary to Local Plan
• Piecemeal part of a larger development
• Flooding
• Education provision
• Loss of rural amenity
• Destruction of trees
• Site always water logged/standing water
• Bungalows only to fit in with Ringwood Close
Loss of sunlight to existing bungalows
noise and dirt from work
Concern about flooding on the site and in Mill Road
lack of visibility and difficulty turning corner
Local amenities/services are already under pressure
Existing trees on border of site should be preserved
Was rejected for planning years ago because of drainage problems
Overlooking/loss of privacy to existing bungalows
Empty houses should be used
Villages should not be turned into towns
Few amenities
Impact on barn owls and amphibians
Flooding
Loss of rural character
Question need for additional housing
Loss of privacy
Will spoil village
Locals views overridden by developers interests
Greenfield site should not be developed
Brownfield sites should be sued
Where is the planning gain for the village
Request mains gas for village
Dwellings should be carbon neutral
Should have solar panels
Density of development should be not greater than existing village
Size of plots is cause for social concern
Existing sense of space should be preserved
Concerns regarding maintenance of drainage features
Concerns over maintenance of boundary features.
Loss of view
Devaluation of properties
Bungalows should be built to the rear of existing bungalows

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is approximately 1.3ha and is located on the southern edge of the built up area of Little Melton and would be accessed form the south side of Mill Road. To the south of the site is bordered by a combination of existing dwellings and open land. To the north-east and west boundaries are existing dwellings. To the south-west is an area open land between the site and existing dwellings. To the south-east is open land between the site and the allotments.

4.2 The application is in outline including the matter of access. The matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The general principle of residential development in this location is set out in the introductory report.
4.6 The application site was one of the preferred sites in the consultation carried out last year. However, the site is not a preferred site in the Proposed Amendment to Preferred Options document which is currently out to public consultation.

4.7 Policy 4 of the JCS expects 33% affordable housing be provided. This would equate to seven affordable dwellings. The applicant has confirmed that they are prepared to meet the affordable housing requirement and mix set out in the consultation response from Housing Strategy. This can be secured by S106 agreement.

Deliverability

4.8 The applicant has submitted a letter from Abel Homes stating that they have reached an agreement in principle for purchase of the site subject to planning permission being granted, that they expect to be able to make an immediate start once the planning application processes is complete, its their policy to build out and finish developments as quickly as reasonably practical.

Character and appearance of area

4.9 The applicant has undertaken an assessment of the site context and its setting that identifies the general character of Little Melton and a description of the site boundaries. The proposal aims to respect the existing site boundaries and provide additional planting and a landscape buffer along the south-western edge of the site, which could help to integrate the site into the landscape to provide a transition between the countryside and the urban edge. However, a development in this location would infill an existing area of open land within the village that currently contributes to the landscape character of Little Melton and the setting of the Mill House Tower.

4.10 The Building for Life evaluation scored 9 greens and 3 ambers, which is considered acceptable at this outline stage.

Highway safety

4.11 Subject to a visibility splay of 43m x 2.4m x 43m at the vehicular entrance to the site from Mill Road and subject to the number of additional dwellings taking access off Mill Road being limited to 20, then the additional traffic generated by this development should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

4.12 The issue of highway drainage is considered below under the sub-section Infrastructure.

4.13 The cumulative impact of development in Little Melton on the local highway network is covered in the introductory report.

Residential amenity

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

Biodiversity

4.15 Most of the sites ecological value is in the trees and hedges in the field margins. The proposal demonstrates that this vegetation could be retained. The SuDs scheme may help to increase biodiversity at the site. There are ponds within the vicinity of the site that are used by great crested newts. Although, these ponds are separated from the site by existing development, there is a chance that great crested newts could be on the site. Subject to the submitted mitigation proposals being followed and the conditions recommended by the
District Ecologist, development of the site could safeguard protected species and enhance the biodiversity value of the site.

Infrastructure

4.16 The Local Planning Authority is aware of concerns by a number of parties regarding the adequacy of the surface water drainage facilities in Little Melton. Surface water drainage proposals have been submitted with the application. The Environment Agency and the Councils Flood Defence Officer have been consulted on the submitted information. The Environment Agency has no objection subject to SNC being satisfied with off site drainage provision. With the exception of Highways drainage issues, The Councils Flood Defence Officer has outlined the off site drainage concerns, and recommended conditions. A response from Norfolk County Council Highways regarding the revised drainage proposals is awaited.

4.17 The existing policies require provision of play space for a development of this size. In this case Little Melton has an existing parish play area that could be improved to meet the needs of the residents of the proposed development. Therefore, in this case a commuted sum is sought in lieu of provision to meet the play space needs generated by the development.

4.18 Norfolk County Council has confirmed the infrastructure needs generated by the development in terms of education, library and fire hydrant provision. The fire hydrant can be secured by condition whilst the other matters can all be secured by S106 agreement.

4.19 The applicant has confirmed their agreement to provide the above matters by condition and S106 agreement as relevant.

Servicing

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

Conclusion

4.21 The principle of additional development in Little Melton outside of the currently adopted Development Limit is set out in the introductory report. Subject to outstanding drainage issues being resolved the application has demonstrated that the site is in principle suitable for a development of 20 dwellings. However, the application is recommended for refusal due to the highway implications of cumulative development as set out in the introductory report.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 There are constraints on the local highway network. Specifically the School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction side road visibility is substandard on both side road junctions. The proposal would result in unacceptable increases in traffic on the School Lane / Burnthouse Lane junction. The proposal would contribute to additional traffic movements that would be detrimental to pedestrian safety and the flow of traffic along Mill Road. Therefore, the proposal would cause a hazard and inconvenience to users of the public highway. Therefore, the proposal would cause a hazard and inconvenience to users of the public highway and is contrary to (Saved) Policy IMP8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
4. **Appl. No**: 2013/0087/O  
**Parish**: BRAMERTON

Applicants Name : Mr David Murrell  
Site Address : Land North Of Church Farm The Street Bramerton Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed new residential development consisting of 10 no dwellings and 1 no office unit

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. In accordance with amendments  
4. Boundary treatment  
5. External materials to be agreed  
6. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
7. New Water Efficiency  
8. Surface Water  
9. Ecology Mitigation  
10. Demolish existing buildings on site  
11. Slab level to be agreed  
12. Retention trees and hedges  
13. No additional windows at first floor  
14. Highway requirements  
15. Office use

Subject to S106 for affordable housing

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 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 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 15: Species protection  
EMP 7: The retention of rural employment and services (Part  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide
2. Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/1014</td>
<td>2008/1014</td>
<td>Demolition of most of the existing buildings, public weighbridge and hard standings. Erection of two new office work spaces and eight new sustainable live/work unit</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2395</td>
<td>2007/2395</td>
<td>Demolition of all but one of the existing buildings, public weighbridge and hardstandings.</td>
<td>Refused by committee but withdrawn before decision issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/1952</td>
<td>2006/1952</td>
<td>Demolition of all existing buildings, public weighbridge and hardstandings and erection of five houses.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Comments on original scheme:
- Affordable housing appears to have reduced compared to the size of the proposed dwellings
- Site problems of surface water drainage and existence of water courses flowing under the site
- Possible contamination from previous use

3.2 District Member Comments on original scheme:
- Happy larger houses are proposed as this is in keeping with the local properties
- The affordable is, of course expected for a development of this size
- Understand the concerns re the access should the number of office users be increased, having taken into account visiting clients and residents in the houses
- Broadband provision is very poor in the area, which will be of concern to any business wishing to locate to the site

3.3 Planning Policy Comments on original scheme:
Object:
- Insufficient employment provided based on the approved scheme
Comments on amended scheme:
- No objections due to increased level from 240sqm to 360 sqm resulting in a insignificant reduction in the level of employment provided by the previously approved scheme

3.4 Economic Development Manager No objections
- The provision of small scale modern offices with appropriate car parking provision in a village location provides greater opportunity for employment and is suitable for a wide range of small business, enabling business and employment growth

3.5 NCC Highways To be reported
3.6 Conservation Officer Comments on original scheme:
Refuse
- Insufficient information to assess whether the development will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bramerton Conservation area
- Lack of evidence to demonstrate that the proposals satisfy the design requirements of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide

Comments on amended scheme:
- To be reported

3.7 Housing Strategy Manager No objections
- 3 affordable dwellings meet policy requirements
- Support tenure - social rent

3.8 Representations Comments on original scheme:
2 letters of support:
- Provided the applicant sticks to his proposed designs
- Wish a 1.8m fence to be erected to boundary with Orchard House
- No reasonable reason to include offices
- Low cost housing should be for sale not rent
- No first floor windows overlook our garden
- 4 objections
- No objection in principle to private housing
- Still supportive of the approved scheme
- Office block would generate more traffic and must exit the access lane which has poor slight line to the south
- Access drive is not wide enough to cope with the traffic
- Find it hard to believe there is a demand for office development in a village such as Bramerton
- Overlooking
- Affordable should be internal to the development
- Affordable should be owner-occupied
- Two storey office block will overlook our property
- Broadband speed is so slow no office user would wish to operate from the site

1 letter advising that existing drainage system runs from the village pond, under The Street and through the site

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline consent for the erection of 10 residential units and 1 office unit within the heart of the village of Bramerton. The site was previously occupied by Herbert Parker Seeds who had been on the site since 1945. Access to the site is from The Street, set between residential properties and located within Bramerton Conservation Area. This access served the industrial site and residential properties to the south of the site (previously barns). The majority of the site is outside, but adjacent to the eastern boundary of the conservation area. To the north and south of the site are residential properties with open countryside to the east and St Peters Church is opposite the site entrance to the west.

4.2 Full planning consent was granted under the 2008/1014 application for the erection of two new office work spaces and 8 new sustainable live/work units. This application seeks unrestricted housing with a separate office space provided for on-site employment as the applicant considers that the live/work units are not feasible. The scheme also provides 3 affordable units. The dwellings are proposed to be of traditional appearance, large 4 to 6 bed units with detached double garages. The office block is also proposed to be two storey.
Concern was raised under the original submitted scheme that less employment provision was being provided than under the previous scheme and the office block was positioned between the affordable housing and the market housing. These concerns have now been addressed by increasing the amount of employment space to 360sqm which is 32sqm below the approved scheme and re-siting the office accommodation to the south of the site.

The redevelopment of the site, outside the development boundaries is contrary to policy ENV8 of the SNLP, Bramerton has been defined as a Service village under the JCS and under the New Local plan the site has been included within the preferred development limit for the village, allocated as a preferred site for mixed use of dwellings and B1 uses. Due weight and consideration can be given to the existing planning consent, the benefit of providing employment on the site and the provision of 3 affordable houses. I consider that there are material considerations of sufficient weight to satisfy a decision contrary to our present policy of resisting development in the countryside.

This application unlike the approved scheme is in outline only and therefore the design and appearance of the dwellings and office block have been reserved for submission under a reserved matters application. However the conservation officer has raised concerns that the application has not been supported by sufficient information demonstrating that the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and lack of evidence demonstrating that the proposals satisfy the design requirements of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The requested reports have just been submitted at the time of writing the report and I will verbally update the committee of the conservation officer’s comments.

In terms of ecology the previous scheme proposed Barn Owl boxes and bat boxes which the ecologist supported, this proposal proposes bird and bat boxes together with improved landscaping. I would wish to see a condition on any consent requiring the provision of both owl and bat boxes.

Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised as set out above, I am however mindful of the previous use of the site and the fact a public weighbridge was on the site, subject to confirmation by the highway officer who supported the previous scheme, I do not consider the application can be refused on highway safety grounds. The boundary treatments and the final design of the properties and offices would be subject to the reserved matters and a carefully designed scheme should not give rise to loss of privacy or overlooking to a detrimental degree.

Subject to the conservation officer been satisfied with the additional information, the proposal is acceptable and I recommend that the application is approved subject to an s106 agreement covering the affordable housing provision.

Reasons for Approval

Subject to satisfactory additional details the proposal, although contrary to Policy ENV8 - Development in the open countryside of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, being located outside any defined developments, can be supported in this instance as some employment will be retained on the site and 3 affordable housing units are proposed. These benefits outweigh the possible disbenefits of allowing an unneighbourly form of development on the site and also removes a number of unsightly buildings in close proximity to the Conservation Area. The proposal, therefore, meets the policy requirements of EMP7 - Retention of rural employment services and Policy 4 - Housing delivery of the Joint Core Strategy.

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

5. **Appl. No**: 2012/1122/F  
   **Parish**: ALBURGH

   **Applicants Name**: Mr Nigel Bond  
   **Site Address**: South Farm Alburgh Harleston IP20 0BS  
   **Proposal**: Installation of one micro scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.5m diameter blades, Evance R9000) or Installation of one micro scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades, HY5)

   **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. Accord with submitted plans  
   3. Turbine specification

1. **Planning Policies**

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

   1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
      Policy 3: Energy and water

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

2. **Planning History**

   2.1 **2012/1013**  
      Installation of photovoltaic PV in ground mounted paddock area  
      Approved

   2.2 **2011/0987**  
      Erection of hanging sign  
      Approved

   2.3 **2011/0986**  
      Change of use to office and showroom  
      Approved

   2.4 **2007/2370**  
      Change of use from storage to a food preparation area, storage & office and retrospective planning permission for installation of 3 windows  
      Approved

   2.5 **2007/0799**  
      Change of use from storage to B1 use and retrospective planning permission for installation of 2 windows in the western elevation of the granary  
      Withdrawn

   2.6 **2007/0475**  
      Change of use of store to brewery shop selling bottled & draught beers and some locally produced foods  
      Approved

   2.7 **2006/2372**  
      Proposed change of use from temporary to permanent use of buildings for storage and repair of motor vehicles  
      Approved
2.8 2006/0106 Conversion of dairy & storage buildings to a micro brewery  Approved

2.9 2005/0647 Conversion of farm building to provide two workshops and storage area  Approved

2.10 2004/1910 Proposed change of use from agricultural building to storage and repair of motor vehicles  Approved

2.11 2002/1622 Change of use from agricultural building to let building for the storage of animal feeds & other non-hazardous substances  Approved

2.12 2000/1899 Change of use from dairy cubicle house to self livery stabling  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council To the original scheme:
- Effect on wildlife
- Detrimental visual impact
- Noise disturbance to neighbouring properties
- Road safety issues
- Precedent might be set
- If minded to approve suggest a site visit
- To amended scheme reducing the number of turbines to 1
- Refuse:
  - Detrimental visual impact on attractive Tunbeck and Broadwash valleys
  - Impact on neighbouring properties via noise
  - Threat to wildlife, particularly bats and birds
  - Neighbours have strong anti views
  - Lens used for photos is totally out of keeping with what the eye will see

3.2 District Member In response to the two turbines:
- Originally requested the application was determined by committee, however following the concerns raised is happy for the application to be refused under delegated powers
Amended scheme to reduce to 1 turbine:
- To be reported if appropriate

3.3 DIO-Safeguarding-Wind@mod.uk No objections

3.4 Public Right Of Way No objections

3.5 Landscape Officer No objection to the reduction of the number of turbines to 1

3.6 Conservation Officer No objections
No harmful impact in respect of the setting of listed buildings

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections

3.8 Environment Agency No comments
3.9  NCC Highways  No objections

3.10  Ecologist  No objections

3.11  Representations  10 letters of objection and a joint letter from the residents of Piccadilly Corner with 14 signatures:
   - Detrimental to the unique landscape
   - Inappropriate structures to site so close to the village
   - Noise disturbance and shadow flicker
   - Detrimental impact of wildlife
   - Visual nuisance would be detrimental to public safety
   - Detrimental impact on tourism with the destruction of visual aspects of this truly beautiful area
   - Request members of the planning committee visit the site
   - Devalue property
   - Impact on health of residents
   - Could be sited elsewhere on the farm
   - Detrimental impact on listed buildings
   - The economy of the village benefits from visitors this would adversely impact it
   - 3 letters of objection to the amended scheme reducing the turbine number to 1
   - Detrimental impact on beautiful Tunbeck and Broadwash Valleys
   - Noise disturbance
   - Threat to wildlife
   - Spoil otherwise relatively unspoilt local attraction and amenity
   - Very close to a number of properties in Alburgh
   - Site is not on top of a hill - it is not an optimal location for wind-energy generation

4  Assessment

4.1  This application originally sought consent for the erection of two wind turbines to the west of the South Farm complex. The scheme has subsequently been amended reducing the number of turbines to one. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbine the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbine will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Red House Farm with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 4.16 tonnes and annual energy of 8.58 MWh.

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

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

4.4  There have been objections raised by local residents and the parish council as set out above both in respect of the two turbines originally proposed and the amended scheme. Whilst the concerns are fully appreciated, in view of the environmental health officer, the highway officer, the ecologist and the conservation officer raising no objections, I do not consider the proposal could be refused on detrimental impact on residential amenities via
noise and disturbance, highway safety, impact on protected species or impact on listed buildings. It is considered that on balance that whilst the proposed turbine subject to this application will be visible, I do not consider the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground.

4.5 The proposed turbine is acceptable and I recommend the application is approved.

5. Reasons for Approval

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2013/0357/CU  
**Parish**: DITCHINGHAM

**Applicants Name**: Ditchingham Farms  
**Site Address**: Dark Hole Toad Lane Thwaite Norfolk, NR35 2EQ  
**Proposal**: Change of use from redundant rural building to car repair workshop

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Full details of external lighting  
4. Specific Use  
5. Limited Hours of Use  
6. Provision of dust, grit extraction  
7. No generators, air handling plant  
8. No working outside the buildings  
9. No powered machinery, plant or tools  
10. No outside storage  
11. Retention of existing hedging and trees

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
**Policy 1**: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
**Policy 5**: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
**EMP 3**: Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment  
**IMP 8**: Safe and free flow traffic  
**IMP 9**: Residential amenity

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Thwaite St Mary Parish Council  
Refuse:  
- Concerned that will have an impact on our village  
- Would subsequently increase in both size and working hours  
- Very quiet community and any increase in noise will be noticeable  
- Security lighting would impact on the enjoyment of the sky at night at Seething Observatory  
- Parking proposed for 10 vehicles - will have a impact with cars travelling to and from the site

Ditchingham Parish Council  
Good use of redundant building

2.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

2.3 NCC Highways  
No objections

2.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Support with conditions
2.5 Representations

1 letter of no objection from Norwich Astronomical Society but they request that suitable lighting be installed that will not project onto the sky

5 letters of objection

- Noise, dust and odour
- Will large doors facing east be closed at all times
- Lived with no close neighbours, in peace and quiet for 35 yrs
- Site is an eyesore, may be suitable for secure storage but not garage workshop and car park
- Uneven concrete surface and not suitable are for parking 10 cars
- Inappropriate development on the edge of a pretty village
- Increase in traffic
- Roads not gritted in winter
- Suitable small industrial site on Harvey Lane and other premises
- Residents of Thwaite should have been notified - we were not
- Personal circumstances of applicant are not relevant

If consent to be granted, following conditions should be imposed:
- Working hours
- Prohibition of all sales
- No outside working or with doors or windows open
- No external storage including vehicles
- No light pollution
- Retention of existing vegetation
- Specific use

3 Assessment

3.1 Proposal to change the use of redundant buildings to car repair workshop. The buildings are located to the south of Toad Lane. The nearest residential property is 210m from the site.

3.2 The existing buildings are red brick and flat roofed. They were originally used in connection with Seething Airfield during the war. They have been used for storage in connection with Ditchingham Hall Estate but are no longer required.

3.3 The proposal seeks consent for the re location of a local car repair business currently located at Woodton. The business is small scale and operated by the applicant, with the help of his daughter. The proposed site is significantly larger than the current site and therefore there is ample capacity for storage and inside workspace. No car sales will take place from the site. No air tools or machinery other than hand drill, tyre changer, wheel balancer and four post and single post lift will be used on the site.

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

3.5 A number of issues have been raised by both Thwaite St Mary parish council and local residents as set out above. Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised, no objections have been raised by the environmental health officer or the highway officer. In view of this, the limited nature and scale of the development and the control from the conditions proposed, the proposed change of use would not give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of nearby residential properties or highway safety as to warrant refusal on the grounds raised.
3.6 The proposal is acceptable and I recommend the application be approved, as it provides employment, re-uses a redundant building and will not affect the amenities of nearby residential to a material degree.

4. Reasons for Approval

4.1 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 5 The Economy of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP8 safe and free flow of traffic and EMP3 - Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes of that plan. It accords with the National Planning Policy Framework Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy

4.2 It is considered that the proposed change of use accords with Policy 5, EMP3 and IMP8, as it provides employment; the existing landscaping of the site will not be compromised; all necessary parking, servicing and circulation can be accommodated on the site for the proposal; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be effected to an unacceptable degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2013/0419/F  
**Parish**: SWAINSTHORPE  

Applicants Name: Mr S Cruickshank  
Site Address: The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe Norfolk NR14 8PU  
Proposal: 2 no single storey rear extensions, new 3 bay garage, car park and garden lighting, erection of timber fences, erection of wall and railings to front, resurface carpark, earth works to grass bank at rear, garden works, landscaping, photo voltaic panels to roof and provision of extract system flue  

Recommendation: Refusal – Contrary to NPPF12 and SNLP IMP 13 and 15  
1. Kitchen extension pitch and span  
2. Alignment of fence to ancillary area  
3. Size and scale of the garage/store  
4. Cutting back of bank and fencing  
5. Fence along A140

8. **Appl. No**: 2013/0420/LB  
**Parish**: SWAINSTHORPE  

Applicants Name: Mr S Cruickshank  
Site Address: The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe Norfolk NR14 8PU  
Proposal: 2 no single storey rear extensions, new 3 bay garage, car park and garden lighting, erection of timber fences, erection of wall and railings to front, resurface carpark, earth works to grass bank at rear, garden works, landscaping, photo voltaic panels to roof and provision of extract system flue  

Recommendation: Refusal – Contrary to NPPF12 and SNLP IMP 13 and 15  
1. Kitchen extension roof span and pitch  
2. Alignment of fence to ancillary area

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 3: River valleys  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
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  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0249 Retrospective application for: rebuild of 2 no chimneys, rebuild of top of both parapet walls to main roof, Re-location of bar counter top, re-new broken tiles to front main roof surface, repair of front dormers, windows and doors and replacement of windows and doors

2.2 2007/2039/LB Construct a timber structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds. Approved

2.3 2007/2038/F Construct a timber structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds. Approved

2.4 2007/0706 Construct a steel and glass structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds. Refused

2.5 2007/0447 Construct a steel and glass structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds. Refused

2.6 1998/0920 New public house signs Approved

2.7 1998/0671 Retention of pub signs Approved

2.8 1993/1104 Retention of signs Refused

2.9 1993/1054 Retention of signs Refused

2.10 1992/1601/LB Illuminated signs on building and forecourt Approved

2.11 1992/1600/F Illuminated signs on building and forecourt. Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No views or comments

3.2 District Member Should be determined by Committee.

- Impact on employment and local economy.
- Financial aspect that has determined the applicant’s design.
- Pitched roof over kitchen has future maintenance savings.
- Solar panels produce projected savings.
3.3 Conservation Officer No objection to additional floor space at rear.
- No objections to alterations to pub that would improve appearance and services it offers.
- Kitchen extension roof is a pitch and span that is unrelated to main range, this would be visible and have a noticeable impact.
- Flue should be painted black.
- No issue with function room extension, solar panels.
- More detailed plan of solar panels is required.
- Details of brick, roof tiles and eaves detail required.
- No objection to garage/store, but scale would compete with main building.
- Garage/store should be redesigned to a more sympathetic proportion and scale.
- Enclosed ancillary area acceptable.
- Fencing to north side of ancillary area should be inverted.
- All external storage should be confined to ancillary area.
- Concern about impact of cutting back grass bank on setting of listed building.
- Fence on elevation to A140 would be prominent.
- New railings would enhance the building.
- Lighting could be an improvement.
- Design of lighting should be conditioned
- Recommend refusal: Impact of kitchen extension; Scale and form of garage; Effect of the altered grass bank with a 2m fence on top; and Use of fencing on A140 elevation.
- Can condition: boundary to ancillary area; colours of flue; materials for extensions; wall and railings; and lighting.

3.4 NCC Highways Recommends conditions regarding external lighting and gates.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection in principle.
Recommend conditions regarding details of extract system and external lighting.

3.6 Historic Environment Service To be reported.

3.7 Representations One letter making the following comments:
- No issue with building plans
- Concern about light being emitted into Greenfields
- Concern about opening hours
- Do not see why pub needs to be open until 1 or 2 am
- Would like hours restricted

4 Assessment

4.1 The Dun Cow is a grade II listed building of early 18th century brick and tiled with later alterations and extensions to the side and rear. It is a very prominent building on the A140 with its associated car park and garden, but has been vacant for some time.

4.2 The proposals comprise 2 extensions at the rear, with a new extract flue and solar panels; a new garage/storage building with an enclosure providing an "ancillary area"; landscaping works to include cutting back the west bank, extending the car park, new boundaries and a series of additional lights. Internally work is proceeding under listed building consent ref: 2013/0249 to upgrade the internal arrangements.
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 impact on the heritage asset; the character and appearance of the area; highway safety; and residential amenity.

4.5 Impact on the heritage asset and the character and appearance of the area.

4.6 The function room extension will not harm the significance or appearance of the heritage asset. There is potential to accommodate the kitchen floor space whilst conserving the form and character of the heritage asset. However, the scale of the kitchen extension would have a harmful impact on the significance of the heritage asset.

4.7 At present there is a collection of extensions at the rear, none of which are particularly well designed, although the two gabled wings have tried to reflect the character of the main range. But they are of a modest scale and span that leaves the original range clearly the dominant element. The submitted scheme merges two of the extensions under one large roof to accommodate the larger kitchen, which although gabled, is of a pitch and span that are unrelated to the main range. This would be seen from the rear, side and from the car park where the larger roof, which would be extended and physically closer, would have a noticeable impact.

4.8 In principle a garage/store could be accommodated on the site whilst conserving the setting of the heritage asset. However, the size of the proposed garage/store would compete with the main building due to its height, scale and proportions.

4.9 The enclosed ancillary area is located to the rear of the existing building. Subject to an alteration to the alignment of the fencing, to reduce its prominence when viewed from north and east aspects, this will not harm the setting of the heritage asset.

4.10 The impact of cutting back the grass bank and topping it with a 2m high fence would make a radical difference to the appearance of the property and the setting of the listed building. This aspect would detract from the setting of the heritage asset, as would the fence proposed along the boundary with the A140 due to its harsh appearance and prominence in the street scene. However, the proposed wall and railings would enhance the setting of the building.

4.11 There is potential for a lighting scheme to be an improvement over the existing arrangement at the site. However, insufficient information has been submitted to properly consider what is proposed. The details of the proposed lighting could be dealt with by condition.

Highway safety

4.12 The proposal would maintain the existing access. Subject to conditions, the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

Residential amenity

4.13 The existing use of the site is a public house which is set within grounds comprising the public house garden and car park. The proposed extensions will not alter the nature of the use at the site and they are set away from the sites boundaries with residential properties. The proposed flue could accommodate the necessary equipment to ensure that levels of noise and odour do not have a materially significant impact on residential amenity.
4.14 The pub use is historic and therefore does not currently have any planning restrictions in terms of hours of operation. The application proposal does not change the use of the premises and therefore it would not be appropriate to add a condition restricting the hours of operation. The hours of use are restricted by the premises licence.

Conclusion

4.15 The proposal will safeguard highway safety and residential amenity. However, the economic benefits of the proposal could be achieved without the adverse impacts on the heritage asset and consequently the character and appearance of the area that will result from the proposal.

(Note: At the time of writing further amendments are anticipated which may address some, but not all of the objections to the application. Any updates will be reported to the meeting)

5. Reasons for Refusal - 2013/0419/F

5.1 The proposal merges two of the existing extensions as well as the proposed kitchen extension under one roof. The roof would be of a pitch and span that are poorly related to the main range. This would be visible in views from the rear, the side where the car park is and from public vantage points along the A140. The pitch and span proposed are overly wide and squat compared with the main range and consequently the extension will harm the significance of the listed building and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The alignment of the fence to the ancillary area would protrude forward of the alignment of the side gable of the listed building which faces the car park. This alignment will be unduly prominent when viewing the listed building from the public side. This alignment will detract from the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the national Planning Policy Framework.

5.3 The size and scale of the proposed garage/store will compete with the main building due to the height, scale and proportions of the proposed garage/store building. Therefore, the building will detract from the setting of the heritage asset and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.4 The cutting back the grass bank and necessary retention combined with the erection of a fence along the west boundary would make a radical difference to the appearance of the property and the setting of the listed building by creating the appearance of a tall structure as a dominating back drop to the site that will be visible from pubic vantage points along the A140. This arrangement will harm the setting of the listed building, contrary to Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.5 The fence along the boundary with the A140 will harm the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the area due to the harsh appearance and prominence in the street scene, contrary to Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. **Reasons for Refusal - 2013/0420/LB**

6.1 The proposal merges two of the existing extension as well as the proposed kitchen extension under one roof. The roof is of a pitch and span that are unrelated to the main range. This would be visible in views from the rear, the side where the car park is and from public vantage points along the A140. The pitch and span proposed are overly wide and squat compared with the main range and consequently the extension will harm the setting of the listed building, contrary to Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6.2 The alignment of the fence to the ancillary area would protrude forward of the side gable of the listed building which faces the car park. This alignment will be unduly prominent when viewing the listed building from the public side. This alignment will detract from the setting of the listed building, contrary to Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2013/0495/H  
**Parish**: TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name: Mrs S Dinneen  
Site Address: The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1ED  
Proposal: Replacement of front gates to match existing, replacement of 2 no rotten dormer windows in roof at rear, repair of 2 no dormer widows in roof at rear, re-paint front and back doors, renovation of attached disused building to become games room/garden room for existing dwelling

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Revised programme of works for dormers
4. Materials
5. obscure glaze side windows
6. Glazing details for outbuilding
7. Materials for outbuilding

10. **Appl. No**: 2013/0496/LB  
**Parish**: TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name: Mrs S Dinneen  
Site Address: The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1ED  
Proposal: Replacement of front gates to match existing, replacement of 2 no rotten dormer windows in roof at rear, repair of 2 no dormer widows in roof at rear, re-paint front and back doors, renovation of attached disused building to become games room/garden room for existing dwelling

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Revised programme of works for dormers
4. Materials
5. Glazing details for outbuilding
6. Materials for outbuilding
7. Paint colour for gates and doors

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 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
### Development Management Committee

**22 May 2013**

**IMP17: Alterations and extensions in conservation areas**

**HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings**

**HOU 20: Extensions to existing dwellings, overlooking**

#### 2. Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 2006/1769/LB</td>
<td>Proposed conversion of barns to residential use, with new garages</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 2006/1768/F</td>
<td>Proposed conversion of barns to residential use, with new garages</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 2010/0094/F</td>
<td>Proposed rebuild of wall and replacement of wooden gate posts with brick pillars.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 2010/0093/LB</td>
<td>Proposed rebuild of wall and replacement of wooden gate posts with brick pillars.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Parish Council</td>
<td>Should be approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 District Member</td>
<td>To be reported if appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3 Conservation Officer | • The glazed roof and wall to the west side of the outbuilding will restore a more traditional form and shape to the building.  
  • Subject to glazing and roofing details the works to the outbuilding will be a significant improvement for the outbuilding and this side of the hall.  
  • Timber gates in north wall are beyond repair  
  • The dormers are in very poor condition.  
  • Dormers are not of such historic interest to justify and object to their replacement.  
  • Detailed design of the dormers retains the overall appearance.  
  • The double glazing is less than normal to reduce the impact on the profiles.  
  • Use of applied glazing is not normally supported for use on listed buildings.  
  • Await views of English Heritage.  
  • Approve with conditions to cover roof materials to outbuildings, details of glazing, colours for gates and main doors.  |
| 3.4 Historic Environment Service | Do not make any recommendations for archaeological work.                                      |
| 3.5 English Heritage   | • Proposal to pain front and rear door are accepted.                                             
  • Encourage condition regarding paint colour and finish.  
  • Proposal for outbuilding is supported.  
  • Proposal for outbuilding would result in some loss of historic significance, loss of evidence of outbuilding use.  
  • It would still be possible to interpret function of outbuilding after change of use  
  • Ask for conditions regarding external finishes and fenestration details for outbuilding.  
  • Concerns regarding replacement of single glazed unit with double glazed. |
The opening and fixed casement windows are of relatively recent date and construction and detailing not appropriate for the age of the dormers.

Windows are in poor condition.

There are some elements of the frame likely to date from 16th and 17th century.

Would not be appropriate to replicate existing window frames.

New window frames could benefit the building.

Opportunity to retain historic fabric and reinstate a consistent historic character in the attic fenestration.

Sealed units will depart from traditional form.

Balance to be found with reference to NPPF para 134.

Are content that revised programme of work in agents email of 2 May 2013 strikes the balance.

No objection subject to condition covering revised programme of works.

3.6 Representations

None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 The Old Hall is listed grade 2* of 16th century origins remodelled in the 18th century in red brick when significant additions were made. The hall has a listed garden wall forming the north boundary while a separate farmhouse and former barns, listed grade 2, to the south and east, add to the setting and significance of the hall. The whole site is within the conservation area.

4.2 The outbuilding is linked to the hall by a modern single storey mainly glazed section. The outbuilding is a later addition comprising a small stable block with storage above which adjoins a modest two storey range at the south end. It is proposed to renovate the building adding a glazed roof and wall to the west side which would restore a more traditional form and shape to provide ancillary accommodation. The intention is to restore the earlier elements but upgrade where possible.

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 impact of the proposal on the heritage assets and residential amenity.

Impact on heritage assets

Outbuilding

4.5 Subject to glazing and roof details this will be a significant improvement for the building and this side of the hall. Therefore, this aspect of the proposal will enhance the heritage assets.

Gates

4.6 The pair of timber gates in the north wall are beyond repair and the intention is to replace them to match. Subject to the colour being agreed by condition, this aspect will conserve the heritage asset.

Doors

4.7 The two main doors are to be repaired and stripped and repainted. Subject to the colour being agreed by condition, this aspect will conserve the heritage asset.
Dormers

4.8 The four dormers on the east elevation have lead roofs and sides and are simple two light casements with a single glazing bar and they are in poor condition. Parts are also not of such historic interest to justify an objection to their replacement. The detailed design retains their overall appearance, but introduces double glazing to enhance energy performance with applied glazing bars to equate to the present thickness. The double glazing is less than normal to reduce the impact on the profiles. The use of applied glazing is not normally supported for use on listed buildings. However, in this case English Heritage has advised that their use strikes the balance sought by paragraph 134 of the NPPF. Therefore, subject to two of the dormers being repaired and the other two being replaced to match, this aspect of the proposal will not harm the significance of the heritage asset.

Residential amenity

Outbuilding

4.9 The building is currently within the residential curtilage of the main dwelling and will continue to be used as part of the existing residential use on the site. Subject to some existing openings on the boundary of the property being obscure glazed, the proposal should not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The obscure glazing can be secured by condition.

5. Reasons for Approval - 2013/0495/H

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP8, IMP9, IMP15 and IMP17 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building and the character and appearance of the area. The proposal will not result in any material adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring property.

6. Reasons for Approval - 2013/0496/LB

6.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP15, IMP13 and IMP17 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2013/0523/A  
**Parish**: DISS  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Colin Edwards  
**Site Address**: Diss Garden Centre Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG  
**Proposal**: Replacement Garden Centre sign at the entrance adjacent the pavement following planning permission 2012/0656/A  

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1-5 Standard advertisement conditions  
6 Level of illumination  
7 Existing sign to be removed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 19: Advertisements (Part Consistent)  
IMP 21: Illuminated advertisements (Part Consistent)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0656 Replacement Garden Centre sign to entrance Approved  
2.2 2010/0380 Non material amendment of 2007/2096 for roof to include profiled roof lights, inclusion of two windows and personnel door Approved  
2.3 2007/2454 Demolition of existing storage buildings Approved  
2.4 2007/2096 Change of use from domestic to office and storage (ground floor only). Proposed extensions, new storage building, greenhouses and disabled WC. Demolition of existing storage building Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Refuse  
- The proposed sign will result in a poor viability splay particularly affecting cyclists and there is concern about the siting of the sign in very close proximity and of similar dimensions to an existing planning consent for the neighbouring property.

3.2 District Members:  
**Cllr Tony Palmer** Can be delegated  
**Cllr Glyn Walden** To be reported if appropriate  
**Cllr Keith Kiddie** To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Conservation Officer Object

- Still believe sign would be harmful to character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- No objection to change in graphics

3.4 NCC Highways Support with conditions

3.5 Waveney Valley Internal Drainage Board No comments received

3.6 Representations Five letters of objections

- Should be a condition restricting brightness of sign must be restricted to 459cd/m² as stated on application form
- Also should be condition that the sign is not illuminated all through the night when they are not trading to prevent disturbance to neighbours
- If this is conditioned then we would withdraw our objection
- Sign is too large and bright for the Conservation Area
- Internal illumination will flood into bedroom windows
- Will affect value of my property
- Sign will over hang our boundary wall
- Concern for the structural stability of the sign and that it may blow over. Structural drawing should be submitted
- Concern over restricted visibility to cyclists has already been an accident recently between a bike and a car exiting the garden centre.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to the Diss Garden Centre, the business is located to the rear of other premises on Victoria Road. The business has an access onto Victoria Road which is its only road frontage. The proposed sign is located just outside the Conservation Area boundary. There is a mix of residential and commercial premises in this part of the road.

4.2 Permission was granted last year application number 2012/0656 for 5 metres high by 2 metre wide internally illuminated totem sign by planning committee contrary to officer recommendation. This application proposes an amended design for the sign and it is also now proposed that the sign would have a curved edge.

4.3 Policy IMP19 permits advertisements as long as they are well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building.

4.4 Policy IMP21 only permits illuminated advertisements within central business areas. On listed building and in conservation areas illuminated advertisements will only be granted where the general level of illumination in the area is such as to require an illuminated sign to satisfactorily identify the business and should only be illuminated with non-flashing external light source. Outside the central business area illuminated signs will only be permitted on businesses dependent on evening trade.

4.5 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies, IMP19 and IMP21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because although those policies are only partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework as the NPPF states that only advertisements that have an appreciable impact on a building or their surroundings should be subject to the local authority's detailed assessment. However, in this case I consider that the impact of this advertisement is significant and does warrant detailed assessment.
4.6 Members may wish to note that applications for signs on this property are a result of committee’s approval of a 5 metre by 2 metre wide fully illuminated totem sign on the adjacent business contrary to officer recommendation (application reference 2011/1164). The sign has yet to be erected but the owner of the garden centre is very concerned that his current sign will be obscured by the approved sign on the adjacent site, and Members were aware of this when approving this sign as an objection had been received. This sign is also likely to obscure the approved sign on the adjacent business to some extent.

4.7 Members granted permission for the previously approved sign because they considered the impact on the Conservation Area was acceptable they gave weight to the 5 metre high sign which had been approved on the adjacent site and also supporting a local business.

4.8 Previously officers have considered that a sign of this size and level of illumination would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the adjacent Conservation Area and would be contrary to both policies IMP18 IMP19 and IMP21 of the SNLP. The sign was also considered excessive for this type of business, which is not dependent on evening trade. However, this sign would not cause any more harm than the previously approved sign and material weight has been given to this when coming to the recommendation.

4.9 Objections have been received from neighbouring properties concerned that about the impact of the illumination of the sign would have on the amenity if it were illuminated during the night and suggest the illumination should be restricted by a condition. The existing permission or the one on the adjacent site do not restrict the times that the sign can be illuminated however the sign is close to residential properties, so this may be something that the members wish to give consideration to. The previous permission did have a restriction on the level of illumination.

4.10 Concern has been raised over whether the proposed sign is located within the boundary of the adjacent property this however is a civil rather than a planning matter.

4.11 One of the standard conditions on all advertisement consent approvals is that the sign is to be maintained in a safe condition. It is the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that the sign is structurally sound and will not fall over.

4.12 Policy IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan requires development not to endanger highway safety or prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic, due weight can be given to this saved policy as it is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Concern has been raised that the sign would reduce visibility when exiting the property and be detrimental to highway safety. The Highway Officer however, raises no objection to the application.

5. Reason for Approval

5.1 Material weight has been given to the approved sign application number 2012/0656 as the impact of this sign on the Conservation Area would not be greater than the approved sign. Weight has also been given to the approved 5 metre sign on the adjacent site and supporting local business.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2013/0563/CU  
**Parish**: DISS

**Applicants Name**: Mrs Stephanie Hare  
**Site Address**: Tatters 6 St. Nicholas Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4LB  
**Proposal**: Change of use from existing A1 classification to A2 to allow for the current retail premises to be used for financial services

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

SHO 5: Mix of uses within Central Business Areas  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council

- Refuse  
  - It is not considered acceptable that this unit is lost to A1 use because being a small retail premises it is ideal for businesses to start up in  
  - At least 3 retailers now in larger premises started in this unit.  
  - Therefore considered contrary to NPPF S23 specifically providing a diverse retail offer

3.2 District Member

- Cllr Tony Palmer  
  - Concern at losses of A1 use in Heritage Triangle
- Cllr Glyn Walden  
  - To be reported if appropriate
- Cllr Keith Kiddie  
  - To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer

- No objection  
  - Site part of Diss Cultural triangle  
  - No alterations are proposed as part of the application so impact on conservation area will not change  
  - Would be positive to have an occupier rather than an empty shop.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)

- No objection
3.5 Representations

Three letters of support
- Have been a succession of small businesses within this shop which have all left within 2 years
- Good to have a well establish company which will provide stability and enhance the street
- Will employ 4 people and attract wealthy clients to this part of town
- With empty shops important that we have viable businesses opening up

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to 6 St Nicholas Street, which is a vacant shop located within the primary shopping area for Diss and is within the Conservation Area. The building is grade II listed. It is proposed to change the use of the building from retail to financial and professional services (A2). The applicant has indicated that it is intended to use the building as a mortgage advisers. No internal or external changes are proposed to the building.

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes competitive town centre environments and states the viability and vitality of town centres should be supported and competitive town centres which provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer should be promoted.

4.3 The main policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan relating to the change of use is policy SHO5, which is a very restrictive policy that does not permit the loss of any retail premises. The aim of this policy is to protect the vitality and viability of town centres by preserving A1 uses within primary shopping areas.

4.4 Whilst the principle of policy SHO5 is broadly consistent with the NPPF which supports the principle of policies identifying Primary Shopping Areas and policies that make it clear which uses will be permitted in such locations; paragraph 23 in the NPPF does not however, offer any additional support to policy SHO5 in comparison to previous national guidance in terms of restricting uses in the Primary Shopping Area to the A1 use class.

4.5 In the past the very restrictive interpretation of policy SHO5, has been relaxed as a result of an appeal decision in Wymondham and also due to changes in national policy. The Wymondham appeal decision (application number 2002/0121) related to a change of use from A1 to A2. Although the Wymondham decision was based on a particular set of circumstances I would maintain that the appeal decision is relevant in requiring a more liberal interpretation of policy SHO5 than refusing all applications for a change of use from A1 regardless of any other considerations. The appeal decision involved a loss of an A1 unit to be incorporated into an adjoining A2 use which was clearly contrary to SHO5; thereby setting a precedent that such change of use applications can be permitted if other considerations show that the majority of units within the primary shopping area remain in A1 use.

4.6 The key issues in determining this application is whether the loss of this A1 unit would adversely impact on the vitality and viability of Diss town centre and whether the proposal adds to customer choice and a diverse retail offer.

4.7 I have re-surveyed the primary shopping area and the percentage of non retail use is currently 62.9% with the proposed change of use this figure would fall to 61.9%. I therefore consider that there is still a predominance of retail in the primary shopping area. The proposal will offer a service within the town centre. The Town Council have raised concern over the loss of a small retail shop which has been used by businesses as a first premises before moving on, which they consider will reduce the diverse retail offer and be contrary to
the NPPF. There are however, other small retail units within the town centre which are vacant which new businesses could lease, the loss of this currently vacant would not result in the retail offer of the town being diminished to an unacceptable level.

4.8 The site also forms part of Diss Heritage Triangle. Diss Heritage Partnership has recently received lottery funding to help improve this area. The loss of a retail shop would not significantly undermine this area. In addition it is important the premises are let and have active uses in them rather than being vacant. Three letters of support have been received from surrounding businesses for the proposal.

4.9 In addition an assessment of the potential harm that a change of use may cause to the integrity of the Primary Shopping Area also needs to be made including ensuring the excessive concentrations of 'dead' frontages arsing as a result of a grouping of too many A2 uses together. Although there are other A2 uses in St Nicholas Street the proposed change of use would not result in a concentration which would be detrimental to the vitality and viability of the primary shopping area.

4.10 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. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 - Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP18 – Development in Conservation Area. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The Primary Shopping Area will still be predominantly A1 taking into account the proposed change of use and the proposal would not result in an over concentration of use A2 uses which would result in harm being caused to the vitality and viability of the town centre.

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

**Appeals received from 13 April 2013 to 9 May 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/1669</td>
<td>Wicklewood Sub-division Of The Garden Of 86 High Street Wicklewood Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Gary Douglas-Beet</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2225</td>
<td>Wymondham Sub-division Of The Garden Of 33 Melon Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr R Barker</td>
<td>Proposed new single storey detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 13 April 2013 to 9 May 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/0607</td>
<td>Haddiscoe Willow Farm North End Thorpe Next Haddiscoe</td>
<td>Fuelsell Ltd - Mr Stephen Filsell</td>
<td>Use as fuel supply business</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1860</td>
<td>Framingham Earl 9 Long Road Framingham Earl Norfolk NR14 7RY</td>
<td>Miss Francesca Savino</td>
<td>Proposed garden gates and wall</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>