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Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 17 July 2013

Time

10.00 am

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 any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee’s attention.

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.

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

10/07/2013
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
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 meetings of the Development Management Committee held on 18 June 2013 and 19 June 2013;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 41)
   To consider the applications as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012/1777/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land Rear Of Mount Pleasant Norwich Road Dickleburgh</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/2034/F</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Land East Of Hillcrest Long Lane Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/2016/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land At Chapel Road And Bunwell Road Spooner Row</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/0892/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land Off Long Lane Bawburgh</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/0760/F</td>
<td>BUNWELL</td>
<td>Sub-division of the garden of The Laburnums The Turnpike Bunwell</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/0990/CU</td>
<td>BERGH APTON</td>
<td>The Stables At Church Road Bergh Apton</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/0335/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Village Hall Norwich Road Brooke</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/0985/H</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Kingfisher Lodge Common Road Dickleburgh</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013/1026/CU</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>32A Mill Road Hethersett</td>
<td>115</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)  

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 14 August 2013
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;
(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;
(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;
(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Fire alarm | 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 |
| Mobile phones | Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode |
| Toilets | The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber |
| Break | There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long |
| Drinking water | A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

<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

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

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

<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 (Details following outline consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Proposal by Government Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal / Variation of Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in recommendations

<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 or works specified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications referred back to Committee

1. Appl. No : 2012/1777/F  
Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

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

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

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

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

Introduction

The application was presented to Development Management Committee on 27 March 2013 and 24 April 2013. Members resolved to approve the application on the 24 April 2013 subject to a Section 106 legal agreement.

Subsequently it was noted that the application had not been referred to English Heritage for comment and that they should have been considered as a statutory consultee due to the development being within the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints.

The application was referred to English Heritage who advised that they would require a Heritage Impact Assessment. The applicant provided the required information for the Council and English Heritage and a formal re-consultation on this new statement was undertaken for a period of three weeks.

The report below has been written to reflect the new information, the English Heritage comments and any new comments received from the public and Parish Council. The previous report of the 24 April 2013 is attached as an appendix. It should be noted that the application proposal has not altered from that previously considered on the 24 April 2012.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD

2. Planning History

2.1 2002/1086 – Land at The Street
Dickleburgh
Diss
Change of use from agricultural to village green
Refused by Council and appeal dismissed.

2.2 2002/1085 – Land at The Street
Dickleburgh
Diss
Erection of 13 dwelling and construction of new access including demolition of one dwelling
Refused by Council and appeal dismissed.

2.3 2001/0492 – Land at The Street
Dickleburgh
Diss
Change of use from agricultural land to village green
Refused

2.4 2001/0491 – Land at The Street
Dickleburgh
Diss
Erection of 13no houses and construction of new access including demolition of one dwelling
Refused

3. Consultations

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

Comments received from further consultation carried out on the 06/06/13:

• The Parish Council would draw your attention to the response submitted in South Norfolk Local Development Framework - the Preferred Options Site Specific Allocations & Policies Consultation Document (Preferred Options Sept.12) where it was clearly indicated the Parish Council’s preference for the site on Rectory Road (site 054, Map 031A) would be the choice of development for affordable housing in Dickleburgh.

• The report sent by English Heritage (ref.P00240200) to South Norfolk further supports both the parishioners and the Council’s views – “the application site makes an important contribution to the significance of the grade 1 listed All Saints’ church….. would result in harm to the significance of those heritage assets.”

• The Parish Council consider they have followed the correct protocol regarding the affordable housing agenda - working together with the parishioners, local housing association to provide homes in appropriate locations, considering their views, listening to their concerns – localism in action.

• Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council recommend South Norfolk District Council to refuse this planning application.

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

3.3 Design Officer
No objections.

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

3.5 NCC Highways
No objections.

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager
No objections.

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

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)
Concerns raised regarding the foul sewage network. (These concerns have been addressed by Anglian Water and the Environment Agency in their consultation responses. The issue was considered in detail at the planning committee of the 24 April 2013)
3.9 Historic Environment Service
No objections

3.10 Environment Agency
No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.11 Ecologist
No objections

3.12 Anglian Water Services Ltd
It is still the case that there is adequate foul water capacity available in the foul water sewer in Norwich Road to accept foul flows from this development of 15 dwellings.

The site will generate a peak flow of less than 0.5 litres of foul flow per second. Given that the receiving foul sewer has a theoretical pipe full capacity of some 14 litres per second, the developed site will have a negligible impact.

To answer your further question, there have been no reported incidents of flooding in Norwich Road that can be attributed to the incapacity of the public sewerage system.

Section 94 of the Water industry Act imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to cleanse and maintain the sewerage infrastructure, on this basis we will continue to monitor the situation in Dickleburgh and take appropriate action should the need arise.

3.13 English Heritage
The Heritage Impact Assessment provides a considerable amount of information on the heritage assets in the vicinity of the application site, but the assessment of how their setting contributes to their significance is lacking in some important respects.

Regarding the conservation area’s western side, where the rear of houses on Norwich Road can be seen from the application site and from adjacent open areas, the Assessment refers to this aspect as ‘a usual and common village setting’. While not unique, this is highly characteristic of linear or ‘thoroughfare’ settlement forms. It is important to the character of Dickleburgh and illustrative of its historic development. One might even say the appearance of single-plot-deep dwellings on this side of the village is as much a defining characteristic of the historic settlement as the view along the main street.

In my earlier advice I noted how assessment of setting should not be restricted to narrow notions of specific and fixed views, but consider the character and quality of landscape and land use in a more dynamic way. The Assessment has not done this, but regularly refers to ‘views’ and how they may or may not reveal the application site and historic buildings, particularly the church. It seems clear that the new development and its boundary development will be visible from the churchyard and from the open fields beyond the village. However, what the Assessment consistently neglects is the contribution to an understanding of the conservation area and the church that is made by the application site when understood as part of the undeveloped land bordering the linear settlement. The quotation from the draft Conservation Area Appraisal I noted in my previous advice places value on this contribution, but the Heritage Assessment does not. The Assessment does acknowledge that ‘open land is being supplanted
by buildings’ (section 5), but there is no assessment of this impact (as opposed to views of this development) and no acknowledgement of the harm to significance of church, conservation area and some of the listed buildings within it.

In summary, I do not feel the Heritage Impact Assessment includes a full assessment of the development’s impact or mounts a justification for the harm it will entail. I therefore maintain my objection to the application.

3.14 Conservation Officer

In my view the key issues for consideration in relation to significance and setting are as follows :-

The Grade I listed church is the most significant and visually dominant building within the village, with the church tower acting as the focal point in views approaching the village where it is seen amongst clusters of roofs and groups of trees which surround the church.

Norwich Road has a mixed character comprising buildings of different periods, architectural styles and building materials. The grain and pattern of development in this part of the village is of a linear character although it is of a more modern and less distinctive nature with bungalows to the north of the site.

The open nature of the site does form part of the setting of the church looking south and the Conservation Area as a whole. The views from the churchyard to the site are restricted by the presence of large trees within the north churchyard and existing enclosures to the northern boundary.

My assessment of impact as a result of the proposed development is as follows :-

I do not consider that the development will have a negative impact on the setting of the listed buildings to the east and south east of the site where their principal contribution is to the character of the street scene.

The scale and form of development proposed make a positive contribution to the existing mixed character of the street and this part of the Conservation Area using a palette of materials based on those found locally.

More extensive development has already taken place on the eastern side of the village and although the proposal is not of a ribbon nature it is of a smaller scale, clustered around the church and close to the core of the village.

From a wider aspect the development builds on the existing character of a roofscape seen against the church tower and groups of trees.

Development of the site will clearly result in a change in the existing open character which I acknowledge will cause a degree of harm to the setting and significance of the church and the Conservation Area, although an area of open land is being retained between the
site and the existing churchyard to the north. However, I consider that this would be less than substantial harm.

Para 134 of the NPPF states that 'Where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

Key considerations therefore include the public benefits of providing affordable housing, where there has been an identified need along with the quality of the design. I am of the opinion that the design is of high quality with traditional materials being used in a contemporary manner. The layout and position of buildings have also taken account of views of the church to create a strong sense of place from within the development.

Further consideration should be given to the treatment of the site boundaries to create a softer interface between the development and the land beyond although this could be conditioned on any approval.

Subject to review of this element of the scheme, I am of the view that the public benefits of the development outweigh the harm which along with the quality of design and layout lead me to conclude that the scheme should be approved.

3.15 Representations There have been 27 letters of objection submitted, they raise the following issues:
- Dickleburgh has already provided affordable housing
- Negative impacts on views across the farmland and public footpaths
- The vehicular access point is situated in an area where traffic speeds up
- The applicant has no regard for the opinion of the people of Dickleburgh
- The development will have negative impact on property values especially as the development is for affordable housing
- Increased traffic volume
- Increased hazards when crossing the road to access services
- Existing drainage/flooding issues will be increased with new development.
- A site at Rectory Road is more suitable
- The development has been designed to create a larger estate.
- The development will have a negative impact on the conservation area and listed buildings
- The development will have a negative impact on the PROW
- The development will infringe the cordon sanitare
- Services, including the sewage system, are at capacity
- Negative impacts on wildlife
- Negative impacts on residential amenity from traffic entering and leaving the site
- Loss of residential amenity
- The provision of play space is in the wrong location
- The construction traffic should enter and leave from the north.
- Affordable housing in the surrounding area is empty
- Children will have to cross a busy road to access the school
4 Assessment

Site Context

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

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

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

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

4.5 The site has a public right of way (PROW) which dissects the site through the middle from the southern boundary to the northern boundary. There is a field access between two residential properties on the eastern boundary onto the roadside.

4.6 Dickleburgh has the a post office, church, public houses(s), bus stops, a village hall, playing fields and a school within its locality.

Proposal

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

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

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

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

4.10 Each dwelling is provided with at least two car parking spaces and a visitor space is also incorporated. The site proposes to create a new vehicular and pedestrian access on the eastern boundary on to Norwich Road/The Street. The access point would be provided between two properties on the eastern boundary and would require for the removal of an area of hedgerow.
The application further proposes that the existing PROW would be retained but would require some diversion works and its physical form on the section which runs across the site would be altered to reflect the build standards of the development proposal.

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

Principle of Development

The application site is located outside of the development boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan, therefore the application should be refused unless there are other development plan policies and/or material considerations which would dictate otherwise.

JCS Policy 4 states that affordable housing can be considered on sites which would otherwise not be released for housing provided there is a demonstrable local need. Furthermore JCS Policy 17 advises that in smaller rural communities affordable housing for which there is a specific local need will be permitted in locations adjacent to villages. The application has been referred to the Council’s Housing Strategy Team who have advised of their support of the application on the basis that there is a shortage of affordable properties in the locality to meet the district needs. This need for affordable housing has been determined through the Council’s housing register, a 2010 housing needs survey for Dickleburgh and the quantum of supply outlined within JCS Policy 4.

The NPPF directs that sites for housing should be both sustainable and deliverable to be considered for approval. The application site is within walking distance of the village services and the land is in the ownership of the applicant. There are no known physical constraints which would prevent the development being brought forward and the scheme has been designed to meet with the requirements of social housing providers.

By virtue of the identified need for affordable housing established through the JCS and the 2011 housing needs survey, the sustainable location of the site and its capability of being delivered the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

Design, Landscape and Heritage

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

Saved Policy IMP15 (setting of listed buildings) seeks to protect listed buildings and their setting, which is consistent with paragraph 132 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve heritage assets. The application site is within the conservation area, but does not contain any listed buildings, however as detailed previously in the report there are several listed buildings in the close vicinity.

The site layout responds positively to the existing residential development to the east by continuing the incremental growth of the settlement from the urban edge into a more agricultural character. The development of the site would aid to redress an imbalance in the village settlement that has occurred in recent times which has seen the majority of new housing development positioned to the east of the village centre.

The edges of the development are generally well screened by trees and vegetation that follow the alignment of existing field boundaries. A buffer zone of land and tree planting is proposed to the east between the site and the adjacent properties, which helps minimises
overlooking from and to the Grade II Listed Mount Pleasant. It is recommended that should approval be forthcoming that conditions be imposed that require for the landscaping detail to be submitted to create a soft edge to the development. In accordance with Saved Policy IMP2 this will supplement the landscape setting, integrate the development into the adjacent countryside setting and reduce the impact of the built form on the heritage assets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.27 It is considered that by maintaining key vistas and through the low density layout the integrity of the surrounding listed buildings, especially that of All Saints Church, would be maintained and that the materials proposed are not in conflict with those used within any of the listed buildings or wider conservation area.

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

4.29 NPPF Paragraph 134 advises that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. English Heritage have confirmed that although objecting to the application, they consider the development proposal to be one which would cause less than substantial harm to the surrounding heritage assets. Therefore the decision on whether the development would bring a community benefit of greater weight than the harm is a decision for the council to make.

4.30 The Council's Conservation Officer has also concluded that the development should be approved due to the negative impact to the heritage assets being less than substantial and that the application would provide for affordable dwellings.
An archaeological report has been submitted with the application and the use of a condition regarding the monitoring of the site for archaeological finds during construction is considered to be sufficient to meet with the requirements of Saved Policy ENV9 (nationally and locally important archaeological remains).

Highways and PROW

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

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

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

Ecology

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

Drainage

The application has been supplemented with a flood risk assessment which has been examined by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA have not objected to the application. The application through the discharge of appropriate conditions is considered to comply with NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and JCS Policy 3: Energy and water.

Conclusion

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

The removal of hedgerow to form the access is regrettable however the hedgerow is not considered to add value to the conservation area or to be of heritage significance in its own right. The hedgerow will be replaced with new planting which will be more in keeping with the character of the area.

The PROW will be diverted across the site which will allow for the current access arrangements to be sustained and that section of the PROW will be adopted by the Highway Authority which will ensure that its surfacing is kept to a high standard.

The development has been designed in a manner to not be overbearing on the conservation area and to respect the listed buildings in the locality. This has been achieved through the use of landscaping, separation areas, retaining key views and the scale of the proposed dwellings.
4.41 The development is not considered to have negative impacts on highway safety or residential amenity and the use of appropriate conditions can ensure that the development does not increase the risk of flooding in the area. Through the imposition and discharge of appropriate conditions the development will not have any surface water run off infiltrating the local sewage system.

4.42 English Heritage and the Council’s Conservation Officer have both advised that the development proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. This less than substantial harm needs to be weighed against the community benefits which affordable housing would bring. In considering this balance the application is recommended for approval in accordance with the provisions of NPPF 12.

5 Reasons For Approval

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

5.2 Through consideration of the design, use of materials, scale and siting of buildings the development is considered to respect the established principles of the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area and therefore in compliance with NPPF Sections 7 and 12, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policies IMP15 and ENV10.

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

5.4 The proposed landscaping will aid to integrate the development into its rural surroundings and enhance the green infrastructure of the locality in accordance with Saved Policies IMP2, ENV14 and ENV15. The careful combination of landscaping, design and layout is such as to take account of views in and out of the development to reduce harmful impacts on local heritage assets.

5.5 The introduction of an improved surface water management system through the development will reduce the risk of flooding of surrounding properties from foul sewage in accordance with the aims and objectives of NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and JCS Policy 3: Energy and water.

5.6 The development is compliant with the provisions of NPPF 12 as it would result in the provision of an identified community need and only result in less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Ian Reilly 01508 533674 ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. **Appl. No**: 2012/1777/F  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL  
**Applicants Name**: Mr A Pym  
**Site Address**: Land Rear Of Mount Pleasant Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Development of 15 affordable residential units with associated landscaping, parking and highways works  
**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

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

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

**Introduction**

The application was presented to Development Management Committee on 27 March 2013. Members resolved to defer the application until further information could be provided regarding the planning history of the site and for officers to investigate issues raised by members of the public and Dickelburgh Parish Council regarding foul drainage.

The site history included in the report has been updated below to include applications on land to the north of the application site which were determined in the period 2001-2003. The housing elements were for outline approvals and for market value housing. None of the applications gained approval. It should be noted that they were determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the time and that these have all be superseded. Therefore the applications and their outcomes have little relevance to the application under consideration and it is advised that they should be given no weight in this determination.

Further consultation has been undertaken with Anglian Water and the Council’s Environmental Protection - Flood Defence Officer. The Flood Defence Officer has advised that there have been reports of the foul sewer network surcharging immediately downstream of the proposed development and into garden grounds of properties on Norwich Road. Therefore they would maintain serious concerns about any additional connection to the network without mitigation works to alleviate the existing problems. The Flood Protection Officer further advised that our data would suggest that insufficient account has been taken with regard to surface water ingress that may be a major contributor to surcharging of the foul sewer downstream.
Anglian Water has advised that the foul sewage discharge is the result of blockages in the system and equipment failures at the plant, they have maintained that there is capacity to accommodate the proposed development.

The EA have not objected to the scheme subject to a condition ensuring that surface water run off associated with the development site would not cause flooding issues and that people and land will be kept safe from flooding.

The Flood Defence Officers comments raise issues of an existing foul drainage issue which may be attributable to surface water run off infiltrating the foul sewage system rather than blockages, as stated by Anglian Water. The satisfactory discharge of the EA condition would ensure that this site would not contribute to any surface water infiltrating the foul sewage system.

If there is an existing problem with the management and maintenance of the Anglian Water foul sewage system in Dickleburgh this application is not the means by which to resolve that, especially in consideration of their advice that there is capacity to accommodate the development. Given the advice received by both Anglian Water and the Environment Agency the existing issue associated with foul sewage discharge is not one which would be suitable as a reason for refusal of the application.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

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

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD

2. Planning History

2.1 2002/1086 – Change of use from agricultural to village green
    Land at The Street
    Dickleburgh
    Diss
    Refused by Council and appeal dismissed.
2.2 2002/1085 – Land at The Street Dickleburgh Diss
Erection of 13 dwelling and construction of new access including demolition of one dwelling
Refused by Council and appeal dismissed.

2.3 2001/0492 – Land at The Street Dickleburgh Diss
Change of use from agricultural land to village green
Refused

2.4 2001/0491 – Land at The Street Dickleburgh Diss
Erection of 13no houses and construction of new access including demolition of one dwelling
Refused

3. Consultations

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

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

3.3 Conservation and Design Officer
No objections.

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

3.5 NCC Highways
No objections.

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager
No objections.

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

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)
See introduction. Concerns raised.

3.9 Historic Environment Service
No objections
3.10 Environment Agency
No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.11 Ecologist
No objections

3.12 Anglian Water Services Ltd
It is still the case that there is adequate foul water capacity available in the foul water sewer in Norwich Road to accept foul flows from this development of 15 dwellings.

The site will generate a peak flow of less than 0.5 litres of foul flow per second. Given that the receiving foul sewer has a theoretical pipe full capacity of some 14 litres per second, the developed site will have a negligible impact.

To answer your further question, there have been no reported incidents of flooding in Norwich Road that can be attributed to the incapacity of the public sewerage system.

Section 94 of the Water industry Act imposes a legal obligation on Anglian Water to cleanse and maintain the sewerage infrastructure, on this basis we will continue to monitor the situation in Dickleburgh and take appropriate action should the need arise.

3.13 Representations
There have been 24 letters of objection submitted, they raise the following issues:
- Dickleburgh has already provided affordable housing
- Negative impacts on views across the farmland and public footpaths
- The vehicular access point is situated in an area where traffic speeds up
- The applicant has no regard for the opinion of the people of Dickleburgh
- The development will have negative impact on property values especially as the development is for affordable housing
- Increased traffic volume
- Increased hazards when crossing the road to access services
- Existing drainage/flooding issues will be increased with new development.
- A site at Rectory Road is more suitable
- The development has been designed to create a larger estate.
- The development will have a negative impact on the conservation area and listed buildings
- The development will have a negative impact on the PROW
- The development will infringe the cordon sanitare
- Services, including the sewage system, are at capacity
- Negative impacts on wildlife
- Negative impacts on residential amenity from traffic entering and leaving the site
- Loss of residential amenity
- The provision of play space is in the wrong location
- The construction traffic should enter and leave from the north.
- Affordable housing in the surrounding area is empty
4 Assessment

Site Context

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

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

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

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

4.5 The site has a public right of way (PROW) which dissects the site through the middle from the southern boundary to the northern boundary. There is a field access between two residential properties on the eastern boundary onto the roadside.

4.6 Dickleburgh has the a post office, church, public houses(s), bus stops, a village hall, playing fields and a school within its locality.

Proposal

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

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

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

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

Each dwelling is provided with at least two car parking spaces and a visitor space is also incorporated. The site proposes to create a new vehicular and pedestrian access on the eastern boundary on to Norwich Road/The Street. The access point would be provided between two properties on the eastern boundary and would require for the removal of an area of hedgerow.
4.11 The application further proposes that the existing PROW would be retained but would require some diversion works and its physical form on the section which runs across the site would be altered to reflect the build standards of the development proposal.

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

Principle of Development

4.13 The application site is located outside of the development boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan, therefore the application should be refused unless there are other development plan policies and/or material considerations which would dictate otherwise.

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

4.15 The NPPF directs that sites should be both sustainable and deliverable to be considered for approval. The application site is within walking distance of the village services and the applicant has advised that two social housing providers have taken options to purchase the site with a view to immediate development.

4.16 By virtue of the identified local need for affordable housing, the sustainable location of the site and its deliverability the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

Design and Landscape

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Heritage assets

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

4.27 The application site does not contain any listed buildings, however as detailed previously in the report there are several listed buildings in the close vicinity.

4.28 It is considered that by maintaining key vistas and through the low density layout the integrity of the surrounding listed buildings would be maintained and that the materials proposed are not in conflict with those used within any of the listed buildings or wider conservation area.

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

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

Highways and PROW

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

4.32 The PROW Officer has raised concerns that the rural nature of the path way will be eroded through the development. However, provided that the development results in a pathway which will be adopted by the Highway Authority the PROW Officer has no objections to the development. The Highway Authority have advised that the section of the PROW which would be within the site would be adopted.
4.33 It is acknowledged that the PROW will change in character but this alteration is only to a small section of a larger rural network and this alteration is not considered to be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

Ecology

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

Drainage

4.35 The application has been supplemented with a flood risk assessment which has been examined by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA have not objected to the application. Further details of the drainage issues associated with this site are examined above in the introduction to this report. The application through the discharge of appropriate conditions is considered to comply with NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and JCS Policy 3: Energy and water.

Conclusion

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

4.37 The removal of hedgerow to form the access is regrettable however the hedgerow is not considered to add value to the conservation area or to be of heritage significance in its own right. The hedgerow will be replaced with new planting which will be more in keeping with the character of the area.

4.38 The PROW will be diverted across the site which will allow for the current access arrangements to be sustained and that section of the PROW will be adopted by the Highway Authority which will ensure that its surfacing is kept to a high standard.

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

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

4.41 Through the imposition and discharge of appropriate conditions the development will not have any surface water run off infiltrating the local sewage system.

5 Reasons For Approval

5.1 The principle of the development is considered acceptable outside the development boundary by virtue of the application being for an entirely affordable housing scheme in accordance with the requirements of JCS Policy 4.
5.2 Through consideration of the design, use of materials, scale and siting of buildings the development is considered to respect the established principles of the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area and therefore in compliance with NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policies IMP15 and ENV10.

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

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

5.5 The introduction of an improved surface water management system through the development will reduce the risk of flooding of surrounding properties from foul sewage in accordance with the aims and objectives of NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and JCS Policy 3: Energy and water.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Ian Reilly 01508 533674 ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No:** 2012/2034/F  
**Parish:** STOKE HOLY CROSS

**Applicants Name:** John Paterson (Dilham) Ltd  
**Site Address:** Land East Of Hillcrest Long Lane Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk  
**Proposal:** New access to land adjacent to Long Lane, provision of 50 houses, road and car park

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. **Standard 3 year time limit for implementation**
2. **In accordance with amended plans**
3. **Materials**
4. **Highway details TBA (including provision of access road to boundary of adjoining developable site)**
5. **Works in accordance with Highway details**
6. **Roads to binder course before occupation**
7. **Garages to have a minimum dimensions of 7 x 3 metres**
8. **Off-site highway improvement details TBA**
9. **Off-site highway works completed prior to occupation**
10. **TRO to extend speed limit**
11. **Surface water drainage scheme TBA**
12. **Foul water drainage scheme TBA**
13. **Archaeology (written scheme of investigation)**
14. **Landscaping (to include bird boxes)**
15. **Landscaping management**
16. **PD removal for conversion of garages**
17. **Contaminated land during construction**

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards libraries and community facilities, the management and maintenance arrangements of the car park facility and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type and tenure mix of affordable housing including its affordability in perpetuity.

1. **Introduction**

1.1 Members resolved to approve this application at the 24 April 2013 Development Management Committee. The approval was subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement to provide for developer contributions towards libraries, a footpath/cycle track, car park facility, and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type and tenure mix of affordable housing including its affordability in perpetuity. The original officer report is attached as appendix 2.

1.2 Members will note that the Parish Council (PC) both before and during the meeting raised significant concerns, and these are attached as appendix 3 to this report. Of particular note is the fact they requested that the developer provide additional community facilities for the village should the application be approved. Although members were made fully aware of the concerns of the Parish Council, (the PC also verbally addressed members at the meeting), and the report fairly summarises the PC's views, it made no assessment of their request for community facilities as a material consideration.

1.3 The Council needs to demonstrate that the comments of the PC (particularly in respect of inadequacy of contributions towards infrastructure) have been properly addressed and recorded. Members are also advised that Community contributions offered by the applicant that do not meet the Community Infrastructure Regulations (CIL) requirements should not be taken into account in the Committee's decision making. A CIL compliance test is therefore included within this report.
1.4 CIL regulations clearly state that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

2. Consultations update

2.1 Parish Council Refuse

- reservations about the suitability of the site as an allocation
- significantly outside the extent of the preferred allocation with no justification
- Development of the site would breach the 'natural development boundary' to this important approach to the village. The development of this area will permanently change the character of this part of the Tas valley
- The Parish Council has received pre-application presentations from two other more suitable sites and it is wrong that this site should be considered ahead of them
- The application should be held in abeyance until applications for the other two alternative sites have been submitted
- Increase in traffic from the development will have a detrimental impact on Long lane, particularly given the proximity to the school and the general increase in traffic from recent permitted developments in Poringland
- Impact on local services that are already under strain
- The use and viability of the proposed car park is questionable. How will it be managed and maintained, and how will it be used exclusively for the school?
- If the application is to be recommended for approval, then the applicant should be required to provide for additional community facilities as the existing pre-school play group is full; the Parish Pavilion is inadequate for a village of our size.

Members will be updated in respect of any further PC comments, not available at the time of writing this report.

2.2 Additional Representations

One additional letter of objection received

- Concern in respect drainage in Mill Green, particularly in respect of sewerage surcharge. These have been reported to Anglian water.

3. Assessment

3.1 The assessment of the application in respect of design and layout and the impact on the character and appearance of the area, impact on residential amenity, and highway impact remains as per the previous report to committee (see appendix 2). The drainage concern raised by a local resident is noted, however Anglian water have confirmed that there is foul drainage capacity to accommodate foul flows from the development. It is likely that localised blockage is causing the surcharging, and it is for Anglian water to investigate this.
The majority of the points raised by the Parish Council have been addressed in the original committee report attached as appendix 2. Additional issues for members to consider as material now are:

- Whether or not the offered planning obligations and those requested from the Parish Council comply with the requirements of the CIL regulations and so should be registered as material.
- The implications of a further application for 24 dwellings close to the site having been recently submitted. (2013/0828 refers)

Planning obligations and contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation/Contribution</th>
<th>Derived</th>
<th>Is it CIL compliant and can it be taken into account?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCC - Libraries</td>
<td>NCC obligations JCS Policy requirement (Policy 7)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 33% affordable housing</td>
<td>JCS policy requirement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space and play area</td>
<td>SNC saved local plan policy requirement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult / older children recreation space contribution (in lieu of there being no on-site provision)</td>
<td>SNC saved local plan policy requirement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of £75,000 towards the provision, extension or improvement of indoor or outdoor physical recreational facilities or equipment within the parish of Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Offered by applicant.</td>
<td>No – although it is considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, this is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, nor is it directly related to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public car park – to help alleviate the parking problem associated with the school during pick-up and drop-off times.</td>
<td>Offered by applicant.</td>
<td>No – although generally welcomed, it is not required to make the development acceptable, and nor is the use of the car park directly related to the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concerns from the Parish Council in respect of planning obligations are noted, however as can be seen from the above assessment, contributions to village facilities for a development of 50 dwellings are not CIL compliant, as demonstrated above, and should not be material to the determination of the application. Notwithstanding this, officers and the applicant have taken on board the aspirations for enhanced village facilities, and the applicant is offering a significant financial contribution, as well as a car park. It is acknowledged that these would be of benefit to the community.

Although the previous report was clear as to which issues had weight in the determination of the application, and set out the developer contributions, it is considered necessary that clarity is given with regard to the CIL regulation requirements by bringing it to members' attention.
Application 2013/0828

3.6 Since members resolved to approve application 2012/2034, an outline application for 24 dwellings on land to the north of Long Lane has now been submitted, and although this site will be considered on its own merits in due course, any cumulative impacts on local infrastructure needs to be considered at this stage. A site location plan is attached as appendix 3.

3.7 Taken together with the application 2012/2034 (under current consideration), a total of 74 dwellings are proposed. Seventy five dwellings have been proposed in the preferred options of the Council’s site allocations. No statutory consultee has raised an objection to this level of development in Stoke Holy Cross. There are no known capacity issues or infrastructure constraints that are material to the consideration of both applications now before the Council.

Conclusion

3.8 This report does not alter any of the matters previously considered by members and does not change the overall officer recommendation. Although the provision of village facilities and the provision of a car park would not comply with the CIL regulations requirements they can be included within the Section 106 agreement provided that they are not considered to form a material consideration in the determination of the application by committee.

3.9 Subject to the contents of this report, the application is recommended for approval as per the officer report, recommendation and reasons of the 24 April 2013 (attached as appendix 2) and subject to a Section 106 agreement as detailed within this report.

4. Reason for Approval

4.1 It is accepted that there is currently not a five year supply of sites within the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

4.2 In this instance, the requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, limited in scale to two-storey in height and in numbers to 50 dwellings, can be accepted as a departure from saved Local Plan policy ENV8, which is given due weight as it remains partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF, and policies 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15 and 20 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2. Appl No : 2012/2034/F
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name : John Paterson (Dilham) Ltd
Site Address : Land East Of Hillcrest Long Lane Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk
Proposal : New access to land adjacent to Long Lane, provision of 50 houses, road and car park

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Standard 3 year time limit for implementation
2. In accordance with amended plans
3. Materials
4. Highway details
5. Works in accordance with Highway details
6. Roads to binder course before occupation
7. Garages to have a minimum dimensions of 7 x 3 metres
8. Off-site highway improvement details
9. Off-site highway works completed prior to occupation
10. TRO to extend speed limit
11. Surface water drainage scheme
12. Foul water drainage scheme
13. Archaeology (written scheme of investigation)
14. Landscaping (to include bird boxes)
15. Landscaping management
16. PD removal for conversion of garages
17. Contaminated land during construction

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards libraries and a footpath/cycle track to Upper Stoke and the senior school, the management and maintenance arrangements of the car park facility, and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type and tenure and mix of affordable housing including its affordability in perpetuity.

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 15: Service Villages
Policy 20: Implementation
Development Management Committee  17 July 2013

1.3  South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the
Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

1.4  Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2.  Planning History

2.1  2012/0383  T1 Oak - stage one of pollard; reduce branches by 4-5 metres.  Approved

3.  Consultations

3.1  Parish Council  Refuse

- reservations about the suitability of the site as an allocation
- significantly outside the extent of the preferred allocation with no justification
- Development of the site would breach the ‘natural development boundary’ to this important approach to the village. The
development of this area will permanently change the character of this part of the Tas valley
- The Parish Council has received pre-application presentations from two other more suitable sites and it is wrong that this site
should be considered ahead of them
- the application should be held in abeyance until applications for
the other two alternative sites have been submitted
- Increase in traffic from the development will have a detrimental impact on Long lane, particularly given the proximity to the
school and the general increase in traffic from recent permitted developments in Poringland
- Impact on local services that are already under strain
- The use and viability of the proposed car park is questionable.
How will it be managed and maintained, and how will it be used exclusively for the school?
- If the application is to be recommended for approval, then the applicant should be required to provide for additional community
facilities

3.2  District Member  To committee - application is contrary to proposed site allocation for
parish, but has merits.

3.3  NCC Highways  No objection to amended plans, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.4  Environment Agency  No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.5  Environmental Services (Protection)  To be reported.
Development Management Committee  

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager  
Supports the revised proposal.

3.7 Ecologist  
There are no protected species issues for this site. Additional planting should include native species. Enhancements should include the provision of at least 6 bird boxes.

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
No objection, subject to appropriate conditions in respect of a drainage strategy downstream of the site.

3.9 NCC- Planning Obligations  
For a development of this size, no contributions will be sought towards education provision. Contributions towards enhance library provision will be required.

3.10 SNC Landscape Officer  
Comments on amended plans awaited.

3.11 Norfolk Historic Environment Service  
No objection subject to appropriate conditions requiring a programme of archaeological work.

3.12 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
Makes general advice about security for parked vehicles and boundary treatments.

3.13 Planning Policy  
The application has been amended to allow access to the remainder of the proposed allocation in the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and therefore the proposed scheme no longer compromises the delivery of this proposed allocation.

Whilst the proposed development still involves additional land to the east of the proposed allocation, little weight can be given to the boundary shown in the preferred options at this stage. Consideration needs to be given to the NPPF and in particular the requirement to provide a five-year supply of housing land. As noted within the supporting information we are not able to demonstrate such a supply in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) in which Stoke Holy Cross falls. There is therefore a strong presumption in the granting of permission for applications for residential development unless there are very strong material considerations as to why permission should not be granted.

3.14 Representations  
6 letters of objection received
- application is for development outside development boundary
- additional impact on traffic on Long lane
- overcrowded school
- will spoil character of the village
- existing infrastructure will not be able to cope
- site is in area of high landscape value
- current issues with surface water drainage
- application is premature
- overdevelopment of site and village in general
- proposed car park facility not in the most desirable location
- besides a local bus service Stoke Holy Cross has no local services
- site layout does not create a cohesive development
- intrusion into the wider landscape
Development Management Committee

Assessment

4.1 The application site is located at the eastern edge of the village, adjacent the property Hillcrest, and bounded to the north by Long Lane, and south and east by open countryside. The site area is approx. 2.8 hectares. The site falls within a landscape character area known as the 'Poringland Settled Plateau Farmland', (as defined within the South Norfolk Place Making Guide), and comprises a generally flat landscape but one that rises steadily to a central dome area. This high point is centred approximately between Upper Stoke and Poringland. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 The site does not fall in an area at risk from flooding, and is currently in agricultural use. The site is well screened by existing hedges and trees, and only glimpses of it are afforded as you travel up and down Long Lane. The site is outside the development boundary for the village. The surrounding development to the west comprises a mixture of single and two storey dwellings of differing styles and character, although the ex-local authority housing to the north of Long Lane are a predominant feature of this end of the village.

4.3 This full application proposes 50 new dwellings and associated works, including access and open space. A small car park is also proposed that will help relieve the pressures for on-street parking on Long Lane during school drop-off and pick-up times. The application includes 33% affordable housing in accordance with policy and a housing mix and tenure that reflect the needs of the community.

4.4 Access to the site will be off Long Lane, with an estate road that allows for further access to the adjoining preferred site allocation to the south west, should this be developed in the future. A site layout and example street scenes are attached as appendix 2 to this report.

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

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Stoke Holy Cross for further small scale housing development during the period 2011 to 2026.
- There is an acknowledged lack of a 5-year housing supply within the Norwich Policy Area (currently 68.3% years supply in the NPA.) The recently published National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply also includes an additional buffer of 5%.
- Having regard to part of the site being a preferred allocation for development of up to 75 dwellings (the site being considered a sustainable location for development.
- The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years).
- Other relevant sections of the NPPF as set out above.

4.6 It will be noted above that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents raising a number of issues. The Parish Council also objects to the development of the site, suggesting that there is a better alternative, however I have to consider the application before me and the merits of the case. Taking these comments into account, the main issues that members need to consider are:
The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the identification of approx. 50% of the site as a preferred allocation for residential development, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing.

- Design and layout and the impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Drainage & flood risk
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highway Impact

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

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

4.8 In terms of sustainability, the site is well located in relation to the local primary school and there is a regular bus service to Norwich. It is acknowledged that the village has recently lost its post office and shop, although I understand that there is opportunity for the shop to reopen. JCS Policy 15 does state that developments in excess of 20 dwellings, especially within the Norwich Policy Area, can be allowed where it can be demonstrated to improve local service provision (or help to maintain services under threat). In this case the development may bring an increased need to allow for the shop to re-open.

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

4.10 Although carrying limited weight, consideration must also be given to the fact that part of the site is a preferred allocation for development, and that it is also located adjacent the wider preferred allocation for development. The proposed development shows an access to the edge of this neighbouring site, and does not prejudice its future delivery. It is also worth noting that the applicants are now in discussions with the neighbouring landowner to ensure a joined-up approach to any future development.

Landscape Impact

4.11 The site is located at the edge of the village where the land gently rises towards Upper Stoke. The land to the north of Long Lane is fairly open and flat in character, whereas the land to the south of the road (where the site is located) is actually fairly well screened from views by mature hedging and trees. I have also assessed the impact of the development of the site when viewed from Brickle Road to the south east, and I am satisfied that no direct views of the site will be afforded due to the nature of the intervening landscape (containing dispersed trees and hedging). Although the site extends beyond the boundary of the preferred site allocation, it is still contained within the natural boundary of the agricultural field, and is generally contained within boundaries of mature hedgerows and trees. I have therefore concluded that there will be no harmful impact on the character of the wider landscape.
Design and layout and the impact on the character and appearance of the area

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

4.13 The scheme achieves a distinct character by arranging the majority of houses in clusters around private roads off the main drive. There is no repetition of the layout which helps the site to feel 'less formal' as well as balancing the need to achieve a coordinated approach and rhythm to house types that unifies the site.

4.14 The intended appearance of the development combines traditional building forms, detailing and materials based on the local vernacular. A limited palette of materials is proposed that helps to give the individual buildings a strong character while maintaining continuity across the site. Overall, the design of the house types responds well to the site context and also to their siting and orientation within the development.

4.15 The amended scheme has been assessed by the Council’s Design Officer who comments that the scheme successfully shows how the proposals will combine the existing site assets into one coherent development that joins up with the proposed and existing and proposed land uses in Stoke Holy Cross. The scheme accords with the requirements of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. The application therefore accords with JCS Policy 2 and section 7 of the NPPF.

Drainage and flood risk

4.16 In respect of foul drainage, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is capacity in the local treatment works to accommodate foul flows from the development. A foul drainage strategy has been agreed with developers that identifies a suitable point of connection, and details of this can be agreed by condition.

4.17 The applicants have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment that indicates that the site is not capable of accommodating infiltration drainage. It is there intended to drain the site to existing watercourses, and to maintain the existing Greenfield run-off rates through the use of surface water attenuation and storage. The rate of surface water discharge from the site will be limited to a maximum rate of 7.6 l/sec for all storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year event (including an allowance for climate change).

4.18 I note a local resident's comment that the site floods after heavy rainfall, however this is almost certainly due to the boulder clay that the site sits on. The applicants are aware of these soil conditions, and have taken these into account in suggesting the use of a positive surface water attenuation scheme for the site.

4.19 The Environment Agency has been consulted and raises no objection to the scheme, which is considered to accord with the relevant sections of the NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

4.20 The site is bounded by existing development only to the west, this being a detached dwelling on a large plot. A substantial hedgerow separates the residential curtilage of this property from the development site, and adequate separation distances (dwelling to dwelling) have been provided within the layout of the scheme. I am satisfied that there will be no direct overlooking of neighbouring properties.
Presently, there are issues with traffic congestion on Long Lane during school pick-up and drop-off times, mainly due to cars being parked on the road during this period. The developers are proposing a 30-space car park with a footpath link to Long Lane that will be available for parents to use, thus reducing some of the pressures to park on the road. This will be managed by the landowner for a period of 3 years, during which time its impact will be monitored. Parents will then be able to access the school via a footpath link. It is acknowledged that parents can not be forced to use this car park, but with the cooperation of the school, my view is that it can only help to reduce the general disturbance to the amenities of existing residents on Long Lane and users of the highway in general.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the development of this site will give rise to an increase in general levels of disturbance in the local area, largely from a relatively small increase in traffic movements and residential activity, this impact would not be so severe as to warrant a refusal of the application, which accords with saved local plan policy IMP8.

Highway impact

I acknowledge that many residents have raised concerns in respect of highway impact, especially in respect of additional traffic movements, however NCC: highways raise no objection to the principle of development or the proposed access arrangement from Long Lane. It has also been accepted that the access and estate road will also have capacity for further development of the preferred site allocation to the west. Although any development of this site will be considered on its own merits at the appropriate time, I am satisfied that the development of the application site in the form shown will not prejudice the delivery of the wider preferred allocation.

I have therefore concluded that the scheme accords with the requirements of saved local plan policy IMP8.

Reason for Approval

It is accepted that there is not a five-year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, limited in scale to two-storey in height and in numbers to 50 dwellings, can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8, which is given due weight as it remains partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Gary Hancox 01508 533841
and E-mail: ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3.  **App. No:** 2012/2016/O  
    **Parish:** WYMONDHAM  

    **Applicants Name:** J Alston  
    **Site Address:** Land At Chapel Road And Bunwell Road Spooner Row Norfolk  
    **Proposal:** Outline planning application for the development of land to the east of Chapel Road - 13 dwellings and land to the east of Bunwell Road - 20 dwellings  

    **Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Reserved Matters  
3. Approved plans  
4. Slab levels  
5. Floor levels of Bunwell Road  
6. Boundary Treatment  
7. Surface water management  
8. Ecological Management Plan  
9. Contaminated land  
10. Full details of external lighting  
11. Noise protection  
12. Foul water  
13. Landscaping  
14. Retention trees and hedges  
15. Tree protection  
16. Fire Hydrants  
17. External materials to be agreed  
18. Standard Estate Road  
19. Standard Estate Road  
20. Connection to highway  
21. Visibility splay  
22. Off site improvements  

Subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure the provision of the proposed affordable housing and its phased delivery, CIL compliant financial contributions and open play space area.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 15: Service Villages
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV 14: Habitat protection
   ENV 15: Species protection
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History
   2.1 None relevant

3. Appeal History
   3.1 None relevant

4. Consultations
   4.1 Wymondham Town Council
      Recommend Refusal
      - The application is contrary to policy and the safe and free flow
        of traffic. Concerns also over drainage and that both sites do not
        contain a mix of affordable and market value housing.

   4.2 District Member: Clr N Ward
      To be reported if appropriate

   4.3 NCC Highways
      Would prefer to see the road widened at Chapel Road from 4.8m to
      5.5m rather than the retention of the hedgerow and object to the
      scheme without these works.
      They welcome the applicants proposals to use road marking and
      signage to reinforce the 30mph speed limit on the Chapel Road
      section of the application.

   4.4 Environment Agency
      No objections. Conditions regarding flood risk recommended.

   4.5 Historic Environment Service
      No objections

   4.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd
      No objections

   4.7 Planning Policy
      - As a Service Village in the Norwich Policy Area, the JCS
        allocated Spooner Row 10-20 dwellings, plus consideration for
        additional development to help deliver the 'smaller sites in the
        NPA' allowance. During the Site Specific Allocations process,
        both application sites were assessed according to the
        sustainability criteria, with the result that the Chapel Road site is
        a preferred site, but the Bunwell Road site is not.
      - Concerns over the Bunwell Road site included part of the site
        being in the flood zone, which is mentioned in the applicant's
        Design and Access Statement.
The Chapel Road site was preferred for 10 dwellings, and policy considerations for the Chapel Road site included possible relocation of the sewage pumping station and acknowledgement of the site's role as a gateway to Spooner Row from the north.

The NPA does not have a five year supply of housing land.

4.8 Housing Strategy Manager
No objections. It is noted that the applicant wishes to provide all of the affordable housing on one site, whilst we do not object to this delivery it is not something we would ordinarily seek to support.

4.9 Ecologist
No objections

4.10 NCC- Planning Obligations
No objections. Contributions will be required for Primary, High School and 6th form provision, these will be sought to make improvements to Spooner Row Primary and Wymondham High School as both schools will be at capacity.

4.11 Landscape Officer
No objections subject to conditions including the management of landscape areas.

4.12 Design Officer
No objections

4.13 Environmental Protection
No objections. Conditions required to ensure that foul and surface water drainage are acceptable.

4.14 Asset Management
No objections

4.15 Representations
35 letters of objection have been received from members of the public. These objections raise the following issues:
- Increased traffic generation
- Local services at capacity including broadband and electricity supply. The schemes put forward do not demonstrate that they will improve services
- Public transport is not of a high enough standard
- Spooner Row should not be considered for Wymondham growth plans and does not meet the requirements of JCS Policy 15 designating it as a Service Village.
- Lack of footpaths and street lighting mean dangerous pedestrian movements
- The developer is developing for commercial gain only and abusing the housing stock growth programme with an inappropriate development with isolated design solutions, especially regarding foul and surface water drainage.
- The rail facilities are insufficient at present, no live service information and only two stops each way per day.
- Villagers do not want allotments or isolated landscaped spaces.
- The developer should be made to widen roads
- Loss of rural village character and field views
- The village requires a full infrastructure over haul
- The financial incentives offer to the village hall and school should not be considered
- The treatment plant would have an outfall and fumes.
- Negative impact on a Listed Building.
- The Bunwell Road site was rejected within the Local Plan site specifics
• The site would increase flood risk to the locality. Flooding in Bunwell Road area occurs regularly.
• There is no need for extra housing.
• The application proposes a cramped intensive housing estate style development, which is inappropriate in a village setting.
• There are other options which should be supported and considered.
• The scale of development is in conflict with JCS Policy 15.
• The application should not be considered as one application.
• The development would increase the village size by approximately 20%.
• The applicant fails to assess the landscape impacts sufficiently and relies on appeal decisions such as Townhouse Road, Carpenters Farm and Pigot Lane, which were for completely different settings and circumstances.
• All benefits associated with the development are needed to mitigate its impact.
• 22 executive homes are not needed in Spooner Row.
• The rail station gate is now unmanned and accidental entry can be gained.
• Affordable dwellings are not affordable enough.
• Inadequate road network.
• Information within the application is incorrect regarding the availability of bus stops.

5 Assessment

Site Context

5.1 Spooner Row is a village consisting of several clusters of development. The A11 is to the west and north and the railway line dissect the village. Wymondham is approximately 3 miles to the north.

5.2 The planning application is divided into two parcels of land which have an accumulative area of 3.77 ha. One site is located to the east of Chapel Road and the other is located to the east of Bunwell Road/Hill Road, both sites are agricultural land of grade 3 quality. Both sites are under the ownership of one individual.

5.3 The Chapel Road site is within the northern cluster of Spooner Row and has residential development to its south and west, these have mostly been developed in a linear fashion. The northern and eastern areas of the site are bordered by open fields with a hedge running along the eastern boundary, save for field access points. There is no other significant vegetation within the site.

5.4 The northern cluster of Spooner Row has no dominant character with each period of development adopting its own style. This has resulted in the southern aspect of the cluster being predominately detached bungalows and the northern aspect, which is directly opposite the site, being two storey ex-local authority semi-detached dwellings. All of the dwellings in this cluster appear to have large garden grounds and off road parking.

5.5 To the rear of the local authority build dwellings (7 Chapel Road) is a sewage treatment works which provides service for the local authority dwellings. The existing sewage works is accessible only via foot. This sewage works forms part of the Councils Sewage Works Improvement Programme, where the Council are seeking to upgrade its works to meet the requirements of Anglian Water. The aim of this programme is for Anglian Water to take adoption of the works and become the provider.
5.6 The Chapel Road site has been identified within the Local Plan Site Specific Allocations process has suitable for 10 dwellings with the potential relocation of the council owned sewage works.

5.7 The row of ex-local authority properties on the western side of Chapel Road amount to 12 dwellings. These dwellings were transferred to Saffron Housing and subsequently only four of them are still in the ownership of Saffron (No’s 9, 11, 13 and 18).

5.8 The Bunwell Road site is to the south of the central cluster of development within Spooner Row. The site provides for 3 ha of the overall application site area. The frontage of the site addresses both Bunwell Road and Hill Road. To the east are open fields and to the north and south are residential properties. The opposite eastern side of the road contains open fields and a Grade II listed property which has had a two storey extension, link building and conversion of a garage approved and implemented.

5.9 The dwellings to the north of the Bunwell Road site are semi detached ex-local authority style houses and those to the south are a mixture of traditional cottages and new build bungalows.

5.10 The majority of the frontage of the site has a hedgerow and there is no other significant vegetation associated with the site. The site contains in its north eastern corner an area of flood risk zone 3.

Proposal

5.11 The application proposes in outline form to establish the two sites for residential purposes, with 33 dwellings across the two sites. All matters are reserved apart from access.

5.12 The Chapel Road site details that 13 dwellings would be accommodated with 11 of these to meet the affordable housing provision for both sites. The site would also provide for a relocated sewage treatment works constructed to Anglian Water standards, which would therefore be capable of adoption. The new sewage treatment works would accommodate the proposed development and those currently connected to the existing station behind 7 Chapel Road, therefore making it redundant. The application proposes the introduction of two vehicular access points, with visibility splays and a footpath behind the existing hedgerow.

5.13 The Bunwell Road site is proposed to accommodate 20 dwellings and a private treatment plant for sewage associated with the development. The application details that two main vehicular access points would be provided, one for the main development and the other for the treatment works and field access. This element of the development also details the provision of two areas of open space, one of which would be the area identified as Flood Zone 3.

5.14 The 20 dwellings on site would all be market value housing and there would be footpaths and crossings created to link with existing.

5.15 The applicant has also advised that, through the Section 106, he is prepared to provide contributions above what is required, to the Village Hall and to the local school. These contributions do not meet with CIL compliant specifications and, although they can be accommodated within the Section 106 legal agreement, they are not to be considered as material to the decision and they have not influenced the recommendation of this report.

5.16 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development, the visual impact of the development on the landscape and its features, the impacts of the development on the existing character of the village, the balance of the affordable housing provision and the Highway Authority objection.
Principle of development

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

5.18 The NPPF directs that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing land cannot be considered up to date where a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites does not exist. Currently there is not a 5 year land supply for housing in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

5.19 The two sites are both within walking distance of the services provided within Spooner Row. Furthermore there are no objections from any statutory consultees and they advise that with mitigation and/or contributions the local services and infrastructure can accommodate for this development. The mitigation and contributions required have been accepted by the developer.

5.20 The two sites are in the ownership of one person and Saffron Housing have advised of their desire to acquire the affordable element, the applicant has not sought to reduce any contributions or requirements and as such the scheme must be considered viable to them. Therefore there are no known factors which would indicate that the scheme cannot be delivered, subject to agreement on phasing and triggers for the affordable housing.

5.21 Given that there is not a 5 year land supply as required by the NPPF and that dwellings will be required in sustainable and deliverable sites, which these are, the principle of the development is considered acceptable. The 33 dwellings would make a significant contribution to the Council’s 5 year land supply requirement. Furthermore, JCS Policy 9 advises that 1800 dwellings will be required within the Norwich Policy Area and Spooner Row is identified in JCS Policy 15 as a service village which could potentially accommodate more than the standard 10 - 20 dwellings.

Design and Landscape

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

5.23 The Bunwell Road site would interrupt views of the existing countryside to the east by changing the overall character of the wider landscape setting, it should be noted that the landscape in question is not designated or afforded any special protection measures. The successful integration of this significant change to the wider countryside landscape will be dependant on the landscape buffers which are proposed. Should approval be forthcoming the landscaping of the development will require to be addressed by condition and reserved matters.

5.24 The proposal aims to extend the existing streetscape along Bunwell Road by continuing the line of existing development in response to the existing mass and rhythm of dwellings to the north by proposing dwellings set back from the road. The Bunwell Road site also has a large area of open space shown on the indicative site layout, this could allow for the creation an attractive focal point with opportunities for a distinctive form of development around this space to be achieved. The application is in outline form but the indicative layout does allow for the possibility of a development with a distinctive and interesting character to be created, in accordance with the principles of the Place Making Guide SPD.
5.25 The Chapel Road site is shown on the indicative layout to be in keeping with the character of the existing development opposite. It will maintain the linear form and set backs already established. The development will also change the character of the landscape and will also rely upon the retention of existing vegetation and the introduction of new planting to fully integrate into its surrounds.

5.26 The original submission had shown that the Chapel Road site would be served by three access points, the road would be widened and a footpath installed. This would have resulted in the loss of the hedging along the frontage of the site. The hedge is considered to be of importance both in terms of demonstrating historical field patterns and as an important aspect of the character of the site. Its retention would also allow for integration of the development to be established immediately.

5.27 The applicant has provided an indicative plan for the Chapel Road site which details that the site would be served by two access points and that the footpath would be placed behind the existing hedge. This allows for the majority of the hedge to be retained and is supported by the Council's Landscape Officer and Ecology Officer.

5.28 The retention of the majority of the existing hedging on both sites and the principles established through the indicative plans demonstrate that the sites can be developed in a sympathetic and respectful manner to the existing village characteristics. The success of the development will rely heavily on the reserved matters applications putting forward designs and layouts which make use of vernacular materials, create distinctive characteristics through the open space/attenuation ponds and introduce substantial quality landscaping.

Highways

5.29 The development would result in two vehicular access points being created on the Chapel Road site and two on the Bunwell Road site. The application also details the installation of footpaths and crossing points.

5.30 The Highway Authority had during pre-application discussion negotiated a widening of a section of the road at Chapel Road to 5.5m from 4.8m. This was then shown within the applicants submission. The road widening and installation of footpath resulted in the loss of all of the hedging along the Chapel Road frontage.

5.31 It is officers opinion that the retention of the hedgerow would be a key factor to assimilating the site to its surroundings and therefore the reasoning for the road widening was requested from the Highway Authority.

5.32 The Highway Authority stated that the development would result in a small increase in traffic movements associated with the site and that this will have an impact and create potential for more conflict between cars and HGV’s. They acknowledged that the road could currently allow for two cars to pass each other; and an HGV and a car to pass each other with care. The widening of the road to 5.5m would allow for two HGV’s to pass each other. The Council cannot agree with this reasoning as the development would not result in a permanent increase in HGV movements in this locality. Therefore the reasoning to this mitigation measure is not justifiable, reasonable or proportionate to the development proposed and it is our position that this could not be successfully defended at appeal if used as a reason for refusal.

5.33 The applicant has proposed to install road markings and highway signage to highlight the current speed limit restrictions when entering from the Chapel Road end of the village and the Highway Authority have welcomed these works.
5.34 The Highway Authority have acknowledged the competing desires of road widening to hedge retention and although they maintain their objection they recognise that the council should have the final decision on the planning outcome. Should approval be forthcoming for the proposed hedge retention at Chapel Road, the Highway Authority have provided relevant conditions.

5.35 It is officer opinion that the application is not of a scale or nature which would result in the application being contrary to the aims of Saved Policy IMP8 and the submitted indicative layout plans demonstrate that the development can comply with the requirements of Saved Policy TRA 19.

Drainage

5.36 The north eastern section of the Bunwell Road site is categorised as Flood Zone 3, accordingly no development has been planned for this location. The indicative masterplan marks it out as a wildlife haven with an attenuation lagoon. The remainder of the two sites are Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency has not objected to the scheme subject to conditions being attached to any grant of approval which would require slab levels at Bunwell Road to be above a certain datum and that a surface water drainage scheme be submitted for approval.

5.37 The application is therefore considered to comply with section 10 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that appropriate development is provided in suitable areas and that adequate mitigation measures are used to limit any damage from flooding.

Foul sewage at the Bunwell Road site is to be managed via a package sewage treatment plant. The indicative masterplan details this as being located to the north of site with an existing field access to be upgraded for servicing.

5.38 The Chapel Road site proposes to build a sewage treatment plant on its southern boundary which would link to the Anglian Water sewer. The construction of this treatment plant to adoptable Anglian Water standards would negate the need for the existing Council maintained treatment plant to be kept operational, as it could serve the development site and those dwellings opposite.

5.39 The applicant has advised that the both solutions would be constructed to the required Anglian Water and Environment Agency standards, this is has also be requested by the Council’s Environmental Protection Team. Provided the standards are adhered to the developments would have no risk of reducing water, land or air quality in accordance with Section 11 of the NPPF.

Ecology

5.40 The site is considered to have low ecological value. The application has not been objected to by the Ecology Officer, but they have made suggestions regarding mitigation. These suggestions include the creation of a pond on the south west of the Bunwell Road site and the introduction of bird and bat boxes.

5.41 It is considered that the recommendations of the ecological report and those suggestions put forward by the Ecologist should be conditioned to achieve the aims and objectives of Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV 15.

5.42 The Council Ecologist has advised that Japanese knotweed is known to be present close to the Chapel Road site and an informative should be included on any grant of permission so that all contractors are aware of this and of the methods to ensure it does not spread. The Ecologist has also raised concern regarding the potential for foul water to infiltrate open ditches at the Chapel Road site should the private treatment plant fail. To this regard a condition will be added to any grant of approval requiring for a contingency plan/statement
to be produced to our satisfaction.

Residential amenity

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

5.44 The indicative layout plans have demonstrated that the amount of housing proposed can be provided for without damage to residential amenity occurring and furthermore the land use proposed is compatible with that surrounding.

5.45 Loss of view is not a material planning consideration and the proposed housing on both sites have been shown to be set back from the roadside so as to not be overbearing on the street scene or neighbouring properties' outlook.

The application is in accordance with the requirements of Saved Policy IMP9.

Affordable Housing

5.46 JCS Policy 4 dictates that sites which provide for 16 + dwellings or are greater than 0.6ha would have to provide for 33% affordable housing within their yield. The amount of housing proposed over the two sites is 33 dwellings, this creates a requirement to provide 11 affordable dwellings.

5.47 The application proposes that all of the affordable housing would be provided for within the 13 houses proposed on the Chapel Road site.

5.48 Within section 6 of the NPPF Local Authorities are advised that when approving affordable housing they should aim to create mixed and balanced communities, this is also reflected in JCS Policy 4.

5.49 The delivery of the proposed affordable housing is not a common approach. However, the development of the Chapel Road site would also have two market value properties and those existing properties which are directly opposite the site, are no longer all in the ownership of a social housing provider (8 private – 4 social). Taking these factors into account the eventual outcome regarding the mix of tenure in this cluster of Spooner Row could be considered to be in keeping with the direction of the NPPF.

5.50 It should also be noted that Saffron Housing has advised of their willingness to take on the affordable element of this proposal and have stated that the provision of affordable housing in one location is beneficial to them in terms of delivery and maintenance/management.

Heritage

5.51 The Bunwell Road application site has to its south west a Grade II listed building. The indicative masterplan details that the existing hedging on the roadside would be maintained and enhanced and that a landscaped open space would then be created between the site edge and the proposed houses. The open space and landscaping would ensure that the setting of the listed building is not degraded and that the principles of historic conservation set out in NPPF Section 12 are met.

5.52 The applicant has provided the results of a geophysical survey with the application which concluded that neither site has any significant heritage assets of archaeological interest and that in accordance with NPPF Section 12 no conditions are recommended.
Section 106 contributions

5.53 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations clearly state that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

5.54 Should approval be forthcoming a Section 106 legal agreement will be required to secure necessary CIL compliant obligations. These necessary obligations will be to secure the affordable housing in perpetuity, payments to Norfolk County Council for education, library and green infrastructure in the local area and the open space/play provisions.

5.55 The applicant has also offered to pay the following:

- £15,000 to be paid to the village hall for works of improvement and 50% of architects fees incurred in the design of required alterations. The money is to be paid prior to occupation of the first private unit.

- £58,220 to be paid to Spooner Row Primary School. The amount would be paid prior to the occupation of the fifth private sale unit. The contribution would be intended to facilitate new teaching and associated buildings at the school and would be re-payable if development on qualifying work has not commenced within 5 years of the date of the contribution.

5.56 The £15,000 and £58,220 detailed above cannot be considered to constitute a material consideration in the determination of the planning application as they have not been requested by any consultee and they are not considered to be CIL compliant. This monetary contribution is not a material consideration and has never formed any part of the determination of the officer’s recommendation.

5.57 Although the payments would not comply with the CIL regulations requirements they can be included within the Section 106 agreement provided that they are not considered to form a material consideration in the determination of the application by committee.

5.58 Should the application be approved and the extra non-CIL compliant contributions be included in the Section 106 then the applicant will be asked to clarify for the legal agreement what is determined as qualifying works to the school and if there is a cap to the village hall architects fees.

Conclusion

5.59 The application would deliver 22 market homes in sustainable locations in a NPA service village identified as being capable of accommodating for more than 10-20 dwellings. The development would also accommodate for 11 affordable dwellings in accordance with the JCS requirements.

5.60 The delivery of the affordable housing is considered to be unusual but it is not an outcome which would result in a community which would be socially excluded.

5.61 It is acknowledged that the visual landscape impacts will be significant however given that the sites are not afforded any special landscape protection measures a refusal on these grounds would not be sustainable with regard given to the advice of the NPPF and JCS.
5.62 The indicative layouts provided give assurance that the developments can take place with regard to the existing village character and will provide for opportunities to add landscape features to those retained. This will be to the benefit of the integration of the schemes to the wider landscape and the green infrastructure of the locality.

5.63 Both developments will create significant changes to the wider landscape setting but this change is not one which could be considered to creating significant harm to the landscape. The landscape area is not offered any special protection measures and as stated previously the integration of these developments will rely heavily on the retention of existing features and additional planting.

5.64 The retention of the hedge in lieu of road widening originally proposed is considered to be the most appropriate outcome in terms of ecological, landscape and visual amenity impacts especially when considered against the Highway Authority reasoning for widening the road.

6. Reasons for approval

6.1 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application. The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and the application can be accepted as a departure from Saved Policy ENV8.

6.2 The application has demonstrated that the site can be developed with regard to the existing design principles of the locality and with the retention of the important natural landscape features, therefore the application is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7 JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policy IMP2.

6.3 The local highway network can accommodate the increased level of traffic which would result from the development without the need for road widening to occur and the proposed access is considered acceptable therefore the application is considered to accord with SNLP Saved Policy IMP8.

6.4 The indicative layout has demonstrated that the development can be accommodated for without impacting negatively on adjacent dwellings in relation to residential amenity and therefore the application complies with Saved Policy IMP9.

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail:  ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

4. Appl. No : 2013/0892/F
Parish : BAWBURGH

Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council
Site Address : Land Off Long Lane Bawburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Creation of a six pitch Gypsy and Traveller short stay stopping place (SSSP utilising a former section of highway and adjacent land)

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Full permission time limit.
2. Amended plans.
3. Occupancy by Gypsies and Travellers only.
4. Site operated and managed by SNC only unless alternative agreed.
5. Maximum number of caravans 6.
7. Access and hard standings before occupation.
9. Any gates set back from carriageway.
10. No commercial use.
11. External lighting.
13. Remediation of low level contamination.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
TRA 13: Corridors of Movement

2. Planning History

2.1 1998/0793 Change of use from agricultural to Park and Ride Site Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Bawburgh Parish Council Refuse.
1. Application lacks detail of rental charges, mobile toilets, refuse collection, water and maintenance.
2. Six caravans are in excess of previous proposals.
3. How will 12 week stay be monitored and enforced? Can caravans return within any time period?
4. How will access be restricted to authorised persons?
5. How will site be monitored to prevent commercial activity?
6. Site area on aerial photo is larger than site plan.
7. Screening as proposed will not ensure site is secure nor prevent land around becoming untidy.
8. Site area has potential for more than 6 caravans.

3.2 Little Melton Parish Council
Parish Council (PC) has no views or comments in respect of this proposal.

3.3 Easton Parish Council
Approve
- Concern about management of the site without on-site presence.

3.4 Costessey Parish Council
Approve.

3.5 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.6 Head Of Environmental Services
No objections

3.7 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager
Support
- History of many unauthorised encampments in the District.
- There are currently no authorised transit sites in South Norfolk.
- 2012 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment shows clear need for short stay stopping place.

3.8 Gypsy Liaison Officer
No comments received

3.9 NCC Highways
To be reported

3.10 Representations
No comments to received

4 Assessment

4.1 This application is submitted by South Norfolk Council to secure permission for a temporary stopping place for up to 6 caravans for use by Gypsies and Travellers. Appendix 2 explains the proposal in more detail. It will be noted that the proposal does not include any permanent building, but services such as temporary toilets and refuse collection would be provided by the Council when the site is required to accommodate Travellers who might otherwise resort to an unauthorised encampment. The application has been amended since original submission revising the layout to make space for improved boundary screening and planting and moving the pitches further from the site frontage. The above comments from consultees relate to the original submission, but any responses to the re-consultation carried out on the revised plan will be reported at the Committee meeting.

4.2 The site comprises part of a former highway and adjoining land which has been used by Travellers on an unauthorised but tolerated basis for a number of years. The site abuts the landscaped bund of the Costessey Park-and-Ride site to the north and open arable land to the south. The former highway extends as far as the Southern Bypass to the East and has frontage to Long Lane to the west where a revised access is proposed.
4.3 The application is supported by an Ecological Survey which concludes that the
development would have limited impact on wildlife and that enhancement of the site can be
achieved by new planting. A Site Investigation Report on ground conditions and
contamination is also submitted. This advises that there is no significant contamination on
the site (although two samples showed a slightly raised level in one chemical group), but
recommends mitigation measures that can be secured by condition (subject to advice from
Environmental Services Team).

4.4 The Council have not yet adopted criteria for allocating or assessing Traveller Sites.
However, the CLG publication ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ sets out issues which
should be considered when considering applications for Traveller Sites of which the
following are particularly relevant (paragraphs 22 to 24).

"22. Local planning authorities should consider the following issues amongst other
relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:

a) the existing level of local provision and need for sites
b) the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants
c) other personal circumstances of the applicant
d) that the locally specific criteria used to guide the allocation of sites in plans
or which form the policy where there is no identified need for pitches/plots
should be used to assess applications that may come forward on
unallocated sites
e) that they should determine applications for sites from any travellers and not
just those with local connections

23. Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in
open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas
allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that
sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled
community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

24. When considering applications, local planning authorities should attach weight
to the following matters:

a. effective use of previously developed (brownfield), untidy or derelict land
b. sites being well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively
enhance the environment and increase its openness
c. promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles, such as ensuring adequate
landscaping and play areas for children
d. not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences,
that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are
deliberately isolated from the rest of the community"

4.5 In the light of relevant policies and the circumstances of the site, the main issues for
consideration in this case are, the need for Traveller Sites; the principle of the proposal in
this location; landscape/ visual impact; highway considerations; and future management.

Need for Traveller Sites

4.6 The Joint Core Strategy requires provision of 28 Traveller pitches within South Norfolk in
the period 2006 to 2011 and a further 38 in the period 2012 to 2026. These requirements
have not been met. This unmet need for Traveller Sites results in unauthorised
campments with problems compounded by difficulties in taking enforcement action when
there are no sites available to relocate the persons concerned. This particular proposal is
intended specifically to deal with such short term need to relocate Travellers who have no
alternative accommodation. I find this need to be a weighty consideration in support of the current case.

Principle of development in this location

4.7 The site is outside any Development Limit, Village Boundary or allocated development site. However, in the absence of an adequate supply of Traveller Sites as discussed above, this is not sufficient reason alone to refuse permission. Although the CLG Policy discourages sites away from settlements or development allocations (para. 23), this site is reasonably close to a full range of services in Costessey and the City is also accessible by public transport (adjacent Park-and-Ride site). Combined with the outstanding need for Traveller Sites in the District, I consider that in these circumstances the location of this site is acceptable.

Landscape/ Visual impact

4.8 The site falls within zones allocated in the SNLP as a 'strategic gap' between settlements (ENV 2) and also part of the Southern Bypass landscape protection zone (ENV 6). I note however that the CLG Policy specifically supports the use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land (para. 24a). The application site is largely comprised of the former highway carriageway and has a derelict appearance, having suffered from fly tipping and fires in the past. The site is screened from Long Lane by a roadside hedge and relates closely to the bunded and landscaped Park-and-Ride site which it adjoins to the north. With additional boundary treatments to reinforce the site screening, I do not consider that the development would cause any material harm to the policy objectives of protecting the landscape and 'strategic gap' function of the area.

Highway considerations

4.9 The proposal includes a new access point to the land further north than the existing access point to Long Lane, which moves it from a position directly opposite an entrance to the Norfolk Showground. The comments of the Highway Authority are not available at the time of writing, but the agent has had discussions directly with the Authority when drawing up the amended plan. There is sufficient space to provide visibility splays and the access gate is shown set back from the highway to allow vehicles to pull off the carriageway while opening or closing it. I do not anticipate an objection from the Highway Authority (subject to conditions) but their final comments will be reported to the meeting.

Site Management

4.10 There are no residential properties near the site, but questions have been raised regarding the management and monitoring of the site including concerns about toilet and refuse services and enforcement of tenancy conditions. Planning conditions are recommended to cover issues appropriate to planning control, but the day-to-day operation of the site would clearly be a matter for those managing the facility. As outlined in Appendix 2, this site would be managed by the Council’s Housing Standards Team. In order to ensure that the responsibility for such management is clear, a condition is recommended to restrict the operation of the site to the District Council unless a suitable alternative is agreed.

Conclusion

4.11 Subject to the conditions recommended, the proposal is not likely to result in any significant harm to the area, despite the location of the site outside any Development Limit and within the strategic gap and landscape zones defined in the SNLP. The need for, and benefits of the proposed development are significant factors in support of the development and outweigh any likely harm arising. The site provides good access to the highway network and services and facilities are within easy reach. I conclude that the proposal constitutes
sustainable development which is consistent with the latest Government policy and the application should be approved.

Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development would contribute to meeting an unmet need for Traveller sites in the District which does not have sufficient sites allocated or approved to meet Joint Core Strategy requirements. The development proposed would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, highway safety or residential amenity and occupants would have convenient access to services and facilities. The proposal is a sustainable form of development which is consistent with local and national policy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett 01508 533794 ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Gypsy and Traveller short-stay stopping place application

Supporting information

Background
South Norfolk Council identified the need for a temporary stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers during a routine assessment of the district's housing need. Providing an approved temporary stopping place will help reduce the number of unauthorised encampments in the area.

Location
This location was chosen because it has been frequently used as a 'tolerated' temporary stopping place by the Traveller community over many years. We have looked for other sites but currently are not aware of any suitable alternative locations that are available.

The site identified would suit Gypsy and Traveller families who have historically visited this area because it has good access to the A47 and A11. Within Costessey there are a range of services, including doctor and dental surgeries and shopping facilities at the Longwater Retail Park.

There is a long history of Gypsy and Traveller encampments in and around the Costessey area. This site will provide Travellers with a place to park and access to nearby services.

Similar sites elsewhere in Norfolk have proved a successful way of managing illegal encampments.

Key features
- Improved road junction access
- Appropriate screening
- Drained hard standings with basic amenities
- As a temporary stopping site, no permanent buildings are proposed

The Site
- The site will have space for up to six caravans. From experience this will be sufficient space for Gypsy and Traveller family groups that have historically camped in the South Norfolk area.
- There will be six hard standing pitches and a water supply.
- Portable toilets and refuse receptacles will be put on site when needed and removed when not.
- The site will have the appropriate screening.

Site Management
- It will provide a place where Travellers in transit may stop for a maximum of 12 weeks.
- The site will be managed and maintained by the Housing Standards team at South Norfolk Council.
- Gypsy and Traveller families will only be able to access the site via South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council or Norfolk Constabulary.
- Business/trade activity will not be tolerated on the site.
- The families will enter an agreement with South Norfolk Council while occupying the site, which will include details of the rent and terms and conditions around use of the site.
- Charges for the site have not been finalised but these will aim to recover the cost of providing mobile toilets, refuse collection, and to offset the site management and maintenance costs.
- The site will be kept closed when not in use and only opened when it is required to provide a stopping place for Travellers, who might otherwise set up an illegal encampment in the area.
Other Applications

5. **Appl. No**: 2013/0760/F  
   **Parish**: BUNWELL

   Applicants Name: Mr Henry Mason  
   Site Address: Sub-division Of The Garden Of The Laburnums The Turnpike  
   Bunwell Norfolk NR16 1SR

   Proposal: Proposed construction of 3 bed bungalow and detached garage

   Recommendation: Approval with conditions

   1. Full Planning permission time limit
   2. In accordance with submitted details and drawings
   3. No PD for Class A to north and east elevations
   4. No additional windows at first floor

   Subject to submission of a flood risk assessment and the satisfactory resolution of any flood issues arising

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 15: Service Villages
   Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0010 Sub-division of garden, erection of two bed bungalow and widening of driveway access Approved

2.2 2011/0800 Sub-division of garden and erection of two bed bungalow Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council No comments received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Original comments:
   - Highway Authority (HA) recommended refusal of the previous application due close proximity to the bend of B1113
- Site plan does not show access for new property - existing access serving The Laburnums outside application redline
- Block plan required to demonstrate access, parking & turning areas

3.4 Environmental Services (Flood Defence Officer) Original comments:
- Development proposals located in flood zones 2 & 3 should be supported by a FRA and passed to the EA for their consideration – currently insufficient information to allow a proper assessment of the flood risk associated with the proposed development
- Surface water drainage advisory note
- Foul drainage advisory note

3.5 Representations Original comments:
- Fence line between site & Evergreen incorrect
- Close proximity to boundary fence & orientation of dwelling with Evergreen would result in dwelling dominating Evergreen
- Floor level will be higher than in Evergreen due to change in levels across site resulting in overlooking of Evergreen
- Conifer hedge within boundary of Evergreen to be removed as it is dying
- Dangerous vehicular access
- Revised plans show building within flood plain which was not allowed at the time of the earlier application
- Building is due south of kitchen, patio, lounge windows
- Query whether chimney stack shown correctly
- Relocating garage to Evergreen side would stop overlooking of lounge windows allowing a double width drive gap between dwelling and The Laburnums (which is also set further forward)

4 Assessment

4.1 The application follows an earlier approval for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow on the site within the garden area of the existing dwelling (The Laburnums), 2012/0010 (contrary to officer recommendation). This followed an earlier refusal for a similar proposal (2011/0800). The earlier application set out that the development was required for the applicants due to health issues, enabling family members to move into The Laburnums. The application site is currently under offer to a third party.

4.2 The application site is not within any Development Limit or Village Boundary as defined in the South Norfolk Local Plan and is therefore considered in the context of Policy ENV8 (Development in the Open Countryside). No further information has been submitted to justify the erection of a dwelling in this rural location and as such the erection of a dwelling on this site is contrary to Local Plan policy. The site is located within a small isolated group of dwellings and at the present time is unlikely to be included in any future Development Limits or sites identified in the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD (SSPA DPD) which is currently being prepared as part of the emerging local plan.

4.3 The approved scheme has been revised as part of the current proposal. The proposed dwelling has been relocated on the site to avoid the area identified as Flood Zone 3 and reduce the impact on the neighbouring property, Evergreen. At the time of preparing this report a Flood Risk Assessment is still to be submitted.
4.4 The Highways Officer has assessed the original submission and has requested further information. Amended plans now show the access to the site however at the time of preparing this report updated highways comments relating to the access and turning area are still to be received. These will be reported separately to the Committee. It should be noted that the Highways Authority objected to the original proposal due to the close proximity of the site to the bend in the B1113.

4.5 To the rear of the site is an area indicated to be within flood zones 2 and 3. The amended scheme has revised the siting of the dwelling so that only the elevated rear part is located within flood zone 2. In accordance with the statutory standing advice provided by the Environment Agency a flood risk assessment has been requested from the applicant. Due to the limited extent of the built form within flood zone 2 the key issue arising is anticipated to be surface water run-off and drainage rather than the impact on the dwelling itself.

4.6 The current application is not supported by any tree constraint information although there are a number of mature trees on the site however the principle of development has been previously established without the submission of this additional information.

4.7 The revised siting of the dwelling, as submitted during the consultation process, results in an improved relationship with the neighbouring property Evergreen. The relocation of the garage to the north of the new dwelling provides a separation between the properties, reducing the bulk along the boundary and providing some additional screening between the dwellings. A two metre fence is proposed for the boundary between the new dwelling and The Laburnums. However, due to the changes in levels across the sites this will not be sufficient to prevent overlooking of the adjacent property. Obscure glazed windows in this elevation will address this concern.

4.8 In view of the permission previously granted, a refusal as originally recommended could not now be sustained. I therefore request authorisation for the DGL to approve the current application following the submission of a satisfactory flood risk assessment and the resolution of any issues that may arise relating to this.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The principle of residential development on the site has previously been established. The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 as it constitutes a logical infill plot within a reasonable distance of a Service Village and can therefore be considered to constitute sustainable development.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher 01508 533985 kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2013/0990/CU  
**Parish**: BERGH APTON

Applicants Name: Mr Geoff And Mrs Karen Rose  
Site Address: The Stables At Church Road Bergh Apton Norfolk  
Proposal: Change of use to keeping horses and construction of a ménage

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Policy 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
LEI 14: Keeping of horses for recreational purposes

2. Planning History

2.1 1975/2596 Erection of horse box and store Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received  
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate  
3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) To be reported  
3.4 NCC Highways No objections  
3.5 Representations No comments received

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the retrospective change of use of the land for the keeping of horses and the construction of a ménage. The application has been submitted by a member of Council staff. The application site consists of two fields set down a privately owned track to the south of Church Road in Burgh Apton. The fields are separated from the highway and residential properties in Church Road by fields used for horse keeping and grazing. There is a stable on the application site and the remains of the land is used as pasture.
4.2 The application is assessed against policies IMP 8, IMP 9, IMP 25 and LEI 14. Policies in the NPPF, JCS and SNLP seek to ensure that the proposals are of a good design and do not adversely affect the existing amenities of the locality and support the use of the countryside for rural pursuits. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because these policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The application site has been used for some time for horse keeping and was formally part of the Bergh Apton Stud. The fields to the immediate north of the site have received approval in the past for horse keeping and there are other field to the east of the site which are in this use. The proposed ménage has low level retaining board to contain the sand and pre-mixed upper surface with a low level rail to the edge of the area. There are no residential properties in close proximity to the site and the proposal has minimal impact on the visual amenity of the area.

4.4 In view of the above I recommend that the application be approved as it supports a rural activity; it will not adversely affect the visual amenities of the surround area; or the amenities of the nearby residential properties to a material degree.

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 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP 2, IMP 8, IMP 9, IMP 25 and LEI 14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with the above policies as the proposal is for a recreational activity which demands a rural location. The proposed manage has a minimal impact on the overall appearance of the site and the development retains the amenity of surrounding area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Cross 01508 533780 hcross@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2013/0335/F  
**Parish**: BROOKE

Applicants Name: Mrs F Hornor  
Site Address: Village Hall Norwich Road Brooke Norfolk NR15 1AB  
Proposal: Erection of bespoke lighting system, comprising 4 steel columns at 8m mounting height with 2x specialised, state of the art Philips Optivision sports projector light fittings on each (8 in total) at Brooke Tennis Club to extend the playing season within limited hours

Recommendation: Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities  
LEI 6: Smaller scale leisure facilities (Part Consistent)  
ENV 15: Species protection  
ENV 14: Habitat protection

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/2111 Erection of storage shed for Brooke Play Park Equipment  
Approved

2.2 2010/1011 Replacement of recreation facilities to include proposed enlargement of the area designated to the play park. Proposed new equipment and fencing.  
Approved

2.3 2010/0759 Proposed solar panels  
Approved

2.4 2008/1184 Erection of 6no 8 metre galvanised lamp posts, each with 2 no Philip luminaries type MVP 507 WB 1kW  
Refused

2.5 2000/0121 Erection of extension to rear of parish hall and retention of extension to car park  
Approved

2.6 1999/0699 Installation of floodlighting system to tennis courts  
Refused
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council** Refuse

- Inappropriate and unacceptable within the conservation area, which has limited sources of artificial lighting and no street lights
- Concerned about light pollution affecting a number of nearby residential dwellings, closest of which is only a few metres from one of the proposed lighting columns

3.2 **District Member** To be determined by committee

- As a service village, the provision of enhanced sporting and leisure facilities is to be encouraged by Core Strategy and local policies.
- The tension between these and the objections should be resolved by committee

3.3 **Conservation Officer** No objections

- The impact of the proposal would be less than substantial harm under Para 134 of the NPPF

3.4 **Environmental Services (Protection)** No objection to the amended details

3.5 **Active Life And Play Officer** No comments received

3.6 **NCC Highways** Support with conditions

3.7 **Ecologist** To be reported

3.8 **Representations** The Brooke Society - object

- Lights will harm the great valued 'dark skies' of Brooke that add so much to character and appearance of the village
- Light spill will be detrimental to householders nearby

The British Astronomical Association's Campaign for Dark Skies - supports the concerns of local residents

2 letters of support

- As long as the hours are not passed 9pm
- Encourage and enable people to exercise more
- Understand concerns re light pollution but feel the need for people to exercise out weights this
- The courts could be used more during the weekends

26 letters of objection

- Negative impact on amenities via excessive direct and reflected light and noise disturbance
- Third application following two previous refusals
- Negative impact on fauna, flora and great crested newts
- Inappropriate, unattractive visual intrusion in the conservation area
- Tennis club is not fully utilised on weekends
- Increased traffic
- Norwich road is not noisy in the evenings
- The village hall is not noisy and rarely experienced any disturbance
- Enjoyed the amenity of darkness without the benefit of street lights
• Concern that the Local Member has asked the application to be determined by committee
• Concern that the conservation officer has reached his conclusion without supporting evidence that the public benefits outweighs the harm
• Not a public facility but a private tennis club
• Members of the Norwich Astronomical Society based at Seething have extreme concerns regarding light pollution
• The Society moved from its previous site due to light pollution and any additional lighting would have a major impact on the function of the society
• Impact on its charitable purposes of education and public outreach
• Negative impact on an area currently known for its excellence for astronomy and nocturnal wildlife including bats and owls

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of 4 no. 8 metre high lighting columns with 2 no Philip Optivision sports projector light fittings on each, at Brooke Tennis Club. The two all-weather courts are located within the village hall complex on the eastern side of Norwich Road, they are to the rear of the existing bowling green which fronts onto Norwich Road. The courts are surrounded by wire fencing which is visible from Norwich Road. There is a club house located to the northern side of the courts. To the south and on the opposite side of the road there are residential properties. The site is within the conservation area for the village and Brooke does not have street lights.

4.2 The applicants wish to develop and sustain the provision of the tennis facilities in Brooke by extending the playing season and by offering training sessions year-round outside the late spring and summer months. The courts would be lit by 4 no columns placed in the corners of the perimeter fence. Each of these poles would support 2 x 1 kW Philip Optivision MVP507 Floodlights (8 in total). The light source would be metal halide with a white colour rendering. It is proposed to restrict the operation of the lights by way of automatic timer, until 9.15pm between April and September and 9pm in other months (they advise that the standard practice on all other flood-lit courts is 10pm cut off-time). They consider that the reduction in number of columns from 6 to 4, the reduction of floodlights from 12 to 8, the reduction in lighting levels from 607 lux average to 444 lux average and the reduction in the spillage envelope surrounding the two courts overcomes the previous reasons for refusal.

4.3 The policies in the NPPF, JCS and SNLP seek to encourage the provision, expansion, enhancement of leisure facilities. This is provided that there would be no harm to the environmental characteristics and where lighting is required that the light spillage and glare are minimised, particularly in areas of open countryside or on the edge of settlements, and there is no detrimental impact on residential amenity.

4.4 The application site is located within the conservation area for the village of Brooke and the previous permission was refused due to the impact on the conservation area. The conservation officer has commented that Brooke and Kirstead conservation areas have their significant interest derived from the Meres, the surviving greens and legacies of the country houses, as well as the many historic buildings. The NPPF in Para 138 advises that not all elements of the conservation areas will contribute to its significance. He considers that the character of the section of the area along Norwich Road could not be said to typify that outlined above and as such does not contribute to the significance of the area as a whole. Therefore the impact of the floodlights would be ‘less than substantial harm’ and under Para 134 of the NPPF, this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In view of the above, which is a policy change in emphasis, the conservation officer raises no objections to the proposed development as its impact would be less than substantial harm under Para 134 of the NPPF.
4.5 The nearest neighbour is located to the south of the site, with a distance of approximately 5m between the south west corner and approximately 2m between the south east corner of the tennis courts and the common boundary with 14 Norwich Road which is a 1.8m wooden screen fence. The previous application was refused on residential amenity grounds. As with the previous applications the environmental health officer has not raised any objections to the proposal, he comments that the revised lighting report now calculates that vertical light intrusion will be 0.56 lux on the north windows of 14 Norwich Road; 1.03 lux on the east windows of the same property; and 0.24 lux on the north windows of 12 Norwich Road.

4.6 Whilst I fully appreciate that this application looks to reduce light spillage and technology has moved on since the 2008 application, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the adjacent residential properties, notwithstanding the fact that the environmental health officer has not raised an objection based on a statutory nuisance. The light sources would be positioned at a level which is higher than the first floor windows of the adjoining dwelling and will create spillage as set out above. Equally the light will spill into the rear garden of 14 Norwich Road. Furthermore the current proposal would enable the courts and floodlights to be used until 9pm to 9.15pm depending on the time of year, which will result in additional noise and general disturbance from players using the courts. The current use during daylight hours means that the adjacent occupiers inevitably enjoy quieter surroundings during the winter months and darker spring and autumn evenings, compared with the summer evenings. The proposal would be contrary to policies IMP9, IMP10 and IMP25 of the SNLP.

4.7 I have discussed with the applicants the above concerns and suggested that a compromise would be the lighting of one courts only, that being the furthest away from the neighbour, however they wish the application to be determined as submitted.

4.8 There have been a number of concerns raised as set out above, and whilst I fully appreciate the issues raised and accept that there may be an impact on the users of the Seething Observatory, I do not consider that this impact would be so detrimental as to warrant refusal on this ground due to the distance of the observatory to the tennis club and the number of lights likely to be already in place between Brooke and Seething. In respect of the impact on the conservation area and highway safety given that the conservation officer and the highway officer have not raised an objection to the proposal, I do not consider the proposal could be refused on these concerns.

4.9 The proposal will improve the facilities at the tennis club which is supported by Council policies, but this has to be balanced against the impact on the amenities of the adjoining residential properties. The proposed floodlighting in an otherwise dark environment would adversely impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties to an unacceptable degree and I recommend that the application be refused.

5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposed floodlighting would by virtue of their siting in a 'Dark Sky' environment and close proximity to the adjacent residential properties, give rise to situation detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent residential properties. The detriment would be by reason of increase noise and disturbance due to the extended use of the tennis courts; and the light spillage into the adjoining residential properties and their associated residential curtilages.

5.2 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, including, in particular, policies IMP9 (Residential amenity), IMP10 (Noise) and IMP 25 (Outdoor lighting).

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. Appl. No : 2013/0985/H  
Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL  
Applicants Name : Mrs Kate Wilby  
Site Address : Kingfisher Lodge Common Road Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4PH  
Proposal : Proposed shed and store room  
Recommendation : Approval with conditions  

1. Planning Policies  
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  

2. Planning History  
2.1 2012/0353 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/1544/F - to substitute approved drawings 311-01B, 311-02B, 311-04C, with revised drawings 311-01D, 311-04E, 311-05A indicating/incorporating plant room  

2.2 2011/1544 Managers Residence With Study / Office Approved  

3. Consultations  
3.1 Parish Council To be reported.  
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate.  
3.3 Representations 2 Letters of support:  
• A normal request for a shed and store, why is consent required?  

4. Assessment  
4.1 The proposal is for the erection of a detached flat roofed garage and store to the rear and easterly side of Kingfisher Lodge which is a newly erected detached house located outside any development limits for the parish of Dickleburgh. Permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings were removed for the dwelling, which was given consent subject to an occupancy condition for the recreation fishery business on the site, hence the need for this application. The new outbuilding is to be timber framed with larch feather edged boards to match the existing house. The house fronts the highway Common Road to the south in an elevated position above the road. The site is open, free from trees and hedging with some post and rail fencing, to the north are fishing lakes. There are dwellings to both the western and eastern sides of the site.
4.2 The proposal is assessed against policies Policy 2, and HOU19 which require, amongst other things, any proposals do not adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling or amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The proposal is considered acceptable and I recommend the application be approved, as the outbuilding has been designed to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and wider street scene and will not have an adverse effect upon the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in view of its location and distance from the nearest dwellings.

5 Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting good design; of the Joint Core Strategy and HOU 19 - Extensions to existing dwellings; of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy HOU19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the outbuilding has been designed to ensure that the parking and access to the dwelling will be maintained, and that neither the character and appearance of the dwelling nor the amenities of nearby residents will be adversely affected to a material degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Cox 01508 533832 hcox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No:** 2013/1026/CU  
**Parish:** HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Miss Li Juan Tang  
Site Address : 32A Mill Road Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3DP  
Proposal : Change of use from office to cafe/tea room

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
SHO 10: Class A3 uses outside the defined Central Business Areas  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse  
- Further clear and specific information regarding on site parking arrangements - indicated that parking will be on grass.  
- Severely restricted visibility onto Mill Road from current arrangements.  
- No outside catering activities should be undertaken from the premises.  
- Details of ventilation and odour dispersion equipment.

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  
Support Conditionally – Subject to revised plan to show parking for 10 cars

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Support conditionally –  
- Hours of opening  
- Hours of deliveries  
- Installation of extraction equipment as submitted
3.5 Representations

Objections

- Parking shown insufficient for customers could result in on street parking causing highway safety issues.
- Mill Road is a bus route the additional traffic to the cafe will cause problems for buses along this road.
- Site recently used as stationery office visitors were few and the onsite parking adequate for this use. Proposed cafe has insufficient parking
- Previous cafes in Hethersett have failed.
- Previous use as bakery some 14 years ago before many of the houses were constructed therefore no issues to neighbouring properties at that time.
- Odour from cooking and waste bins.
- Viability of cafe in this location, if it fails pressure could be to open longer and/or change the use of the building therefore causing harm to neighbouring properties.

Support

2 Letter of support

- Subject to all deliveries being made during working hours - no late or early deliveries.
- All parking to be at front, number of parking spaces - is this adequate.
- Cooking and odour ventilation to be at roof level to minimise intrusion onto joining properties.

4 Assessment

4.1 The property is a single storey premises which was historically used as a bakery. However, in recent times it has operated as an office/ stationery suppliers with few visitors to the site with most of the business being conducted by telephone/internet. The premises have been vacant since December 2012. The site is off Mill Road with an in/out drive arrangement. Residential properties adjoin all three boundaries to sides and rear of the site and on the opposite side of Mill Road. The site lies within the Development Limits of Hethersett, but is some distance from the main village centre.

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

4.3 Although this application has been received and is being assessed, a recent change in Legislation which came into force on the 30 May 2013 permits the change of use (without planning application) from B1 (the last lawful use of this building) to A3 (the proposed use of this building) for a temporary period of time (2 years from the first use of the building within the flexible use class). The change in legislation is a material consideration when assessing this application.

4.4 The Legislation only permits a temporary change of use. However the current application, is assessed as being for a permanent use which would give a more secure outcome for the applicant, especially as they will need to make considerable financial investment in relation to the upgraded extraction equipment.
4.5 Based on this information there are two main issues raised by local residents and the Parish Council which relate to the potential for odour and noise from cooking and any associated extraction/cooling units, and secondly the traffic and parking arrangements for the site and how this will impact on safety for the area.

4.6 Prior to the application being submitted, advice was sought from Environmental Services to ascertain appropriate systems to prevent noise and odour issue to neighbouring properties. This information was submitted with the application. The proposal is supported by Environmental Services subject to a condition to ensure that the extraction equipment installed is as detailed in the report from Levcat Catering Equipment suppliers and installers submitted as part of the application.

4.7 Taking into account the position of the premises which is surrounded by residential properties, it is necessary to mitigate against unacceptable levels of disturbance. For this reason an hours condition has been recommended. The applicant requested 09:00 hours to 16:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays. Comments from Environmental Services support the 09:00 to 16:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 – 16:00 on a Saturday. However, a planning condition should only restrict the development to the extent that is necessary and reasonable to make the development acceptable. Mill Road acts as a distributor for local traffic and I consider the location is not unduly sensitive to additional activity beyond the hours of trading actually proposed. The hours recommended for the condition are 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Saturdays with no Sunday opening. The purpose of applying these hours is a balance between supporting a viable business and protecting the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in accordance with policies in the NPPF, the JCS and SNLP as set out above. Concerns have been expressed about a possible hot food take-away use, but this would require separate consent as a Class A5 use which is not included in the current application.

4.8 Environmental Services also suggest a condition to restrict the time of deliveries to the site. Given the limited scale of the proposal, this is not considered necessary. The scale and duration of delivery activity is unlikely to be substantial and would not result in an unreasonable level of disturbance to neighbouring properties given the commercial history and location of the site. For this reason the condition is not recommended to be imposed.

4.9 The second issue relates to on-site parking and the potential impact on highway safety. The size of the cafe results in a requirement of 16 parking spaces if applying the Highways Authority maximum parking standards.

4.10 This number is the maximum number of spaces, however, the number of spaces which could be achieved on the site is significantly less than 16. The plan submitted with the application is not accurate and does not show adequately how parking can be achieved. Given many of the customers will visit the premises on foot, plans to demonstrate 10 spaces would be considered acceptable. Subject to receipt of the parking plan which is imposed as a condition, Highways would be able to support the application with 10 parking spaces.

5. Reason for Approval

5.1 The use of the premises for a café allows the opportunity for a business to serve the local community, while limiting the hours provides a balance between supporting a viable business while protecting the residential of neighbouring properties in accordance with the planning policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals received from 7 June 2013 to 4 July 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/1434</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Mr S Biart</td>
<td>Residential development of up to 70 new dwellings, including associated access and parking, utilities and service infrastructure, amenity space, play area, open space and landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land At Chapel Lane Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0221</td>
<td>Diss</td>
<td>Mrs R Garrard</td>
<td>Variation of condition 7 of planning permission 2011/1750/F to reduce the required visibility splays in the western direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-division Of The Garden Of Newlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Frenze Road Diss Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0397</td>
<td>Carleton Rode</td>
<td>Mr B Chetwynd</td>
<td>Removal of condition 6 (restricting occupancy of dwelling to persons employed in the adjoining fishery) of planning application 2007/0167/O granted on appeal by the Inspector's letter dated 17 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fen Lake Fishery  Fen Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton Rode Norwich NR16 1RT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals decisions from 7 June 2013 to 4 July 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>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>