# Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

**Pool of Substitutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr L Dale</th>
<th>Mrs V Bell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Foulger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Riches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Savage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Walden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss L Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time**

9.00 am Blomefield Room

---

**Agenda**

**Date**

Wednesday 11 September 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.
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 14 August 2013;
   (attached – page 9)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013/0505/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land To The West Of Norwich Road And North Of Stoke Road</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2013/0506/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land To The West Of Norwich Road And South Of Caistor Lane</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/0892/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land Off Long Lane Bawburgh</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/1463/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Car Park At Venta Icenorum Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/0531/F</td>
<td>TOPCROFT</td>
<td>The Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street Topcroft</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/0771/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Subdivision Of Garden Of 165 Norwich Road Oakwood Drive</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/0986/F</td>
<td>BUNWELL</td>
<td>Horseshoe Cottage Brick Kiln Lane Bunwell</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/1211/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Manor Farm Bungalow Wramplingham Road Downham</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013/1281/CU</td>
<td>THARSTON &amp; HAPTON</td>
<td>Nether Langleys Bungay Road Tharston</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013/1362/F</td>
<td>MUNDHAM</td>
<td>Mundham House Thwaite Road Mundham</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee with the date and membership to be confirmed.
7. Planning Appeals (for information)  (attached – page 89)

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 9 October 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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

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

   YES

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

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

NO

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

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

Other Interest

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.

Related pecuniary interest

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

Pecuniary Interest

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

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

YES

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

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

Other Interest

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.

Related pecuniary interest

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

YES

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

Other Interest

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

**Report of Director of Growth and Localism**

Key to letters included within application reference to identify application type – e.g. 2013/0001/A – Application for consent to display and advert

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

**Key to abbreviations used in recommendations**

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

1. **Appl. No**: 2013/0505/O  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND

   **Applicants Name**: David Wilson Homes  
   **Site Address**: Land To The West Of Norwich Road And North Of Stoke Road, Poringland, otherwise known as Heath farm, Poringland, Norfolk

   **Proposal**: Outline application for up to 100 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access on land to the west of Norwich Road and north of Stoke Road, Poringland

   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

   1. Outline permission time limit  
   2. Standard outline condition requiring submission of reserved matters  
   3. In accordance with submitted Masterplan  
   4. Ecology mitigation  
   5. Materials  
   6. Surface water drainage details  
   7. Details of foul water disposal (inc. pumping station)  
   8. Detailed plans of estate roads to be submitted and agreed  
   9. Works in accordance with agreed details  
   10. Roads and footpaths to binder course before occupation  
   11. Phasing plan for road and footpath provision to be agreed  
   12. Off-site highways drainage  
   13. Landscaping  
   14. Landscaping management plan  
   15. Fire hydrants  
   16. Tree and hedge protection

Subject to Norfolk Historic Environment Services confirmation that they have no objection to the scheme, following an analysis of the results of recently completed trial trenching on site.

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

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   - NPPF 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 08: Promoting healthy communities  
   - NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

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
   HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the
   Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. Planning History
2.1 None relevant.

3. Consultations
3.1 Poringland Parish Council
   Refuse - we have major concerns about the traffic impact of traffic on Stoke Road and believe the Traffic Assessment to be flawed.
   Soakaways should not be used in area. We would like to see full details of drainage.

3.2 Caistor St Edmund Parish Council
   Request that the proposed footpath to the south side of Caistor Lane continues from Norwich Road to Southwood Drive along with additional traffic calming at the north access road of the development onto Caistor Lane. *(NOTE – this issue will be dealt with under application 2013/0506, which follows this report)*

3.3 District Members – Cllr Lisa Neal
   Have some concerns with additional traffic from Caistor Lane to join with the B1332, as well as student access to Framingham Earl High School from the opposite side of the road given the increased volume of traffic. Both concerns would be considerably reduced with a Pedestrian Crossing to control traffic flow.

   Cllr John Overton To be reported if appropriate

3.4 Environment Agency
   No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection)
   Flood Defence Officer - No objection subject to appropriate conditions requiring detailed drainage information.

3.6 Planning Policy
   The applications are on a preferred site, and subject to any unforeseen changes, the site will become an allocation in the Local Plan.

   One of the key considerations for inclusion of this site in the Local Plan was to formalise the arrangements for the open watercourse behind properties along Norwich Road and Caistor Lane. The views of the Flood Defence Officer should be sought in this respect.
Although the policy allocation is for 200, the site is within the NPA where additional numbers may be appropriate. Assuming the layout deals with the surface water issue there would be no policy objection to an additional 50 dwellings over the 200 allocation.

3.7 NCC- Planning Obligations

No objection, but require developer contributions towards nursery, primary and high school provision, as well as contributions towards enhanced library provision.

3.8 Design Officer

The indicative masterplan now accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 2 and has the potential, subject to the submission of reserved matters in accordance with the Masterplan/Design & Access statement, to satisfactorily address the Building for Life criteria.

3.9 Landscape Officer

To be reported.

3.10 Norfolk Historic Environment Service

Requested trial trenching prior to determination of the application. Comments on the results of these to be reported.

3.11 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection - Anglian Water has worked with the developer to determine appropriate mitigation measures through an agreed drainage strategy.

3.12 SNC: Ecologist

To be reported.

3.13 SNC: Environmental Services

To be reported.

3.14 NCC Highways

No objection to outline application subject to access being solely from Stoke Road, along with provision of bus stops.

3.15 Housing Strategy Manager

The application provides for 33% affordable housing in accordance with policy.

3.16 Operations Manager – Ketteringham Depot

No comments received

3.17 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

No objection - natural features of the site should be retained. Biodiversity offsetting should be considered.

3.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No comments received

3.19 Representations

30 letters of objection received

- Additional traffic congestion in the area
- Increase in traffic will create additional risk to children
- There should be a vehicular exit onto the B1132
- Housing would be overbearing
- Proposed drainage would be unsightly and dangerous
- Impact on existing infrastructure, which already struggles to cope
- Detrimental impact on the privacy and quality of life resulting from the proposed access
- Development will change the face of the local area
- No need for additional housing
- Caistor Lane will become a rat-run
- Loss of existing open fields
- Flooding

4 Assessment

4.1 This outline application forms part of a wider site (approx. 15 hectares) to the west of Norwich Road and between Caistor Lane to the north and Stoke Road to the south. The site is bounded by existing residential development to the north, south and east, and comprises a single agricultural field (classified as Grade 4 agricultural land). The west boundary of the site takes the form of a hedgerow interspersed with semi-mature and mature trees. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 This application seeks outline approval the southern part of the site, with the sole access off Stoke Road. Adjacent this site permission has recently been given for a new medical centre, again with access from Stoke Road. A sister application for full permission (150 dwellings) on the northern part of the site has been submitted alongside this one (2013/0506 refers). All matters except access are reserved.

4.3 The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document identifies this 15-hectare area of land as a preferred site for residential development, and although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration. The site is outside the current development boundary for the village.

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

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Poringland/Framingham Earl for further development of between 100 - 200 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026. Settlements within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) may also be considered for additional development to help deliver the1800 dwellings ‘in smaller sites within the NPA.

- The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document allocates the wider 15-hectare site for 200 dwellings.

- 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%. Within the South Norfolk part of the NPA, the 5-year housing land supply is continuing to improve, since the South Wymondham applications were granted consent, subject to a S106. The evidence currently being gathered is likely to show that South Norfolk has the required 5 year land supply plus 5%. However, this is work in progress and to date no figures have been published. It is anticipated these figures will be published late September/early October. Therefore for the purpose of this application consideration should be given to the latest published figure for South Norfolk, which is 4.66 years supply, as at March 2013.

- The sustainability of the site’s location, having regard to Poringland/Framingham Earl being defined as a Key Service Centre within Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.
The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years).

- The environmental impacts of developing the site, including the impacts on existing infrastructure.
- Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

4.5 It is noted that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents and Parish Councils raising a number of issues, particularly in respect of the sensitivity of the site and the potential impact on the local highway network. Taking on board the comments raised, in my opinion the critical issue that members need to address is the principle of the development having regard to:

- The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Drainage & flood risk
- Highway Impact
- Indicative layout and design

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

4.6 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. Within the South Norfolk part of the NPA, the 5-year housing land supply is continuing to improve, since the South Wymondham applications were granted consent, subject to a S106. The evidence currently being gathered is likely to show that South Norfolk has the required 5 year land supply plus 5%. However, this is work in progress and to date no figures have been published. It is anticipated these figures will be published late September/early October. Therefore for the purpose of this application consideration should be given to the latest published figure for South Norfolk, which is 4.66 years supply, as at March 2013.

4.7 The NPPF 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 land supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year land supply also includes an additional buffer of 5%. 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 Poringland/Framingham Earl has been selected as a Key Service Centre as it has a range of facilities that enable it to meet local needs as well as the needs of residents of the surrounding areas. These centres also benefit from good public transport services.

4.9 Taking the above into account I feel that the development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a housing supply (albeit an improving situation) carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

4.10 Having also given weight to the sites’ status as a preferred site for residential development, I consider that the principle of development can be accepted, subject to consideration of the remaining issues set out below.

Drainage & flood risk

4.11 The applicants have submitted a detailed Flood Risk Assessment that covers the wider site and is applicable to both this application and the sister application for full planning
permission on the adjoining site to the north. This report provides for a drainage strategy that seeks to improve the existing situation for many local residents where poorly maintained drainage ditches surrounding the site have led to localised flooding events.

4.12 Key drainage points can be summarised as follows:

- On site surface water run-off will be attenuated to Greenfield rates, utilising improved ditches.
- Discharge to surrounding ditches will be contained prior to controlled discharge to four outfalls. This will reduce the uncontrolled run-off to the surrounding area.
- Drainage ditches will be managed and maintained by a Management Company.

4.13 No objection to the scheme has been raised from the Council's Flood Defence Officer or the Environment Agency, subject to suitable conditions.

4.14 Anglian Water has confirmed that capacity exists to cater for the foul flows from the development, and that they are content with the proposed foul drainage strategy for the site. (This incorporates on-site storage and pumping to a connection point on Caistor Lane.)

4.15 Taking the above into account, I consider that in respect of flood risk, the application is in accordance with the requirements of section 10 of the NPPF, having demonstrated that the site can be developed without increase in flood risk elsewhere.

Highway Impact

4.16 The applicants are proposing to split the site into two phases, with this outline application for 100 dwellings being served off Stoke Road. The remaining 150 dwellings would be served off Caistor Lane. The applicants have submitted a Transport Assessment covering the impact of both sites, which has been assessed by NCC: Highways. They have concluded that the assessment is robust. Whilst it is acknowledged that additional burden will be placed on the local highway network at peak travel times, the highway improvements and the proposed residential travel plan will help to mitigate this impact.

4.17 NCC: Highways do not feel that a highways objection could be substantiated at appeal, subject to appropriate conditions covering the requirement for detailed designs of the road widening to Caistor lane, a new footpath and the pedestrian crossing to Norwich Road.

4.18 The application is considered to accord with the NPPF and Local Plan policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic).

Indicative layout & design

4.19 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 being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The applicant's Design & Access statement and Masterplan for the wider site have demonstrated that the site can be developed having appropriate regard to its context, providing for open space and play areas, links to the wider community and local facilities, appropriate drainage, a good mix of market housing, and the policy required 33% affordable housing. A Masterplan for the site is attached as appendix 2.

4.20 The masterplan explores ways of creating character areas throughout the site that have the potential to add interest and variety to the proposals. Indicative house types have been considered in the context of the wider surroundings, which are capable of reinforcing and enhancing the local character of Poringland. Consideration has also been given to the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide that describes the existing landscape character and land uses, which to help inform and justify the development proposals.
The public open space at the centre of the development provides a strong focus on the edge of the site as well as small pockets of open space within the site, which help to provide attractive areas for informal and formal recreation to take place. The layout is also capable of providing strong visual links into the surrounding countryside and a natural transition from the build edge of the development to the countryside by the use of appropriate boundary and landscaping treatments.

There has been a commitment to provide cycle and pedestrian routes into the site that connect to a new footpath along Caistor Lane linking with Norwich Road (ref 2013/0506). A pedestrian crossing is also proposed providing safe access to the high school. A permeable pedestrian/cycle link is created through the site, which is capable of linking the site to Stoke Road through the development.

The development proposals recognise the need for car parking that will provide spaces in direct relationship to the property they serve, which will be screened by low level landscaping to help minimise the impact of parked cars on the street scene.

The Masterplan indicates that the wider site will be developed at a density of approx. 22 dwellings per hectare (11.55 hectares, excluding landscaping buffer), although this outline site, taking into account the shared public open space of 2.8 hectares, will be 20 dwellings per hectare. This density of development is considered appropriate for its context.

In terms of scale, the Masterplan and context appraisal have adequately demonstrated that the site is capable of accommodating dwellings of up to 2-storey in height. I have assessed the Masterplan and design approach for the scheme and concluded that, subject to the submission of reserved matters in accordance with the Masterplan/Design & Access statement, the development has the potential to achieve a high standard of design as required by JCS Policy 2.

It is accepted that as at March 2013 there is 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 five year supply, the requirements of the NPPF, and the fact that the site is a preferred site for residential development, are very strong material considerations in favour of this application.

The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development in accordance with the submitted Masterplan 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 the Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2013/0506/F  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: David Wilson Homes  
Site Address: Land To The West Of Norwich Road And South Of Caistor Lane  
Poringland Norfolk

Proposal: Full application for the construction of 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure (including formation of new access off Caistor Lane and public open space) on land to the west of Norwich Road and south of Caistor Lane, Poringland, otherwise known as Heath farm, Poringland

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. Ecology mitigation  
4. Materials  
5. Surface water drainage details  
6. Details of foul water disposal (inc. pumping station)  
7. Detailed plans of estate roads to be submitted and agreed  
8. Works in accordance with agreed details  
9. Roads and footpaths to binder course before occupation  
10. Phasing plan for road and footpath provision to be agreed  
11. Off-site highways drainage  
12. Off-site highway works  
13. Travel Plan  
14. Landscaping  
15. Landscaping management plan  
16. Fire hydrants  
17. Tree and hedge protection

Subject to Norfolk Historic Environment Services’ confirmation that they have no objection to the scheme, following an analysis of the results of recently completed trial trenching on site.

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

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 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 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

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
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the
Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 None relevant.

3. Consultations

3.1 Poringland Parish Council
Original scheme
Refuse
- Design does not conform with the Policy 2 Building for Life criteria. The design shows no character and is bland in the extreme. No sympathy with the surrounding development.
- No soakaways should be used.
- Would like confirmation from the developer that street lighting, dog waste bins and grit bins will be provided on the site before any of the houses are occupied.
- Residents believe the transport assessment to be flawed.

Amended scheme
As above but with additional concerns
- The impact of the foul water pumping station and its ability to cope during a power outage
- The erection of anything higher than a 1.8 metre fence of wall on the boundaries is rigorously opposed.

3.2 Caistor St Edmund Parish Council
Original scheme
Request that the proposed footpath to the south side of Caistor Lane continues from Norwich Road to Southwood Drive along with additional traffic calming at the north access road of the development onto Caistor Lane.

Amended scheme
To be reported.
3.3 District Members – Cllr Lisa Neal
Have some concerns with additional traffic from Caistor Lane to join with the B1332, as well as student access to Framingham Earl High School from the opposite side of the road given the increased volume of traffic. Both concerns would be considerably reduced with a Pedestrian Crossing to control traffic flow.

Cllr John Overton To be reported if appropriate

3.4 Environment Agency
No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.5 NCC Highways
No objection, subject to appropriate conditions requiring off-site highway works and estate road details.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection)
To be reported.

3.7 Planning Policy
The applications are on a preferred site, and subject to any unforeseen changes, the site will become an allocation in the Local Plan.

One of the key considerations for inclusion of this site in the Local Plan was to formalise the arrangements for the open watercourse behind properties along Norwich Road and Caistor Lane. The views of the Flood Defence Officer should be sought in this respect.

Although the policy allocation is for 200, the site is within the NPA where additional numbers may be appropriate. Assuming the layout deals with the surface water issue there would be no policy objection to an additional 50 dwellings over the 200 allocation.

3.8 NCC- Planning Obligations
Require developer contributions towards improved primary and high school provision. (Totaling £886,784)

3.9 SNC: Ecologist
To be reported.

3.10 Landscape Officer
To be reported.

3.11 Design Officer
The amended plans now accord with the requirements of JCS Policy 2, and satisfactorily address the Building for Life criteria.

3.12 Historic Environment Service
Requested trial trenching prior to determination of the application. Comments on the results of these to be reported.

3.13 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection - Anglian Water has worked with the developer to determine appropriate mitigation measures through an agreed drainage strategy.

3.14 Housing Strategy Manager
To be reported.

3.15 Operations Manager – Keteringham Depot
No comments received.

3.16 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
No objection - natural features of the site should be retained. Biodiversity off-setting should be considered.

3.17 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
No comments received.
3.18 Representations

Original plans

90 letters of objection received

- Additional traffic congestion in the area
- Increase in traffic will create additional risk to children
- There should be a vehicular exit onto the B1132
- Housing would be overbearing
- Proposed drainage would be unsightly and dangerous
- Impact on existing infrastructure, which already struggles to cope
- Detrimental impact on the privacy and quality of life resulting from the proposed access
- Development will change the face of the local area
- No need for additional housing
- Caistor Lane will become a rat-run
- Loss of existing open fields
- Flooding
- Poor design

Amended plans

23 letters of objection received

4 Assessment

4.1 This full application forms part of a wider site (approx. 15 hectares) to the west of Norwich Road and between Caistor Lane to the north and Stoke Road to the south. The site is bounded by existing residential development to the north, south and east, and comprises a single agricultural field (classified as Grade 4 agricultural land). The west boundary of the site takes the form of a hedgerow interspersed with semi-mature and mature trees. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 This application seeks full approval the northern part of the site, with the sole access off Caistor Lane. A total of 150 dwellings are proposed along with an access road, drainage attenuation, open space, and landscaping. A sister application for outline permission (100 dwellings) on the southern part of the site has been submitted alongside this one (2013/0505 refers).

4.3 The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document identifies this 15-hectare area of land as a preferred site for residential development, and although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration. The site is outside the current development boundary for the village.

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

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Poringland/Framingham Earl for further development of between 100 - 200 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026. Settlements within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) may also be considered for additional development to help deliver the 1800 dwellings in smaller sites within the NPA.
• The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document allocates the wider 15-hectare site for 200 dwellings.

• 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%. Within the South Norfolk part of the NPA, the 5-year housing land supply is continuing to improve, since the South Wymondham applications were granted consent, subject to a S106. The evidence currently being gathered is likely to show that South Norfolk has the required 5 year land supply plus 5%. However, this is work in progress and to date no figures have been published. It is anticipated these figures will be published late September/early October. Therefore for the purpose of this application consideration should be given to the latest published figure for South Norfolk, which is 4.66 years supply, as at March 2013.

• The sustainability of the site's location, having regard to Poringland/Framingham Earl being defined as a Key Service Centre within Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.

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

• The environmental impacts of developing the site, including the impacts on existing infrastructure.

• Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

4.5 It is noted that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents and Parish Councils raising a number of issues, particularly in respect of the sensitivity of the site and the potential impact on the local highway network. Taking on board the comments raised, in my opinion the critical issue that members need to address is the principle of the development having regard to:

• The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
• Drainage & flood risk
• Highway Impact
• Layout and design
• Impact on neighbour amenity

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

4.6 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. Within the South Norfolk part of the NPA, the 5-year housing land supply is continuing to improve, since the South Wymondham applications were granted consent, subject to a S106. The evidence currently being gathered is likely to show that South Norfolk has the required 5 year land supply plus 5%. However, this is work in progress and to date no figures have been published. It is anticipated these figures will be published late September/early October. Therefore for the purpose of this application consideration should be given to the latest published figure for South Norfolk, which is 4.66 years supply, as at March 2013.
4.7 The NPPF 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 land supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year land supply also includes an additional buffer of 5%. 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 Poringland/Framingham Earl has been selected as a Key Service Centre as it has a range of facilities that enable it to meet local needs as well as the needs of residents of the surrounding areas. These centres also benefit from good public transport services.

4.9 Taking the above into account I feel that the development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a housing supply (albeit an improving situation) carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

4.10 Having also given weight to the sites’ status as a preferred site for residential development, I consider that the principle of development can be accepted, subject to consideration of the remaining issues set out below.

Drainage & flood risk

4.11 The applicants have submitted a detailed Flood Risk Assessment that covers the wider site and is applicable to both this application and the sister application for full planning permission on the adjoining site to the north. This report provides for a drainage strategy that seeks to improve the existing situation for many local residents where poorly maintained drainage ditches surrounding the site have led to localised flooding events.

4.12 Key drainage points can be summarised as follows:

- On site surface water run-off will be attenuated to Greenfield rates, utilising improved ditches.
- Discharge to surrounding ditches will be contained prior to controlled discharge to four outfalls. This will reduce the uncontrolled run-off to the surrounding area.
- Drainage ditches will be managed and maintained by a Management Company.

4.13 No objection to the scheme has been raised from the Council’s Flood Defence Officer or the Environment Agency, subject to suitable conditions.

4.14 Anglian Water has confirmed that capacity exists to cater for the foul flows from the development, and they are content with the proposed foul drainage strategy for the site. (This incorporates on-site storage and pumping to a connection point on Caistor Lane.)

4.15 Taking the above into account, I consider that in respect of flood risk, the application is in accordance with the requirements of section 10 of the NPPF, having demonstrated that the site can be developed without increase in flood risk elsewhere.

Highway Impact

4.16 The applicants are proposing to split the site into two phases, with this full application for 150 dwellings being served off Caistor Lane at a point where there is adequate space to provide the required junction. The remaining 100 dwellings would be served off Stoke Road. The applicants have submitted a Transport Assessment covering the impact of both sites, which has been assessed by NCC: Highways. They have concluded that the assessment is robust. Whilst it is acknowledged that additional burden will be placed on the local highway network at peak travel times, the highway improvements and the proposed residential travel plan will help to mitigate this impact.
4.17 NCC: Highways do not feel that a highways objection could be substantiated at appeal, subject to appropriate conditions covering the requirement for detailed designs of the road widening to Caistor lane, a new footpath and the pedestrian crossing to Norwich Road.

4.18 The application is considered to accord with the NPPF and Local Plan policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic).

Layout & design

4.19 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 being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The applicant’s Design & Access statement and Masterplan for the wider site have demonstrated that the site can be developed having appropriate regard to its context, providing for open space and play areas, links to the wider community and local facilities, appropriate drainage, a good mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 bed market housing, and the policy required 33% affordable housing. Some single storey bungalows are also provided. (A site layout and example street scenes are attached as appendix 2.)

4.20 The layout (as amended) has evolved taking into account its context, and in particular the strong linear patterns of development along Caistor Lane and Norwich Road. The large areas of open space are a strong feature of the development, as well as being central within the wider site. House types have been simplified, and they are now considered more reflective of their rural location. There is a stronger emphasis on the public realm, and most of the open space is well overlooked. Parking is well provided for, and in most cases is in-curtilage. Garages are provided with an improved internal dimension of 3 x 7 metres.

4.21 A Landscape Appraisal was submitted with the application that concludes that the site has a fairly contained visual envelope with general views into the site seen between existing residential properties along the surrounding roads. It suggests that that it not anticipated that there will be any unacceptable visual impacts as a result of the development proposals, and I would concur with this view.

4.22 The Council’s Design Officer has assessed the amended scheme and considers the overall design, scale and layout of the amended scheme to be appropriate for the site, responds to the requirements of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide, and is of a high enough quality to accord with JCS Policy 2.

Impact on neighbour amenity

4.23 The development only directly affects the amenities of those neighbouring properties on Caistor Lane and Norwich Road, with the site backing onto these properties. However, adequate back-to-back separation distances between existing and proposed dwellings have been afforded, with rear gardens backing onto each other. Single storey bungalows also feature in these areas, helping to further minimise impact. I note that several residents have objected on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy, however taking into account the similar scale of the proposed properties, and the rear garden separation, I do not consider this impact to be significant.

4.24 Clearly the access point at Caistor Lane will increase general amenity disturbance through increased traffic and associated noise, particularly to the adjoining neighbour. However, the access road has been positioned in such a way as to minimise this disturbance and a degree of separation has been maintained. The pedestrian link through to Norwich Road will also cause additional disturbance, however again I do not consider these detrimental impacts to be so severe as to warrant refusal of the application.

4.25 The application accords with saved local plan policy IMP9 (Residential Amenity).
Conclusion

5.1 It is accepted that as at March 2013 there is 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 five year supply, the requirements of the NPPF, and the fact that the site is a preferred site for residential development, are very strong material considerations in favour of this application.

The principle of development on this site is considered acceptable, and accords with existing and emerging Local Plan policy. The design and layout of the scheme is considered to be appropriate for its context and is of sufficient design quality to accord with JCS Policy 2. The scheme does not significantly harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and accords with saved Local Plan policy IMP9 (Residential Amenity). Whilst it is accepted that the development will increase general traffic flows in the local area, this impact is not so severe as to not still accord with saved Local Plan policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic). The development is in accordance with sections 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the NPPF, and all other relevant policies of the Joint Core Strategy.

The saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan are given due weight as they remain wholly/partly consistent with the published NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

3. 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.
6. Landscaping and fencing to be agreed.
7. Landscaping and screening before use.
8. Access and hard standings before occupation.
10. Any gates set back from carriageway.
11. No commercial use.
12. External lighting.
13. Detail of retaining structures to be agreed.
15. Remediation of low level contamination.
16. No occupation before Traffic Regulation Order.

Introduction

Consideration of this application was deferred at the July meeting in order to clarify land ownership issues. Various constraints on the land available have been reviewed and a revised scheme has been presented. Interested parties have been re-consulted on the amended proposals. The following report has been amended to reflect the revised application and the response of consultees where available. Any further comments from consultees will be reported orally to the meeting.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
CLG Publication - 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
2. Planning History

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

3. Consultations

3.1 Bawburgh Parish Council

Original Proposal - 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.

Amended Proposal – Approve with conditions
1. Should provide more detail on cost of rental charges, toilets, refuse collection, water and maintenance.
2. Set out how 12 week stay will be monitored and enforced.
3. State whether caravans can return within any time period.
4. State how access will be restricted to authorised persons.
5. State how site will be monitored to prevent commercial activity.

3.2 Little Melton Parish Council

Original Proposal - Parish Council (PC) has no views or comments in respect of this proposal.

3.3 Easton Parish Council

Original Proposal - Approve
- Concern about management of the site without on-site presence.

3.4 Costessey Parish Council

Original Proposal - 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
Development Management Committee  
11 September 2013

3.9 NCC Highways To be reported

3.10 Glen Lodge Golf Club

Original Proposal – Object. Support objection from Bawburgh PC.

- Previous experience of trespass, damage and stray dogs on golf course.
- Area already has higher than normal population of travellers.
- If approved requires tighter control of trespass onto other land.

3.11 Tenant of adjacent agricultural land

Original Proposal – Object

- Previous experience of trespass, crop damage, dumping of waste in field.
- Access to field blocked.
- Abuse experienced from previous occupants.
- Suggest fenced and high bunded site at east end of lane with access via Park-and-Ride site.

3.12 Solicitor on behalf of land owner

Original Proposal – Object

- Previous occupation has not been “tolerated” as far as the land owner and tenant are concerned, so it should not be assessed as a ‘tolerated site’.
- Note problems associated with previous occupants of the land as explained by tenant.
- Severence of land ownership by Long Lane makes the land vulnerable to misuse.
- Earth bund blocking former Long lane also makes land vulnerable and without proper access to clear or maintain it.
- 10 year supply of Traveller sites should be provided via Local Plan allocation, not by opportunistic use of disused former highway.
- Council should have regard to CLG publication ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’.

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 scheme so that the caravans would now sit within a bay cut into the landscaped bund along the southern side of the Park and Ride site. The bund rises to approximately 2m in height and the cut sides would have retaining works (gabions, brick or concrete to be agreed). Additional fencing and planting to enhance the site screening is also proposed.

4.2 The site would have access from Long Lane via a section of closed-off highway currently the subject of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting vehicular traffic. The TRO would need to be lifted from the first section of the old road to facilitate this proposal, but the remainder would not be affected and a gate/barrier would prevent access beyond.

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
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 encampments 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 revised location for the caravans is proposed to be cut into the 2m high bund around the Park and Ride site to the north. This would provide screening to the north, east and west, and further screening is proposed by fencing and additional planting. The site is also screened from Long Lane by a roadside hedge. 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 revised plans suggest reopening the previous access onto Long Lane and demonstrate that adequate visibility splays can be achieved. 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 plans. The plans make provision for turning space within the site. 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.

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.
Applications which South Norfolk Council has an interest in

4. **Appl. No**: 2013/1463/F  
   **Parish**: CAISTOR ST EDMUND  
   **Applicants Name**: Norfolk Archaeological Trust  
   **Site Address**: Car Park At Venta Icenorum Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk  
   **Proposal**: Erection of oak timber-framed pantiled shelter  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. In accord with submitted drawings  
   3. Pantiles/timber treatment to be agreed  
   4. No grey cement to be used

1. **Planning Policies**

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

   1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
      Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
      Policy 2: Promoting good design  
      Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

   1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
      ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
      IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

   2.1 2012/0797 Footbridge over River Tas for pedestrian access to the Roman Town  
        Approved

3. **Consultations**

   3.1 Parish Council To be reported
   3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
   3.3 Conservation Officer No objections.  
      - Condition new pantiles to be agreed and no grey cement to be used in the new mortar for fixing hip tiles.

   3.4 NCC Highways No highways objections
   3.5 Historic Environment Service To be reported
   3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) No adverse comments
   3.7 Representations To be reported
4 Assessment

4.1 This application proposes the erection of an open sided timber shelter with a pantile roof to cover new information panels atVenta Icenorum, Stoke Road, Caistor St Edmund (Caistor Roman Town). The site is a designated archaeological site and ancient monument containing within its area the Grade II listed St Edmund's Church. The application is presented to Development Management Committee as this Council has management responsibility for the site and therefore has an interest in it.

4.2 The proposed timber shelter is to be located on the western side of the car park for the site on the route taken by most visitors to access the remains. The location is partially screened by the existing hedge boundary to the car park. The open sided design of the shelter will allow visitors to see the site from the location of the information boards whilst minimising the potential for vandalism of the structure. The use of plain wooden posts and a traditional pantile roof is in keeping with the historic nature of the site and will not materially harm the setting of either the monument or the nearby listed Church. It is the applicant's intention to apply for Scheduled Ancient Monument Consent for the proposal if this planning application is successful. No objections have been received for the application. The Conservation Officer has however requested conditions requiring details of the proposed pantiles to be agreed and a restriction on the use of grey mortar on the structure to ensure that the structure is in keeping with the historic setting. As such approval of the proposal is recommended.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The application as proposed complies with adopted policies within the Joint Core Strategy in relation to protecting environmental assets (JSC1) good quality design (JCS 2) and the provision of Culture, Leisure and Entertainment facilities (JCS 8), specifically the improvement of existing facilities at this historic site. The development is low key but will enhance the interpretative information at the site. The location of the development is immediately adjacent to the car parking area away from the upstanding remains and is minimal in scale therefore not having a significant impact on the historic asset.

5.2 In terms of the South Norfolk Local Plan the design of the proposed shelter is traditional and will not materially harm the setting of the listed church on site in accordance with policy IMP 15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan which is fully consistent with the National Planning Policy framework. Policy ENV 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as also relevant to the assessment of the application although this policy is only part consistent with the NPPF. In relation to scheduled monument sites the adopted policy approach is in line with the guidance in stating that there would be a presumption against development which would have a significant impact on nationally recognised sites. In this case however the proposal is considered to be acceptable as although it is proposed within an ancient monument site, the location of the development is immediately adjacent to the car parking area away from the upstanding remains and is minimal in scale therefore not having a significant impact on the historic asset.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Cross 01508 533780
and E-mail: hcross@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

5. **Appl. No** : 2013/0531/F  
**Parish** : TOPCROFT

**Applicants Name** : Mr P Rout  
**Site Address** : The Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street Topcroft Norfolk NR35 2BJ  
**Proposal** : Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling.

**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Specific details to be agreed
5. Foul drainage to sealed system
6. Demolish existing buildings on site
7. Slab level to be agreed
8. Development to accord with FRA mitigation measures
9. Boundary treatment to be agreed
10. Implement landscaping scheme
11. Retention trees and hedges
12. New Water Efficiency
13. No PD rights for ancillary outbuildings
14. No PD for fences, walls etc
15. Existing Access - Closure
16. Existing Access, Widen or Improve
17. Access Gates - Configuration
18. Provision of parking and turning area

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU 11: Replacement dwellings (Part Consistent)
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0023 Stationing of a residential caravan for a temporary period of 1 year (retrospective application)  
Refused and Enforcement Notice served
2.2 2013/0531  New field access for agricultural use  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Approve:
- The PC has grave concerns regarding building in a flood zone and seek assurances that the building will not cause future flooding
- Foot bridge is conditioned to be pedestrian and not vehicular
- Concern that materials are out of keeping but the plans may be misleading on this point
- Would prefer the footprint to be located closer to the existing bungalow
- Existing bungalow to be demolished before works begin on the new property
- Hard standing where mobile homes are located reinstated as meadow
- Concern that this sets a precedent for demolition of smaller affordable homes being replaced with larger more expensive homes, which would alter the demographic of the village
- Concern that this sets a precedent for developing agricultural land

3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee:
- Concerns by residents over the 1 flooding and 2 design and location.
- Assess in relation to policies

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)  Support with conditions

3.4 Environment Agency  Support with conditions

3.5 NCC Highways  Support with conditions

3.6 Conservation Officer  Support with conditions

3.7 Public Rights Of Way  No objections

3.8 Flood Defence Officer  Support with conditions

3.9 Representations  10 letters of objection
- The new drive way that was for agricultural purposes has been used solely as a driveway to serve the temporary domestic dwellings on site, which were erected without planning permission
- New static caravans have been erected and lived in on agricultural land which contravenes normal planning regulations
- Disagree with the conservation officer, the dwelling is entirely out of keeping with the local vernacular and is not in keeping with the other houses in this rural village with many listed buildings
- Would like to see a more sympathetic modern 'eco build with more natural materials and sympathetic roof line and tiles
- Not on or near the original dwelling, understand that any application for rebuild should be on the site of the existing
- New dwelling is 3 times larger than the existing
• The Wooden Bungalow was flooded twice between 1990 and 2000
• The revised 3D images does not show the street scene
• Fits none of the criteria stipulated in The Character Area B1 Document (8.14)
• Wooden Bungalow was an original land girl's hut dating from the First World War
• FRA seems to be the excuse to why the new dwelling is to be sited within the middle of the field, why can't it be built on raised foundations on or very near the existing dwelling
• New dwelling looks more like an extension to School or suburban modern house rather than a modern sympathetic eco house in a rural village
• Existing boundary hedgerows and trees have been removed and new hedgerows planted to encompass field adjacent the bungalow
• Will lead to a precedent of other planning applications to develop agricultural land
• Loss of view

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the demolition of The Wooden Bungalow, Topcroft Street and the erection of a replacement dwelling.

4.2 Under the Joint Core Strategy Topcroft Street is identified as Other Village and therefore under the New Local Plan a development boundary is proposed. The site is however located outside this preferred development boundary for the village and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). An exception to the above is the replacement of an existing lawful residence under policy HOU11 of SNLP. The NPPF under Section 6 positively supports the provision of housing. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP because policy HOU11 remains consistent with the NPPF as in that, whilst it resists new dwellings in the open countryside it does not place any restrictions on the replacement of existing dwellings.

4.3 The main issues for consideration in this case are, the principle of the proposal in this location and flood risk; design; and highway considerations.

Principle of the proposal in this location and flood risk

4.4 It is proposed to demolish the existing modest single storey wooden bungalow and replace it with a significantly larger 3 bedroomed two storey dwelling of a contemporary design. The existing dwelling is capable of occupation and has a lawful residential use. The proposal is for one dwelling. Policy HOU11 requires the replacement dwelling to be located in the same position on the site as the existing dwelling or in a position which is less obtrusive. In this case it is proposed to site the dwelling further away from the adjoining watercourse and on higher ground. The Environment Agency Flood Map indicates that the site is located within Flood Zone 3. The applicants consultant has undertaken an independent modelling study and consequently demonstrated that the site falls into a lesser, modified flood plain which has been confirmed by the Environment Agency. The northern area of the site is currently located in Flood Zone 2 (with climate change Flood Zone 3) and the remainder of the site including the siting of the proposed dwelling will be located within Flood Zone 1 (with climate change Flood Zone 2). The scheme proposes mitigation measures including a finished floor level of 34.59m (AOD). The proposed site would therefore be creating a betterment to the existing site, where the existing bungalow is situated in a more vulnerable
location and has according to local knowledge flooded in the past. The design of the
dwelling has taken into account the context and landscape setting. In view of the above the
proposal is acceptable in terms of the principle of replacing the existing dwelling; its siting
and potential flood risk.

Design

4.5 The site falls within Landscape Character Area B1: Tas Tributary Farmland and is located
in a distinctly rural part of The Street. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed
architectural character incorporating a range of materials, some of which are of relatively
small scale. The application has been supported by a Design and Access statement which
includes a detailed appraisal of the site and its context along with a Code for Sustainable
Homes pre-assessment. The relevant design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place-
making Guide have been taken into account in developing the design and responding to its
context. The proposed dwelling is a two storey building of timber construction with shallow
curved roofs. It is set back from the road in a similar nature to other rural properties in the
vicinity. The external treatment of the house picks up on the materials used in the local
area, natural render and timber cladding. The roof is to be finished with a single ply grey
membrane with up-stands and has a similar appearance to a lead roof with rolled seams.
The contemporary design approach is acceptable and is to be of sustainable construction.
The scale, bulk, massing and design of the dwelling respects the scale and character of the
site and its surroundings, and in all respects represents an improvement on the existing
dwelling.

Highway

4.6 The highway officer has raised no objections to the proposal, provided that the existing
vehicular access to the Wooden Bungalow is permanently closed to vehicular traffic and
the highway verge reinstated; and the agricultural access is upgraded to accord with the
Norfolk County Council residential access construction.

4.7 A number of concerns have been raised in respect of the proposal as set out in para 3.9.
Whilst I fully appreciate the issues raised, the access being given consent for agricultural
purposes and now uses for residential; the applicant placing a mobile home and associated
structures on the site without consent; the removal of existing trees and hedges; loss of
view and precedent; none of these would be sustainable reasons to refuse the application.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is considered to accord with policies HOU11, IMP9, IMP8, Policy 2
and the NPPF as the existing dwelling enjoys a lawful permanent residential use; there is no
increase in the number of dwellings; the replacement is located in a better and safer siting to the
existing; the scale, bulk, massing and design of the dwelling is of good quality and respects the
character of the existing site, its surroundings and represents an improvement on the existing;
the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree; and the
proposal will not give rise to a situation detrimental to highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2013/0771/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Ms J Reay  
Site Address : Subdivision Of Garden Of 165 Norwich Road Oakwood Drive Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 4 no. dwellings and associated double garages.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Windows to be obscure glazed  
5. Slab level tba  
6. No additional windows at first floor level  
7. No PD for classes ABCD  
8. Landscaping scheme  
9. Water efficiency  
10. Provision of parking and servicing areas

Subject to a S106 agreement to cover the application site and the land outlined in blue to ensure that affordable housing requirements are met if further development comes forward.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant
3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council

Should be approved.

3.2 District Member

- To Development Management Committee
- Should be approved.
- Type A two storey dwelling adjacent to south boundary will cast a shadow into the neighbours garden.
- Neighbouring garden is used to grow plants as part of neighbour’s business.
- Neighbours nursery area will be under shadow.
- Proposed dwelling should be single storey.
- 57 Norwich Road garden severance sets a precedent for single storey development

3.3 Flood Defence Officer

- Surface water drainage advice.
- Land drainage advice.
- Garages appear to be sited on the bank of a water course.
- May give rise to stability issues.
- Should not be assumed that the water course can be culverted.

3.4 NCC Highways

Requested conditions regarding access, parking and turning area to be laid out.

3.5 Representations

Letters from 5 properties making the following comments:

Object
- In favour of site being developed.
- Concern about height and position of dwelling type A.
- Dwelling type A will overshadow 167 Norwich Road rear garden.
- Will adversely affect ability to grow plants for commercial purposes at 167 Norwich Road.
- A bungalow should be erected on dwelling type A plot.
- Will be overcrowded and noisy.
- 9 Oakwood Drive will be overlooked.
- Request 4 bungalows instead
- First floor windows will overlook living and bedrooms and garden of 161 Norwich Road
- Bungalows more in keeping with area
- Houses will be Overdevelopment
- Bungalows will have minimum impact on sky line
- Request fence height of 2m along boundary
- Boundary security of 163 Norwich Road
- Increase traffic on Oakwood Drive
- Noise disturbance to bedroom window of 13 Oakwood Drive from increased traffic
- Noise disturbance from development
- Do not understand need for more development in Wymondham
- Lack of parking
- Additional on street parking
- Concern about drive to 13 Oakwood Drive being blocked
- Shadow analysis report has inaccuracies
- Existing trees are 4.5m high deciduous open sparse leaved trees which provide dappled shade and sunlight.
• Dwelling will create unacceptable year round soil shading.
• Object to removal of more trees from 163 Norwich Road.
• Concern about loss of habitat for wildlife due to loss of trees.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for 2 bungalows and 2 houses on the rear part of 165 Norwich Road Wymondham. The site would be accessed from Oakwood Drive.

4.2 The site of 165 Norwich Road is a linear plot leading off Norwich Road. There is an existing empty property in a state of disrepair near the front of the site which fronts Norwich Road. The application site only includes part of the land that currently comprises 165 Norwich Road. The existing house and surrounding land are outside the site of the current application. The application site comprises the majority of the rear garden of 165 Norwich Road and a smaller element of land to link the 165 Norwich Road site to Oakwood Drive to provide the proposed access.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The site is located within the adopted Development Limit for Wymondham. Therefore, the principle of additional dwellings in this location accords with adopted Development Plan Policy.

4.6 To the south east of the site leading down to Norwich Road is the remainder of the plot of 165 Norwich Road. This land is within the blue line submitted with the application. The land outlined in blue is occupied by an existing house, which whilst appearing structurally sound on the outside, is not in a habitable condition inside. Therefore, the current application is only for part of a potentially larger development site. Should the applicant propose development on the land outlined in blue a formal application would need to be considered in accordance with the normal procedures. The current application being considered is for 4 dwellings, which is only one dwelling below the threshold for affordable housing provision as set out in JCS Policy 4. Paragraph 5.28 of the JCS recognises ‘that much development takes place on smaller sites and that without appropriate contributions from such schemes there would be a significant undersupply of affordable housing against identified need’. A S106 agreement attached to the current application and covering the land outlined in blue would ensure that the necessary affordable housing would be provided by the plot of 165 Norwich Road should the total development on the plot exceed the threshold for affordable housing set out in JCS Policy 4. The applicant has been asked about their plans for the blue land, and requested to address the affordable housing requirements of JCS Policy 4 through a S106 agreement. The applicant has stated that once planning permission is obtained for the application site the blue land will be put up for sale. The applicant has confirmed their agreement to a S106 covering the application site and the land outlined in blue meaning that this proposal for 4 dwellings would count as the first 4 dwellings for the purposes of calculating the affordable housing requirement for the whole of the 165 Norwich Road site.

Highway safety

4.7 The proposed dwellings would be accessed from an existing close, Oakwood Drive. Norfolk County Council Highways have been consulted on the proposal. Subject to the conditions the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.
There is adequate space provided on site for the parking and turning of vehicles.

Residential amenity

4.8 Due to the location, orientation and scale of the proposed two bungalows, these two proposed dwellings should not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings. The two proposed bungalows themselves should provide the occupiers of those dwellings with a sufficient level of residential amenity.

4.9 The two proposed houses would each be located approximately 1m from the side boundary of the rear gardens of the two neighbouring dwellings. The side flank walls would only contain windows that could be obscure glazed. Therefore, the proposal should not result in a loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwellings. Due to the proposed dwellings being located some way down the garden of the neighbouring house the proposal should not result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwellings. The dwellings would be located to the north of 163 Norwich Road and therefore should not result in a loss of light to that property. The dwelling on plot 1 would be to the south of part of the garden of 165 Norwich Road. The dwelling on plot 1 would cause some overshadowing of the garden of 167 Norwich Road. However, due to the orientation this would be for part of the day and would affect an area at the end of the garden. Whilst the concerns raised by the neighbour have been taken into account, the extent of overshadowing that would be caused would not be sufficient to warrant refusal in this case.

4.10 Comments have been submitted raising concerns about maintenance of the ditch due to the proposed location of the side boundary fence between the site and 163 Norwich Road. A proposed fence in the location shown does not require planning permission. The ownership and maintenance of the ditch are a private legal matter between the parties involved. Access could be provided through the fence to the ditch.

Character and appearance of area

4.11 The proposed dwellings would continue the character of Oakwood Close, with bungalows on one side and houses on the other. Locating development to the rear of the existing frontage properties on Norwich Road would not be out of keeping with the overall character of Norwich Road.

4.12 There are existing trees at 163 Norwich Road that are separated from the site by an existing ditch. The trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Whilst these trees may cause some shadowing of plot 3, it appears unlikely that the development of plot 3 will have a significant impact on the trees partly due to the intervening ditch.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, UTL14, HOU4 and TRA19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The site is located within the adopted Development Limit for Wymondham. Therefore, the principle of additional dwellings in this location accords with adopted Development Plan Policy. The proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway. There is adequate space provided on site for the parking and turning of vehicles. The level of residential amenity offered by the new dwellings and the impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of existing dwellings
would be acceptable. The proposed dwellings would continue the character of Oakwood Close, with bungalows on one side and dwellings on the other. Locating development to the rear of the existing frontage properties on Norwich Road would not be out of keeping with the overall character of Norwich Road.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2013/0986/F  
**Parish**: BUNWELL

**Applicants Name**: Miss R Durrant  
**Site Address**: Horseshoe Cottage Brick Kiln Lane Bunwell Norfolk NR16 1SA  
**Proposal**: Proposed replacement dwelling in the style of a Norfolk long house, one and a half storeys with dormer windows and timber car port

**Recommendation**: Refusal

1. **Detrimental to character of locality**

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
**Policy 2**: Promoting good design  
**Policy 1**: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
**Policy 3**: Energy and water  
**Policy 17**: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
**ENV 8**: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
**IMP 8**: Safe and free flow traffic  
**IMP 9**: Residential amenity  
**IMP 2**: Landscaping  
**UTL 14**: Waste collection and recycling  
**HOU 11**: Replacement dwellings (Part Consistent)  
**TRA 19**: Parking standards

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

2. **Planning History**

2. **2012/1008**  
**Extension to existing dwelling. Single storey new extension for kitchen, dining, living area, utility room and enclosed porch. Existing part to become 3 bedrooms and bathroom.**  
**Refused**

2.2 **2009/0585**  
**Change of use for stables and paddocks to registered racing greyhound kennels and puppy rearing pens**  
**Refused**

2.3 **2005/2002**  
**Proposed stable block comprising of 3no stables, 1no tack room, 1no feed room, 1no hay store and a wash area**  
**Approved**

2.4 **2000/1900**  
**Conversion and extension of existing barn to create new residential unit**  
**Approved**
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No objection.
   - Would like standard lighting clause attached as a condition.

3.2 District Member To be determined by Committee.
   - Design appears satisfactory.
   - Accommodation is not fit for purpose by today's standards and needs to be improved.

3.3 Flood Defence Officer Surface and foul water drainage advice

3.4 Representations None received.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing dwelling on the site and replace it with a three bed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be 6m high to the ridge. There would be living accommodation and one bedroom with en-suite and dressing room on the ground floor and two bedrooms and two bathrooms in the roof space served by six dormers comprising three on the front and three on the rear. There would be an attached car port.

4.2 The existing range of buildings on the site was converted to a dwelling following approval in 2000. The existing dwelling is comprised a number of small scale elements which run parallel to the northern boundary and which have narrow gable widths and a low ridge line.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The site is located in the countryside outside of the adopted and emerging Development Boundaries. There is an existing dwelling on the site which is occupied. The existing dwelling was created by the conversion of a former agricultural building in accordance with the adopted policy at the time which permitted the conversion of buildings outside the then designated Development Boundaries. The building was converted in a manner that retained the character and appearance of the existing building and made use of an existing building in an area where new dwellings would not normally be permitted. Relevant conditions were attached to the permission to ensure that the barns character and appearance were maintained over the long term.

4.6 Whilst there have been a number of changes to policy since the dwelling was permitted, the principles of restricting new housing outside Development Boundaries and permitting the conversion of existing buildings subject to retaining their character have continued in an updated form.

4.7 As the lawful use of the building is now a dwelling and the building is occupied Saved SNLP Policy HOU11 is relevant to the proposal. This policy permits the principle of the replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside subject to the replacement dwelling maintaining the character of the site. JCS Policy 17 permits the appropriate replacement of existing buildings in the countryside where it can be clearly demonstrated to further the
objectives of the JCS.

4.8 Although the principle of replacing the existing dwelling on the site may accord with adopted policy, the replacement dwelling being proposed does not maintain the character of the site for the reasons set out below.

4.9 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF says that Local Planning Authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside, unless there are special circumstances. The only relevant special circumstances in this case are whether the exceptional quality of what is being proposed, or the innovative nature of the design is sufficient to allow the scheme to proceed in a location where it would normally be resisted. The design is not of sufficient exceptional architectural quality to satisfy the special requirements of the NPPF paragraph 55.

Character and appearance of the area

4.10 The existing dwelling is comprised of a number of small scale elements which run parallel to the northern boundary and which have narrow gable widths and a low ridge line.

4.11 The site is located in an open countryside location and the dwelling is seen in an isolated position to the south of the main settlement. It is accessed from a narrow track which also carries the line of the definitive right of way. The dwelling is located in the north eastern corner of a large paddock area and is bordered to the north and east by hedgerows. To the west of the dwelling, on slightly elevated ground is an L shaped range of stables.

4.12 Policy HOU11 replacement dwellings criterion iii states: 'The scale, bulk, massing, design and landscape impact of the proposed dwelling respect the scale and character of the existing site and its surroundings, and in all these respects represents an improvement on the existing dwelling.'

4.13 The design of the scheme has been amended during the consideration of the application. This assessment relates to the revised details. The scale and form of the dwelling is significantly larger than the range of buildings that comprise the existing dwelling. The proposed dwelling will be significantly higher than the existing dwelling and the footprint is significantly larger. This will therefore, add to the intrusion of built form into the countryside. The proposed dwelling will significantly increase the built mass on the site and will dominate the site to the detriment of the character of the site and the openness of the countryside. The proposed dwelling by reason of its scale, and mass and its location will have greater visual impact than the existing single storey range in a largely undeveloped area and will consequently have an intrusive impact on the rural character of the area. The proposed dwelling will be clearly visible from the adjacent public right of way and will be detrimental to the character of the locality. Therefore, the proposed dwelling does not respect the scale and character of the site and is considered to be contrary to criterion iii of Policy HOU11.

4.14 Whilst the application seeks to demonstrate why the applicant considers the new development could fit into the surrounding rural landscape, the scale and mass of the proposal will have a degree of harm on the character of the site and its rural appearance by introducing a large domestic structure into the landscape. The scheme would not significantly enhance its immediate setting and the new proposed dwelling would also be damaging to the rural character of the site and its surroundings.

Residential amenity

4.15 The site is sufficiently far from existing nearby dwellings that the proposal should not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of any nearby dwellings.
Highway safety

4.16 The proposal would not alter the number of dwellings on the site. The access would be in a similar location to the existing access and there would be adequate turning and parking space on site. Therefore, the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway. The proposed car port location does not appear to be the most convenient arrangement given the front boundary of the site. Notwithstanding this there would remain adequate space within the site to park vehicles.

5 Conclusion and reason for refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and Joint Core Strategy for Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk including, in particular, policies ENV8 and HOU11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The scale and form of the dwelling is significantly larger than the range of buildings that comprise the existing dwelling. The proposed dwelling will significantly increase the built mass on the site and will dominate the site to the detriment of the character of the site and the openness of the countryside. The proposed dwelling will be clearly visible from the adjacent public right of way and will be detrimental to the character of the locality.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Michelle Lyon 01508 533681
and E-mail:  mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee 11 September 2013

8. **Appl. No:** 2013/1211/F  
   **Parish:** WYMONDHAM

   **Applicants Name:** Mr P Richardson  
   **Site Address:** Manor Farm Bungalow Wramplingham Road Downham Norfolk NR18 0SB  
   **Proposal:** Demolition of existing bungalow and proposed new dwelling

   **Recommendation:** Refusal

   1. Out of character in the locality  
   2. Unacceptable overlooking

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 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 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
   HOU 11: Replacement dwellings (Part Consistent)  
   TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/2014 Certificate of Lawful Development for residential occupation in breach of condition 3 agricultural occupancy of planning permission WY/1163

   **Grant:** Granted

2.2 2012/2185 Demolition of existing bungalow and proposed new dwelling

   **Withdrawn**

2.3 WY/1163 Erection of bungalow for foreman

   **Approved**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council
   - Should be approved.  
   - Suggest condition agricultural restriction.

3.2 District Member
   - Can be determined as a delegated decision if recommended for approval.
Committee should examine design and bulk.

3.3 Flood Defence Officer
- Surface water drainage advice.
- Package sewage treatment plan advice.

3.4 District Ecologist
To be reported

3.5 NCC Highways
Request condition regarding parking and turning layout

3.6 Design Officer
- Recommend refusal
- Despite some positive benefits of the overall scheme in terms of its aspiration to achieve a passive house design, the design is not of sufficient exceptional architectural quality to satisfy the special requirements of the NPPF paragraph 55, or the South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8, which seek to protect the countryside from unnecessary development and HOU11.

3.7 Historic Environment Service
- Does not have any implications for the historic environment.
- No recommendations for archaeological work

3.8 Representations
None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks planning permission for demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with a two storey dwelling and change of use of agricultural land to residential curtilage to serve the proposed dwelling.

4.2 The existing bungalow was built as an agricultural workers dwelling. It is approximately 5m high and has three bedrooms. The bungalow is not currently occupied. A certificate of lawful use to occupy the bungalow without complying with the agricultural restriction was granted in February 2013. The use had become lawful over the passage of time because the bungalow had been occupied in breach of the occupancy restriction for over 10 years.

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

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

Principle of development

4.5 The site is located in the open countryside outside the Development Limits defined in the Development Plan. There is an existing dwelling on the site that has until relatively recently been occupied. Therefore, Saved SNLP Policy HOU11 is relevant to the proposal. This policy permits the principle of the replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside subject to the replacement dwelling maintaining the character of the site. JCS Policy 17 permits the appropriate replacement of existing buildings in the countryside where it can be clearly demonstrated to further the objectives of the JCS.

4.6 Although the principle of replacing the existing dwelling on the site may accord with adopted policy, the replacement dwelling being proposed does not maintain the character of the site for the reasons set out below.
The submitted Design and Access Statement makes the case that the proposal meets the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF says that Local Planning Authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside, unless there are special circumstances. For the reasons set out below, despite some positive benefits of the overall scheme in terms of its aspiration to achieve a passive house design, the design is not of sufficient exceptional architectural quality to satisfy the special requirements of the NPPF paragraph 55.

Character and appearance

Policy HOU11 replacement dwellings criterion iii states: "The scale, bulk, massing, design and landscape impact of the proposed dwelling respect the scale and character of the existing site and its surroundings, and in all these respects represents an improvement on the existing dwelling."

The proposed dwelling will be significantly higher than the existing dwelling, with much greater bulk above ground floor level. The footprint is significantly larger and it will be located closer to the road than the existing dwelling. This will therefore, add to the intrusion of built form into the countryside. The proposed dwelling by reason of its scale, bulk and mass and its location on the corner plot will have greater visual impact than the existing bungalow in a largely undeveloped area and will consequently have an urbanising and intrusive impact on the rural character of the area. Therefore, the proposed dwelling does not respect the scale and character of the site and is considered to be contrary to criterion iii of Policy HOU11.

Whilst the proposal seeks to demonstrate how the new development could fit into the surrounding rural landscape, the scale and bulk of the proposal will have a degree of harm on the character of the site and its rural appearance by introducing a large domestic structure into the landscape, which is out of character with the existing site context. The scheme would not significantly enhance its immediate setting and the new proposed dwelling would also be damaging to the rural character of the site and its surroundings.

Highway safety

The proposal is for one dwelling and does not include alteration to the existing arrangements for access to the public highway. There is adequate space on site to park and manoeuvre vehicles. Therefore, the proposal should not have an adverse impact on the safe or convenient use of the public highway over or above the current situation.

Residential amenity

Because the dwelling would be located to the north of the existing bungalow the proposal should not result in overshadowing or loss of light to the existing neighbouring bungalow. The proposed dwelling would be sufficiently far from the existing neighbouring bungalow not to have an overbearing impact. Subject to the side bedroom window facing the neighbouring bungalow being obscure glazed the proposal should not result in overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring bungalow from rooms within the dwelling. However, the proposed balcony would overlook the neighbouring dwelling to the south. The balcony could be modified to provide a screen on the south elevation to prevent overlooking.

Biodiversity

A Biodiversity and European Protected Species Survey has been submitted. An assessment of the ecological implications of the proposal will be reported to Committee.
5 Conclusion and reasons for refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk including, in particular, Saved policies HOU11 and ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed dwelling will be significantly higher than the existing dwelling, with much greater bulk above ground floor level. The footprint is significantly larger and it will be located closer to the road than the existing dwelling. This will therefore, add to the intrusion of built form into the countryside. The proposed dwelling by reason of its scale, bulk and mass and its location on the corner plot will have greater visual impact than the existing bungalow in a largely undeveloped area and will consequently have an urbanising and intrusive impact on the rural character of the area. Therefore, the proposed dwelling does not respect the scale and character of the site. The scale and bulk of the proposal will have a degree of harm on the character of the site and its rural appearance by introducing a large domestic structure into the landscape, which is out of character with the existing site context. The scheme would not significantly enhance its immediate setting and the new proposed dwelling would also be damaging to the rural character of the site and its surroundings.

5.2 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, policy IMP9 and the National Planning Policy Framework. The balcony on the proposed dwelling will cause overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling to the south causing a loss of privacy to that dwelling to the detriment of the residential amenity of that dwelling.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2013/1281/CU  
**Parish**: THARSTON & HAPTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mrs Annabelle Conway  
**Site Address**: Nether Langleys Bungay Road Tharston Norfolk NR15 2YL  
**Proposal**: Change of use from residential to mixed use residential and day care children's nursery  
**Recommendation**: Refusal  
- Unsustainable location  
- Inadequate visibility splays  
- Loss of residential amenity  
- Inadequate information on impact of staff parking on trees

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (part consistent)

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 16: Conversion/subdivision of large properties  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

- **2005/2058**: Proposed first floor extension at side and single storey extension at rear of existing dwelling  
  - Approved
- **2005/0082**: Proposed demolition of existing double garage and erection of 2no storey extension to front of dwelling with single storey extension to side  
  - Refused
- **2003/1774**: Retention of existing entrance gate & brick piers  
  - Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**: To be reported

3.2 **District Member**: To be determined by committee if recommended for refusal  
- Wish to support application  
- Increase employment in the area and provide a much needed service
Concerned if permission is not granted operation may be moved outside my ward

3.3 NCC Highways Object

- Site is rurally located with the access onto the Bungay Road and has a short frontage of approximately 30 metres onto the highway.
- The site is situated close to a bend in the road.
- Results in poor visibility being available from the access to the east which is the important oncoming traffic direction.
- Proposal is for day care children nursery with 30 places. Will result in a marked increase in traffic from the site.
- Recommended visibility in 60 mph road is 215 metres.
- Site only achieves 45 metres maximum at 2.4 metre set back in both directions.
- This level of visibility is only suitable if traffic is travelling at 30 mph which is not the case on this road.
- Even considering traffic travelling at 40 mph the available visibility is only a third of the recommended in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.
- Particular concern for vehicles turning right would collide with vehicles approaching from the east around the bend at speed.
- Stopping distance for vehicles travelling at 50 mph is 53 metres which is greater than the splay available.
- Proposal would result in 60 car movements to and from the site on a daily basis, with this type of development it is essential the correct site is chosen that has safe access for all. It is clear that in highway safety terms this site is well short of this requirement.
- Proposal is likely to causes hazard and danger to road safety.
- Site is outside a development boundary and remote from public transport connections, renders the users of the nursery dependent on the private care, although it is noted the current location of the nursery is similarly sited remotely in transport sustainability.

3.4 NCC - Children’s Services

No comments received

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection)

Support with conditions

3.6 Representations

One letter of objection
- Big impact in terms of noise
- Car park for clients is located 20 feet from the back of my house
- Noise disturbance from car coming and going on gravel drive, car doors opening and closing and voices
- Would destroy peace and quiet of the area.

Two letters of support from local residents
- I support this proposal but I am concerned about even more vehicles using Parkes Lane Tharston which is already a rat run.
- Represents an expansion of a well-established business. As a resident of the village I would support this kind of diversification.
One letter of support from an existing client

- Daughter attends existing nursery, very difficult to find suitable child care in this area.
- Expansion of business benefit local families
- New premise will enable a greater emphasis nature which is supported

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Nether Langleys which is a substantial detached dwelling set in large grounds. The property is accessed off the C497 Bungay Road in Tharston. There is a residential dwelling to the west otherwise the site is surrounded by farmland. The property is located well outside any existing or proposed development limit.

4.2 It is proposed to change the use of the dwelling to a mixed use children’s nursery / residential dwelling. As well as day care the nursery also proposes to offer before and after school care for Hempnall and Tasburgh schools and a holiday club. It is proposed that up to 30 children could attend the nursery at any one time. The proposal would result in the creation of 3 new jobs.

4.3 Jack in the Box nursery currently operates from Holly Cottage Brick Kiln Lane in Morningthorpe where there is a restriction that only 12 children can be minded at any one time. This has resulted in business having to be turned away and the need to find a new site.

4.4 Sustainable development is at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework and one of the core planning principles is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. This view is also reflected in the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan. The site is remote from the surrounding villages and is not easily accessible by public transport or by foot or cycle. The proposed location would mean that the clients of the business would be dependent on the private car. The proposal is therefore contrary to the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.5 The site is accessed off the Bungay Road close to a bend to the east. It currently suffers from poor visibility in both directions with only a maximum of 45 metres at the required set back of 2.4 metres being achieved. The road is subject to a 60 mph speed limit, the recommended vision splay in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for this speed of road is 215 metres. The available vision however, is only a third of what is required if vehicles are travelling at 40 mph, which is a more realistic speed for the vehicles travelling along this road. The property has a limited frontage and the land either side of the site is outside the control of the applicant, so the visibility issue cannot be easily resolved. The proposed change of use would result in a substantial increase of traffic movements from the site with up to 30 children being present at the site at any one time and well as staff. Although only 30 children could be present at once these could be different children in the morning and the afternoon. The Highway Officer has objected to the application because of the poor visibility from the site particularly from the east direction where he is particularly concerned that vehicles turning right would collide with vehicles approaching from the east around the bend at speed. The stopping distance for a vehicle travelling at 50 mph is 53 metres which is greater than the splay available. The proposal would therefore result in a hazard and danger to road safety and be contrary to policy IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.6 Concern has been raised by the immediate neighbour regarding the potential noise and disturbance from cars coming and going from the site on the gravel drive, car doors and voices. The proposed change of use would result in a big increase in the intensity of the
use of the site, with up to 30 children on site at any one time. Although the disturbance created is unlikely to be a statutory nuisance, given the number of people involved it is likely to result in a loss of amenity to the neighbouring property, especially given the limited distance between the neighbouring property and car parking area. There is a tall conifer hedge which separates the two properties which will offer visual protection; however, it is unlikely to act as a successful barrier in terms of noise disturbance. The disturbance is likely to be more notable given the quiet nature of the area and result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to the neighbouring property. As a result the proposal would be contrary to policy IMP9 and IMP10 in the South Norfolk Local Plan which seeks to protect the amenity of surrounding residents and restricts development which would result in noise disturbance close to noise sensitive uses.

4.7 The staff car parking is currently proposed to be between trees on the site to the west of the entrance drive, no detail of the surface of the parking and no aboricultural report has been submitted with the application to assess if the impact on the trees could be mitigated. It would be better to try and move the car parking away from the trees and neighbour’s boundary.

4.8 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. Policy EMP4 has been given no weight as it is not consistent with the NPPF.

4.9 Although we would normally wish to support such a local business and some weight can be given to the fact that the existing business is not in a sustainable location, given the substandard visibility at the site access and the detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent property, in this instance the application is recommended for refusal.

5 Conclusion and Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The site is located outside any existing or proposed development limit and is remote from any form of public services and the lack of safe footway and cycle provision would realistically mean that users of the site would be dependent on the private car. The site is therefore located in an unsustainable location contrary to the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 Inadequate visibility splays are provided at the junction of the access with the County highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway, contrary to policy IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.3 The proposed intensity of the use of the site with up to 30 children at the site at any one time would result in the creation of an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance from vehicular movements and general noise and disturbance from the use which would result in a loss of amenity to the neighbouring property and result in the proposal being contrary to the provision of policy IMP9 and IMP10 in the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.4 Insufficient information has been received by the local planning authority to adequately assess the merits of the scheme. In particular, in the absence of information relating to the impact and mitigation of the staff parking area on the surrounding trees.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2013/1362/F  
**Parish**: MUNDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Phillip Jeans  
Site Address: Mundham House Thwaite Road Mundham Norfolk NR14 6FD  
Proposal: Demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of a new country house single family dwelling with Mundham House retained as a Dower house with the same occupation. Erection of an associated grounds maintenance store, internal and external improvements and restoration of Mundham House along with replacement of the single storey extension, erection of car port, gate house and associated landscaping work.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Specific details to be agreed  
5. Foul drainage to sealed system  
6. Surface Water  
7. New Water Efficiency  
8. Ecology Mitigation  
9. Retention trees and hedges  
10. Planting scheme  
11. Tree protection  
12. Details of new access to be submitted  
13. Slab level to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 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 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  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
## Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/1363/LB</td>
<td>Alterations to Mundham House comprising replacement of single storey rear projection, new openings and alterations to fenestration, replacement dormers, minor interior works and repairs to structure and fabric. Alterations to the Cottage (former stables) including removal of modern extensions.</td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1564 &amp; 2012/1562</td>
<td>New walled kitchen garden and utility shed with associated landscaping linked to planning permissions 2011/0867 &amp; 2011/0868</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/0868 &amp; 2011/0867</td>
<td>Proposed new entrance gates, new outbuildings comprising garage block and leisure block, new cottage, conversion of existing cottage to garden building, new covered walkway with brick wall and new landscape scheme including walled orchard garden. Demolition of storage and workshop building and gatehouse, existing cottage extensions, entrance gates and minor garden structures.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/1478</td>
<td>Retrospective application for demolition of extension</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/0034 &amp; 2010/0033</td>
<td>Change of use from agricultural land to residential (garden), formal landscaping proposals and new access/boundary fence</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2040 &amp; 2009/2039</td>
<td>Extension and alterations to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0143 &amp; 2009/0142</td>
<td>Extension and alterations to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2557 &amp; 2006/2556</td>
<td>Change of use from agricultural land to residential (garden), formal landscaping proposals and new access/boundary fence</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2197</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/1192 &amp; 2006/1191</td>
<td>Change of use from agricultural land to residential (garden), formal landscaping proposals and new access/boundary fence</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/1184</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Refused allowed at appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/1181</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  Approve

- Consideration should be given to the visual impact of the maintenance store
- Local concerns raised that what was, until recently, an agricultural land is now becoming building land

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Seething Airfield  No comments received

3.4 Historic Environment Service  No comments received

3.5 Landscape Officer  Support with conditions

3.6 Ecologist  Support with conditions

3.7 NCC Highways  Support with conditions

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections

3.9 Flood Defence Officer  Support with conditions

3.10 Representations  No comments received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of a new country house single family dwelling with Mundham House retained as a Dower house with the same occupation. Erection of an associated grounds maintenance store, internal and external improvements and restoration of Mundham House along with replacement of the single storey extension, erection of car port, gate house and associated landscaping work.

4.2 In policy terms, Mundham does not have any development boundary or village limit and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under this policy and therefore the erection of a new dwelling in this location is contrary to policy. An exception to the above is Paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design. Such a design should:

- Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in the rural area;
- Reflect the highest standards in architecture;
- Significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
- Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

4.3 This proposal has been the subject of pre-application discussions where various options for the development of the site have been thoroughly explored from demolition and rebuilding through to restoration and siting of a new building. The application now submitted follows the principles agreed through this process and is supported by a comprehensive set of documents including a Heritage Statement, Design & Access Statement, Landscape &
Visual Analysis and Structural Assessment. In addition to the impact of the proposals on the significance of the listed building and its setting, other considerations include impact on landscape and the principle of a new building in the countryside. Although the proposal would be sited within the grounds of Mundham House, so will not stand alone, it is set in the open countryside and does not infill or form part of a grouping of existing residential development. Therefore the principles set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF are of critical importance when assessing this application.

4.4 Mundham House is a Grade II listed C18 house with later additions to the rear with its own extensive grounds, within a relatively open countryside setting. The garden cottage (formerly the stable building) is also listed Grade II for group value although this is much altered. There have been numerous consents granted for development of this site, some of which have been implemented including various outbuildings and extensions as well as works not yet undertaken such as the removal of chimney breasts and alteration of the principal building's plan form, granted on appeal. The current proposal is based on a detailed appraisal of the site and its setting along with the wider landscape character with a view to considering opportunities for significant enhancement of the setting and fabric of Mundham House. The Design & Access Statement, Heritage Statement and Landscape & Visual Analysis are exemplar documents which have carefully set out the appraisals which have been undertaken, the key considerations and options explored and how the proposal has evolved in response. Not only will the scheme ensure the retention of the maximum amount of historic fabric to Mundham House, it will remove a number of elements which cumulatively have detracted from the character and significance of the listed building and will create a design and landscape of exceptional quality which will enhance the setting of the listed building.

4.5 It is considered that the benefits of the proposed development include:

- Sympathetic restoration of the principal building and replacement of the existing rear extension with a design more in keeping with the historic character and appearance of the dwelling.
- Improvements to the significance of the listed cottage (former stables) through removal of modern / unsympathetic additions and very skilful redesign as one of a pair of 'gatehouse' buildings as an architectural feature which frames the approach to the new country house from the north.
- Enhanced setting of Mundham House through a carefully designed and attractive landscape scheme based on the landscape characteristics of the locality, including the reinstatement of the walled garden.
- Appropriate siting of the new dwelling, parking barn and grounds maintenance building based on a thorough appraisal and understanding of landscape character, settlement pattern and the setting of Mundham House.
- A new dwelling which is clearly of exceptional quality, designed by Robert Adam, a highly respected architect with a national reputation for contemporary classical design which takes account of C21 requirements for sustainability, energy conservation etc. The building uses sound principles of composition, proportion and style which is carried through to detailed design and specification of materials which complement the listed building.

4.6 The scheme is a very carefully considered proposal of the highest quality which satisfies the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF in relation to outstanding design, highest standards in architecture, enhancement of setting and sensitivity to local defining characteristics. I therefore recommend that the application is approved.
5 Conclusion

The proposed dwelling whilst outside a defined development boundary is of exceptional quality and satisfies the requirements of Para 55 of the NPPF as it is truly outstanding and will help to raise standards of design more generally in the rural area; reflect the highest standards in architecture; it will significantly enhance its immediate setting; and is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

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

**Appeals received from 3 August 2013 to 29 August 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2013/0238 | Swardeston  
   Land At Eastern End Of Bobbins Way Swardston Norfolk | Mr Michael Bobbins | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 detached houses and garages and ancillary works                     |
| 2013/0725 | Pulham St Mary  
   Land East Of Semere Green Road (forming Part Of Upper Vaunces Farm) Pulham Market And Dickleburgh (with New Access From The A140) | Upper Vaunces Wind Farm Ltd | Erection of three wind turbines (maximum 126m in height) and associated development for a period of 25 years, including control building, electricity transformers, underground cabling, access tracks, crane hardstandings and vehicular access |

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 3 August 2013 to 29 August 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>