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Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 4 December 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

26/11/2013
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
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 6)

4. Minutes of the meetings of the Development Management Committee held on 22 October and 6 November 2013;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 25)
   To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011/0505/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North Of The A11 At Park Farm Silfield Road</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/0371/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land To The East And West Of Rightup Lane</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/1748/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Land North Of Nelson Road Diss</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/1521/H</td>
<td>ASHWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL</td>
<td>Walks Farm Barn Blacksmiths Lane Ashwellthorpe</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/1736/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Plots 23, 24, 25 &amp; 26 Common Farm Common Road Dickleburgh</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/1783/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Plot 42 Common Farm Common Road</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/1886/CU</td>
<td>LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY</td>
<td>Langley Abbey Langley Green Langley</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/1948/LB</td>
<td>TACOULNESTON</td>
<td>The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston</td>
<td>60</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 63)

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 8 January 2014 in Colman & Cavell Rooms
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

- Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

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

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

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<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.

Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.

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

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

Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

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

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A  Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
Development Management Committee 4 December 2013

Agenda Item No. 5

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in recommendations

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

Report of the Director of Growth and Localism

1. **Appl. No : 2011/0505/O**
   **Parish : WYMONDHAM**
   Applicants Name : Pelham Holdings Ltd
   Site Address : Land North Of The A11 At Park Farm Silfield Road Wymondham
   Proposal : Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting and new playing pitches relating to Wymondham High School.

2. **Appl. No : 2012/0371/O**
   **Parish : WYMONDHAM**
   Applicants Name : Endurance Estate Strategic Land And Landowners
   Site Address : Land To The East And West Of Rightup Lane Wymondham
   Proposal : Mixed use development of up to 730 dwellings, up to 128 bed care home / homes (in one or two buildings), up to 250 square metres of retail / commercial floor space, a new primary school together with all other associated temporary and permanent infrastructure, including new access arrangements, sport pitches, allotments and community orchard.

Update from the Director of Growth and Localism

This matter was reported as an urgent item to Committee at the meeting on 22nd October. It was resolved to extend the period of delegated authority to approve the applications, subject to completion of the necessary Section 106 Agreements, until 6th December 2013 or refuse in default. It is anticipated that the agreements will be completed and permissions issued before that date. However, because this has not quite been achieved at the time this agenda is prepared, this update report is included as a precaution in the event of further unforeseen delay or any question requiring to be referred to Committee.

As at the date of preparing this report, there are no issues which have been identified as requiring to be referred to Committee for a member steer on any point of detail, but the situation is being continually monitored as we await formal clearance on behalf of developers and landowners, in combination. The schedules of conditions to be included in the planning permissions are complete and await only final comments from the developers’ side. These have previously been exchanged and no significant disagreements have arisen. Agreement is expected imminently.

A fresh update on the situation will be given at the meeting

**Recommendation:**

That the Committee notes the current situation, subject to any subsequent update given at the meeting.
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3. **Appl. No**: 2013/1748/F  
**Parish**: DISS  
**Applicants Name**: East Anglia Care Homes Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Nelson Road Diss Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Erection of a 76-bedroom care home, associated site works, landscaping and car parking  
**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with the approved plans  
3. Surface water drainage  
4. Foul water drainage  
5. Boundary Treatment  
6. Landscaping  
7. Materials  
8. Use class restriction  
9. Construction details - access  
10. Visibility splays  
11. Parking construction timing  
12. Footpath link east  
13. Footpath Link west  
14. Implementation of footpaths  
15. Historic investigation  
16. Contaminated Land  
17. Location of Bird/Bat Boxes

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
DIS 2: Mixed use development, west of Mission Road/Sandy Lane,  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
EMP 1: Employment land allocations
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0393/F
Construction of new 2.4m wide footpath linking Diss Railway Station and Nelson Road with installation of a new street lighting column
Approved

2.2 2005/2181/O
Proposed demolition of existing bungalow and development of site for 14no dwellings with new road and pavement infrastructure
Refused

2.3 2004/1766/RM
Erection of 177 dwellings, new roads, roundabout and all associated works including public open space
Approved

2.4 2002/0603/O
Mixed use development: Class B1/B2/B8, Transport Depot/Coach Park Workshop/offices/ancillary coach wash/residential/improvements to transport infrastructure
Approved

Appeal History

2.5 APP/L2630/A/06/2008178
Appeal against refusal of 2005/2181/O
Appeal dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Diss Town Council
The application is supported in principle as it will bring employment to the town and the use will not detrimental to those existing residential properties. Footpath links, landscape maintenance and the position of the foyer to the vehicle access need to be considered.

3.2 District Members:
Cllr Kiddie
The application can be a delegated decision

Cllr Walden
Should be determined by committee. This is a significant development in an industrial area.

Cllr Palmer
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
No objection. Conditions recommended and stopping up order required for a small portion of the application site in the south east corner which is in highways land.
3.4 Planning Policy

The application is considered to be contrary to existing Development Plan policy (policies EMP1 and DIS2 of the Saved Local Plan) and meets a 'need' that is not identified in the adopted Joint Core Strategy. It would also potentially threaten the ability of the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document to provide sufficient employment land in Diss to meet the requirement in Policy 13 of the JCS.

3.5 Design Officer

No objection. The proposal represents a well thought through scheme capable of making a positive contribution to this part of Diss, whilst also providing an interesting design that fits into a difficult context. 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 the site.

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager

No objection.

3.7 NCC Social Services - Adult

There is a general need for residential care provision for older people in this area of South Norfolk including homes that can support people with dementia.

3.8 Historic Environment Service

No objection.

3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection.

3.10 Representations

There have been two letters of support received.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located to the east of Diss and is separated from the town by the railway line which runs north – south. The site forms part of an established growth area to the east of the town, between Victoria Road and the Frontier Agriculture site to the north, which has seen a variety of uses develop, including residential.

4.2 To the north of the application site is the Frontier Agriculture site. The Frontier Agriculture site has on that common boundary a landscaping strip/bund, a two storey office block and three large grain silos. To the south of the site is Nelson Road and the residential element of the outline planning approval 2002/0603/O, detailed above. The dwellings facing onto Nelson Road are generally two storey with a three storey building on the roundabout junction.

4.3 The eastern element of the site is bound by Sandy Lane with a retail warehouse development on the opposite side of the road. Within the eastern element of the site is a residential property which does not form part of the application site. To the west is the station yard and the railway station, there is no formal link along Nelson Road to the station.

4.4 The site is relatively flat with little vegetation apart from that situated on the northern boundary.

4.5 The application proposes to erect a residential care home (Use Class C2) with 76 bedrooms over the 0.8 ha site. The development would also comprise of 32 car parking spaces and 14 bicycle spaces. The development would be formed of one continuous built form with a central courtyard and be single storey on the eastern and northern boundary and two storey on the southern and western boundary. The materials would comprise of red brick, wood cladding and render with a terracotta pantile.
4.6 The site would take a direct access from Nelson Drive and the car park would be situated to the east of the site. The application proposes a comprehensive landscape scheme and provide for footpath connections up to the edge of its site ownership.

4.7 The application form details that the development would provide for 80 full time jobs.

Principle of Development

4.8 The application site located within the development limits of Diss and allocated through the South Norfolk Local Plan as DIS 2 - mixed use development (west of Mission Road/sandy lane, Diss). The land allocation policy dictates that the 7.1 ha site should be used for residential and employment uses. The policy states that the balance between employment and housing will be dependent on the availability of employment land and housing provision in the town. The policy does not specify an employment use type; however the site also forms part of the Saved Policy EMP1 land use allocation which directs that the employment use should be B1, B2 or B8.

4.9 JCS Policy 13 advises that for Diss to meet with its growth ambitions it should have 15ha of employment land allocated. The emerging Local Plan document specifies that the application site will be allocated for a B1 use, which is considered to be an appropriate use class adjacent the existing residential development.

4.10 A large portion of the land associated with DIS2 has been partially developed through the outline approval 2002/0603/O and has provided for residential properties which would direct that the remaining land portion should be utilised for an employment purpose. The 2002 outline approval is consistent with Saved Policies EMP1 and DIS2 as it allowed for the site to be developed for B1, B2 and B8 purposes; and while other sites surrounding have been developed, or are in process, this site with its existing approval has not come forward.

4.11 The original B1/B2/B8 use class envisaged for the site through the 2002 approval has been in place for over 10 years without any success in bringing that to market, this proposal is a more than reasonable alternative and accords with the economic development principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4.12 The applicant has supplied details of demand for care homes within Diss which advises that the shortage at present could be partially met through this planning application and 2013/0385 (60 bed care home at the former Cartco yard - approved on 05/07/13). The shortage is believed to be approximately 270 beds. This position has been confirmed by the NCC Adult Services consultation response detailed above.

4.13 To continue to protect the land as a B1 use within the emerging Local Plan would not accord with the advice of the NPPF. The NPPF states that employment land allocations which have not come forward for a number of years should be considered for any other appropriate uses. The use proposed has a justified need and the applicant has supplied professional advice detailing that Diss has sufficient land for its current and future employment land requirements.

4.14 The intent of JCS Policy 4 is to supply care accommodation in areas of need, Diss is not specified within the policy as an area of need. However, the JCS was published in 2011 and the supporting details specifying care home need in Diss, which have been supplied by the applicant, have been formed after the JCS publication. It is accepted that the development would meet a specified need which is in accordance with the intent of JCS Policy 4.

4.15 The proposal is primarily residential based on its use and is therefore contrary to Saved Policies EMP1 and DIS 2 and JCS Policy 13. However, it has employment generating functions which are of material consideration and meet with the twin objectives of allowing Diss to grow and provide for sufficient employment opportunities. On balance given the justified need and the employment generated from that need the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable.
4.16 To ensure that the mixed use objectives of Saved Policy DIS 2 are not fully conceded a condition would be attached to ensure that the use of the building was for a care home, C2 use class.

4.17 The principle of the development is accepted and as such the main issues for further consideration are related to design, residential amenity and highway functionality/safety.

Design

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

4.19 The application site has very different built environment characteristics surrounding and as such it is considered to be a very difficult context to address. The building has been designed to address Nelson Street and adds coherence to the overall residential feel of the streetscene.

4.20 The proposed building draws on the architecture of Diss and South Norfolk, and is influenced by the character areas and design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The treatment of the façade is largely traditional, with vernacular materials and detailing common to Diss. The building takes the form of projecting gables that are more modern in appearance. These are rendered, with a central recess treated with full height glazing and louvres giving contrast to the other areas of the building. The proportion of the windows in the traditional and more modern areas is constant, linking the different areas and giving the façade a common theme.

4.21 The remainder of the building is treated in a similar method with some elevations rendered to reduce the dominance of brickwork. Each wing of the building is treated as a solid element with the same finish, lending a coherence to the building layout. This variety in materials has the effect of breaking up the mass of the building, and emphasising the differences between the individual sections. The two storey part of the building makes use of dormers windows to keep the building as low as possible, and further breaks up the mass of the roof.

4.22 The design is considered to meet with the objectives of NPPF 7 and JCS Policy 2.

4.23 Sustainability issues have formed part of the design process including the use of large areas of glazing to make the most of solar gain as well as good levels of natural light, with louvres protecting against excessive heat in the summer months. The building also proposes high levels of insulation to meet current Building Regulations and under-floor heating which is more efficient than traditional radiant heating systems. These elements are sufficient to address the requirements of JCS Policy 3.

Residential amenity

4.24 The application is designed to respect the residential amenity of the dwelling to the east of the site with those elements closest being single storey. The development also provides for garden grounds around the majority of the adjacent property. The separation distance between the development and the residential development to the south ensure that no loss of privacy occurs.

4.25 The building has been designed so that the northern section, closest to Frontier Agriculture, incorporates various facility rooms, any bedrooms in this section are either recessed from the boundary or have no openings on the facing elevation. The application has been assessed by the Council’s Environmental Protection Team and they have not raised any objection to the development in relation to noise disturbance for residents and have quoted the design aspects mentioned and the existing bundling as mitigating factors.
4.26 The application by virtue of its considered design, layout and scale protects the residential amenity of existing surrounding occupiers and of those proposed for the application site. The application complies with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Highways

4.27 The application proposes to create an access on to the southern Nelson Road and provide for vehicle and cycle parking. The application has been assessed by the NCC Highways Authority and they have not objected.

4.28 The application proposes to connect to the eastern footpath but does not show any paving to the west of the site along Nelson Road. It is accepted that the development cannot connect directly to the railway station as there is an undeveloped parcel of land in between. However, it is considered important that the development provides for a pathway up to the western boundary of their site so that the connection can be made in the future. The applicant has agreed to this and any forthcoming approval will have a condition attached requiring for the path to be installed.

Ecology and landscape

4.29 The site has little biodiversity merit apart from the existing hedgerows on the northern and eastern boundaries. The application proposes to landscape the garden areas with the hedgerows to be supplemented, this will help create a net biodiversity gain in accordance with the NPPF Section 11. The applicants ecology report also recommends the installation of bird and bat boxes, this will be conditioned should approval be granted.

4.30 The planting plan will help to add character to this part of the locality in accordance with Saved Policy IMP2 and the hedgerow protection and additions coupled with the habitat installations will aid the biodiversity of the area in accordance with Saved Policies ENV14 and ENV15.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the development is considered acceptable, it is acknowledged that the proposal is contrary to Saved Policies EMP1 and DIS2 or JCS Policy 13. However, although the proposal is primarily residential in function it will generate 80 full time jobs in an employment area. This coupled with the justified need for further care home provision in Diss provides sufficient weight to recommend this departure from policy for approval.

5.2 The building has been designed and orientated to ensure that it does not create unacceptable levels of residential amenity for the occupiers or those surrounding in accordance with Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

5.3 The site is situated in a sustainable location with good public transport links and road connections. Footpath connections have been negotiated and parking levels proposed are acceptable. The application complies with Saved Policies IMP8, TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 19.

5.4 The hedge protection, enhancement planting and bird/bat boxes proposed will ensure that the site delivers a biodiversity net gain as required by NPPF 11.

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

4. Appl. No : 2013/1521/H
Parish : ASHWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL
Applicants Name : Mr R Ford
Site Address : Walks Farm Barn Blacksmiths Lane Ashwellthorpe Norfolk NR16 1EP
Proposal : Variation of Condition 2 of Planning permission 2011/1061/F- To include extensions to form garden and boot room

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1. Barn Conversion - time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. External materials to be agreed
4. New Water Efficiency
5. Window details to be agreed
6. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
7. Implement boundary treatment
8. Office and student accommodation to be an
9. Storage/workshop building not to be sold
10. No external storage
11. Ecology

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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
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)
HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes (Part Consistent)
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1061 Proposed barn conversion for residential/student living accommodation and office space Approved

2.2 2010/1918 Proposed barn conversion for residential/student living accommodation and office space Refused
Appeal history

2.3 2010/1918  Proposed barn conversion for residential/student living accommodation and office space  Appeal Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Original plans
   - No views or comments  Approve followed by a further letter stating plans are incorrect and uses the plans that were refused response from parish council would have been different, suggest re consultation and application to be determined by committee as parish council appear to have been misled and misinformed

   Re consultation
   No response received

3.2 District Member  I was amazed when this building was given consent originally as it had no historic or architectural value and was a ruin attached to a shed. Consent was given as it was to be used as a training centre for students from Easton college. If this is a method to be used to gain consent for a residential building outside of any approved area then this is a breach of faith and may lead others into thinking that this is way to gain permission that would otherwise not be considered.

   Further comments received

   The reason I want this to go to committee is as follows.

   Please read my comments as of file dates 6.9.11 & 15/9//1 also those of the applicant file date 23/5/11.

   In these it is abundantly clear the 'raison d'etre' for this was its educational linkage for training agricultural students, Easton College I believe being cited. Members at that meeting where this was initially granted will remember the stress placed on this purpose. Do we now have a home with extension constructed outside the development boundary for Ashwellthorpe. This is planning by the backdoor as without the educational element I and many others felt that it would never have been granted.

3.3 Representations  1 letter of objection
   - Represents a significant new build
   - Pretence of work being carried out in accordance with previous approved scheme and what is being sort is a simple extension but there is significant internal and external differences
   - What is proposed is more domestic than the previously approved plans
   - No justification why residential use is needed in this location, no detail how the building will be successfully converted or what new build element is required beyond that conversion.
- Why garden room required for what was originally primarily for student use and ancillary to rural enterprise
- Plans and description submitted to deceive the Local Planning Authority
- Plans mirror what was refused
- Proposed tree planting would prevent right of way.

4 Assessment

4.1 A previous application was approved on this site in 2011 for a barn conversion for residential/student living accommodation and office space.

4.2 This application is for the variation of condition 2 of that application 2011/1061/F which lists the plans that should be complied with. The variations to the approved plans are the inclusion of two single storey extensions. The extension on the east elevation is for a garden room and the one on west elevation is for a boot room and office. The proposed plans also re design the internal layout of the approved dwelling removing two small bedrooms and moving the office into the proposed extension. Works on site have commenced and this includes changing the fenestrations from what was approved in 2011 to what is required to incorporate the extensions should they be approved. A copy of the original approved plan has been attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

4.3 The site is in an open countryside location where new development is restricted to that which requires a rural location or is needed in connection with rural enterprise. The application has been submitted as a barn conversion and should be considered under the provisions of Policy HOU10. This application also proposes extensions to the approved conversion and therefore Policies HOU14 and HOU19 are of relevance. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as those policies remain consistent or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 The assessment of this proposal is similar to the previously approved application with regard to providing accommodation for the applicant and his family on a site required for agricultural purposes, economic re-use and security. A copy of the committee report for application 2011/1061/F is attached as Appendix 3 to this report. Attached as Appendix 4 are letters from the Local Member and the applicant that have been included at the request of the Local Member.

4.5 There are concerns to the proposal with respect to the design of the internal layout and the proposed extensions and what appears to be the loss of the student accommodation. The applicant has stated that with this application the accommodation for student/seasonal employment always was and still is to be utilised and due to the expanding business a larger office space is required. Paragraph 4.11 of the committee report on application 2011/1061/F assessed the need to restrict the occupancy of the dwelling and also its use for student accommodation and states "Concerns have been raised that the scheme does not propose to limit the occupancy of the dwelling to an agricultural worker and that there would be no requirement for the applicant to provide the student accommodation." As set out above, the conversion of the building has been considered under policy HOU10, not HOU9 and I do not consider that there is a functional need which would justify a new dwelling. I therefore do not consider that it is reasonable to restrict the occupancy of the dwelling to an agricultural worker. Similarly, while the provision of the student accommodation is supported, it has not been a material consideration in justifying the suitability of the building for conversion. Therefore the barn conversion was approved as a residential dwelling with no occupancy conditions to be complied with and therefore this application should be assessed as such.
4.6 Concerns have been raised with regard to the plans first submitted with the application and further consultations have been carried out with copies of the original approved plan; plans and elevations of what is existing on the site; and plans and elevations of what is proposed. There has been no further comments since the re-consultation was carried out.

4.7 The neighbouring occupiers had concerns with regard to a right of way over the application site. The plans show the access remaining and any further concerns are a civil matter and do not fall under planning control.

4.8 The existing building has a simple form and the proposed boot room is of a similar design using similar materials. The garden room is to be constructed of mainly glazing and weatherboarding and although this is different to the original building I consider that the design and position of the extensions respect the landscape setting of the building and surrounding area and will not affect the character or appearance of the building to a material degree.

4.9 Due to the position of the extensions there will be no significant impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the conversion of this building to a dwelling under South Norfolk Local Plan policy HOU10 has been accepted without reliance on any agricultural need or provision of student accommodation. The principle of this conversion to an unrestricted dwelling remains acceptable. The proposed extensions will have no adverse impact on the landscape setting of the building or its grounds or the character and appearance of the original building to a significant degree. Due to the design and position of the extensions, the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers will not be affected. In these circumstances the application should be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
Lynn Armes 01508 533821
and E-mail: larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 3

### 1. Planning Policies

#### 1.1 National Planning Policies

- Planning Policy Statement 4 “Planning and Sustainable Economic Growth”
- Planning Policy Statement 7 “Sustainable development in Rural Areas”

#### 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

- EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages
- ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
- HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- IMP 10: Noise
- IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

### 2. Planning History

#### 2.1 2010/1918

- Proposed barn conversion for residential/student living accommodation and office space
- Refused
- Appeal lodged – Hearing 4/10/2011

### 3. Consultations

#### 3.1 Parish Council

- None received

#### 3.2 District Member

- To be reported if appropriate

#### 3.3 NCC Highways

- No objection

#### 3.4 Ecologist

- To be reported
First Wednesday Planning Committee

3.4 Ecologist : To be reported

3.5 Letter from site owner
- Purchased Walks Farm in October 2009 and have owned and farmed the neighbouring land at Poplar Farm, Wrenningham since 2003. Richard Ford has been our agricultural contractor since 2003.
- Looked to find an alternative use for redundant farm buildings and proposed scheme seemed an ideal solution to Mr Ford’s requirements. If the application is successful we have agreed to sell the site to Mr Ford.
- Confirm that Mr Ford has employed students from a number of agricultural colleges and support his efforts to encourage young people to enter the industry
- Raise concerns about the accuracy and validity of points raised by objectors relating to the planning history of the owners; the future intentions relating to the sale of the buildings; the availability of other tied agricultural buildings in the locality and rights of access to the neighbouring property.

3.6 Local Residents : 3 letter of objection
- Note this application is for conversion of brick structure but the residential use being sought is as a direct need for having an agricultural dwelling on this site.
- Previous application was refused due to insufficient information to demonstrate a functional need and this is to be considered at an appeal hearing.
- No functional test has been submitted to set out in clear terms why it is essential that the applicant lives at Walks Farm
- In respect of security, the proposal is close to an existing dwelling so could not be considered to be isolated.
- No condition is proposed to limit occupancy of dwelling to agricultural use.
- Concern that proposed use will not materialise and once converted the building could be sold on the open market, which could resulting a further application for an agricultural dwelling
- Applicant already lives in the locality
- Applicant has not demonstrated that the re use of the building for economic purposes has been explored as required by PPS4
- The structure is of no architectural or historic interest to justify a dwelling in the countryside.
- Proposal will create a number of new openings
- Conversion constitutes a new build from a barn to a private dwelling
- There is no evidence to demonstrate that there is a lack of student accommodation. Additionally there would be no requirement to provide the student accommodation once converted.
- An ecology survey has not been undertaken
- Plans do not allow for access to yard to rear of neighbours
- Concerns regarding the proposed bin position
- Increase in traffic on narrow lanes
- Disturbance from student accommodation
- Speed of traffic on roads
- Site is outside development boundaries

6 letter of support
- Existing structure is an eyesore
- Applicant is a respected farmer and contractor
- Should encourage people to live locally and regenerate buildings
Development Management Committee 4 December 2013

First Wednesday Planning Committee 7 September 2011

- Should encourage young people into farming
- Site has always been a working farm with traffic movements.
- Proposal will reduce heavy goods vehicles, tractors and trailers due to grain no longer being stored there
- Barn not big enough for modern machinery. If not converted to living accommodation it will deteriorate

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is a revised proposal for the provision of a dwelling at Walks Farm. An earlier application (2010/1918) proposed the conversion of a brick barn and erection of an extension for residential/student living accommodation and office space. The application was refused due to the scale of the extension being tantamount to the construction of a new dwelling without adequate justification. This is due to be considered at an appeal hearing on 4 October 2011.

4.2 This revised scheme relates to the conversion of the existing brick building only but still includes student living accommodation and office space in connection with an agricultural contracting business. The workshop/store building to the south of the brick building is to be used by the applicant who is an agricultural contractor in association with the dwelling.

4.3 The site is in an open countryside location where new development is restricted to that which requires a rural location or is needed in connection with a rural enterprise. This application has been submitted as a barn conversion which would be considered under the provisions of Policy HOU10 together with policies in Planning Policy Statement 4 “Planning and Sustainable Economic Growth” and Planning Policy Statement 7 “Sustainable development in Rural Areas”. These seek to ensure that the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion and that the scheme preserves the character of the building.

4.4 This application differs to the refused application in that it only relates to the conversion of an existing building and does not include a substantial element of new building. Given the scale of new building previously proposed that application was also considered against Policy HOU9 of the local Plan which relates to proposals for new dwellings for rural enterprises and seeks to ensure that there is an existing functional need for a full time worker to live on the site.

4.5 The functional need for a new dwelling was considered in connection with application 2010/1918. The applicant set out that machinery and equipment was currently spread out over customer’s farms and security had become an ongoing problem. The proposal would allow this to be on one site and provide a suitable office, employee accommodation and a family home. The adjacent grain store would be used for machinery over winter whilst not in use and a small workshop area for day to day running repairs. It was explained that the students and the applicant needed to be on site, as they work long days and for security reasons needed to be resident on site.

4.6 Information submitted with this application (2011/1061) sets out that once machinery has left storage to go out to work at the start of the season, it tends not to come back until the end of the season unless for major repairs. From the details submitted it is my understanding that the primary use of the site will be for residential purposes, providing accommodation for the applicant and his family with an ancillary office for the business and accommodation for temporary staff. The use of the adjacent buildings will be for storage purposes for plant and machinery associated with the applicant’s contracting business and other than running repairs and this will essentially be over the winter period, as the majority of the equipment does not return from the farms until the end of season.

4.7 The primary reasons set out by the appellant for the need for accommodation on the appeal site is for the convenience of having all the operations in one location and for security reasons. It is therefore my opinion that needs of the business do not justify the erection of a new dwelling and while security can be a material planning consideration, it is not sufficient in its own right to justify the erection of a new dwelling.
However, as set out above, this application is for the conversion of an existing building and should therefore be considered under the provisions of Policy HOU10, together with Planning Policy Statements 4 and 7. The applicants have submitted details relating to the needs for the buildings for agricultural purposes and the potential for economic re use (appendix 2). The re use of the adjacent workshop/store for the contracting business does provide an economic re use for part of the site and I note the comments regarding the suitability of the building for alternative uses and the availability of other premises in the locality. I therefore consider that it is appropriate to consider the conversion of the existing brick building under the provisions of HOU10 for use as a dwelling.

The building is of little character and is functional in form with limited openings. The structural report submitted with the application indicates that the roof framing would be inadequate for domestic load without considerable enhancement and there has been some minor historic movement of walls but there is no evidence of recent or untoward distress. It is considered that the building is in reasonable structural condition and reasonably maintained. It is recommended that foundations are inspected before commencing any works. I consider that the building is capable of conversion without the need for significant rebuilding.

The building currently contains limited openings and the scheme re uses the opening on the north elevation. The proposal will include the provision of 11 new window and 4 new door openings. These openings are simple in form and limited in size and while these will alter the appearance of the building, I do not consider that the scheme as proposed will harm the character of the area, and the conversion as proposed is acceptable.

Concerns have been raised that the scheme does not propose to limit the occupancy of the dwelling to an agricultural worker and that there would be no requirement for the applicant to provide the student accommodation. As set out above, the conversion of the building has been considered under policy HOU10, not HOU9 and I do not consider that there is a functional need which would justify a new dwelling. I therefore do not consider that it is reasonable to restrict the occupancy of the dwelling to an agricultural worker. Similarly, while the provision of the student accommodation is supported, it has not been a material consideration in justifying the suitability of the building for conversion.

Notwithstanding this, given the proximity of the workshop/store to the proposal and the associate yard area, I consider that it is reasonable to tie the ownership of the workshop/store and the associate yard area, and operation of the contractors business to the occupation of the converted building in order to avoid an unacceptable relationship of uses.

The proposal will be located to the south of Walks Farmhouse which is a listed building. The Conservation Officer has considered the relationship between the buildings but is of the view that it will not adversely affect the setting of the listed building. With regard to the relationship between the buildings, windows in the north end of the brick element will be 14m from the rear of this property and while there will be some overlooking, as this element is single storey I consider that this will not result in a significant loss of amenity. The neighbour has raised concern about the position of bin storage and a right of access to the rear of their property. I note their concerns regarding the bins but do not consider that this will significantly impact on their outlook or amenity. With regard to the access the owner of the site has commented on this and I consider that this issue would need to be resolved as a civil matter.

Concerns have been raised about the impact of the contracting business on the amenity of neighbours and the suitability of the highway network to accommodate the associated traffic. Additional information has been submitted relating to the nature of plant and machinery to be stored / maintained at the site, together with indicative traffic movements through the year. On the basis of this information I consider that the proposal is unlikely to result in significant disturbance to the neighbouring properties and the Highway Authority has raised no objection. In the interest of the appearance of the area, I consider that it is appropriate to control the extent of storage and position of any external storage.
4.15 An ecology survey has been undertaken which concludes that European Protected Species are unlikely to be affected but makes a number of recommendations for enhancement. The Council’s ecologist has raised no objection.

5 Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies EMP4, ENV8, HOU10, IMP8, IMP9, IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal reuses an existing building which is considered to be capable of conversion without adversely affecting the character of the area, the setting of the adjacent listing building or the amenity of neighbouring properties.

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

From: Stuart Pontin
Sent: 05 September 2011 10:11
To: ikb@talktalk.net
Cc: Planning Idox
Subject: RE: Application 2011/1061.F

Dear Cllr McClenning

Thank you for your e mail. I will report your comments to the committee.

Regards

Stuart Pontin
Senior Planning Officer
Development and Environment
South Norfolk Council
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

Telephone 01508 533796
E mail spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Web site www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

From: ikb@talktalk.net [mailto:ikb@talktalk.net]
Sent: 04 September 2011 20:11
To: Stuart Pontin; barryduffin@bcpproperties.co.uk
Subject: Application 2011/1061.F

Dear Mr Pontin,I trust you received my previous letter regarding this proposal.
Whilst I am fully in favour of business being enabled in rural areas this seems an unlikely candidate for the starting point of what will amount to the builders hammer, that is that little of the original structure is involved.
I feel that if the committee are minded to approve then perhaps a new build would be better and restricted to both occupants and future use.
This also if approved, paves the way many other applications that will use this as justification for their own schemes. I would be grateful if my original letter and this one are made available to members of the committee before the meeting on Wednesday.
thanks.
Bob McClenning .District Councillor for Aswellthorpe
Brunel,  
Cheneys Lane,  
Tacolneston,  
Norwich.  
NR16 1DB

10th August 2011

Dear Mr Pontin,

This evening I visited Walks Farmhouse with the Parish Chairman and another Parish Councillor to bring myself up to speed with this Application/Appeal (2010/1918).

The District Councillor at the time of the initial application was Councillor Smith who through ill health had his duties carried out by Councillor Spratt as he became increasingly ill.

Since I was elected in May I have been unaware of the ongoing situation on this proposed site. The visit I made leaves me in no doubt that the refusal was justified on the grounds that were stated. I cannot see how any residential development could work here. Incorporating what little there is of the foundations and brickwork is not architecturally viable or desirable and I see little historic value in saving any part of it.

Yours, Bob McClennning  
Member for Fornceett
Dear Mr Pontin

Further to our meeting on 5th May 2011, we are writing to you to firstly clarify our reasons for wishing to convert Walks Farm, and secondly to outline any proposed traffic movements.

**REASONS**

1. We have been looking for a suitable property for our needs, both personal and business, in the area for approximately seven years but nothing has been either available or affordable. Refer to letters from Brown & Co and Arnolds.

2. The opportunity has now arisen for us to purchase Walks Farm subject to planning approval.

3. It is ideally situated from a personal and business prospective as it is located centrally for our working area and for school. Also this development will give us accommodation for students, as I employ up to two students at various times of the year, from colleges on long and short term placements studying for degrees in agriculture. Suitable accommodation is neither available nor affordable to them. I have found a shortage of skilled employees in the area and I feel that any employment opportunity should be encouraged for sustainability in the future, as recently highlighted in the EDP article supplied.

4. Security has been a major problem in the past and is not getting any better, as on 08/04/2008 the workshop was broken into and tools and equipment were stolen, 28/05/2008 a teleporter was stolen from the same farm and in March 2007 a compact tractor was stolen from Wreningham, therefore being able to store certain items of machinery under one roof under lock and key in the one location is far more secure than being located around the various farms over the winter months and this would give peace of mind and reduce traffic movements to and from farms.

5. Our intention is to store all machinery and equipment inside the adjacent building during the winter months, before being put to work. (See attached machinery movement projections).

6. The site will be sympathetically landscaped to keep in with the surroundings. Trees and hedges will be planted where required.
7. Due to the high value of modern farm machinery, we do not intend to leave any outside.

8. The site is centrally located within our working area thus enabling us to operate a more efficient environmentally friendly operation due to a lot less time spent on the highways with machinery travelling between farms. See enclosed map.

9. We already have livestock on the farm which we would like to expand in the future therefore being on site would be very beneficial for husbandry purposes.

Subject to planning approval there will be no grain stored at Walks Farm, thus eliminating approximately 127 tractor and trailer movements in and out of the property and approximately 62 articulated lorry movements in an average year. Also there will be no seed, fertiliser or chemical deliveries to this site further eliminating another 12 heavy good vehicle movements.

If planning permission is approved this will be the family home and not just a business operation, as once machinery has left storage to go to work at the start of the season it tends not to come back until the end of the season unless for major repairs.

The grain dryer will no longer be in use resulting in no disturbance and noise 24/7 during harvest.

We are very aware there are neighbours and we do not wish, and will make every effort not to inconvenience or disrupt their daily routines.

Yours sincerely

Richard Ford
PROJECTED TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS PER MONTH FOR WALKS FARM OVER ONE YEAR

JAN – Tractor and trailer x2
FEB – Tractor and trailer x 2, sprayer x 1
MAR – Tractor and spreader x 1, sprayer x 1, tractor x 2
APR – Tractor and spreader x 1, sprayer x 1
MAY – Sprayer x 2
JUN – Sprayer x 2
JULY – Tractor x 2
AUG – Tractor and plough x1, tractor and trailer x 1, loader x 2
SEP – Tractor and trailer x 2, tractor and drill x 1
OCT – Tractor and drill x 1, sprayer x 1
NOV – Tractor and trailer x 2
DEC – Tractor and trailer x 2, tractor and plough x 1

Please note the combine will be kept on another farm as the barn at Walks Farm is not suitable and access along Blacksmiths Lane is not suitable.

PROPOSED STORAGE OVER WINTER MONTHS

2 TRACTORS
1 SPRAYER
1 LOADER
1 PLOUGH
1 DRILL
1 FERT SPREADER
ASSORTED CULTIVATION MACHINERY
5. **Appl. No**: 2013/1736/F  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

Applicants Name: Mr Mark Heeney  
Site Address: Plots 23, 24, 25 & 26 Common Farm Common Road Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4PH  
Proposal: Erection of post and rail fencing with access gate

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

2. **Planning History**

2.1 Article 4 (1) Direction  
26 February 2003

3. **Consultations**

3.1 District Member  
To be determined by committee; it is open agricultural land with no current fences.

3.2 Parish Council  
Object:
   i. visual impact, fencing and gates not in keeping in an open field,  
   ii. setting a precedent for a collection of fences inappropriate,  
   iii. may encourage storage/parking of vehicles on site.

3.3 Representations:  
1 letter of objection:  
   - It will set a precedent and would be a blight if all the owners erected fencing.  
   - Maintenance of the land would be impossible by the farmer using large machinery,

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal seeks consent for the erection of post and rail fencing around four plots of agricultural land, situated outside any development limits for the parish of Dickleburgh.

4.2 Ordinarily planning permission would not be required for the erection of post and rail fencing. However, in excess of ten years ago two parcels of land, having been divided into 186 plots, were marketed for sale on the internet. Concerns were raised that the subdivision of the land into numerous plots would result in the proliferation of temporary structures and enclosures, out of character with the open countryside and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. As a consequence, an Article 4 was imposed, removing permitted development rights for the erection, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure or for the provision of buildings, movable structures, works plant or machinery required for the duration of operations being carried out on, in under or over the land or adjoining land.
4.3 The proposal is assessed against Policy 2 of the joint core strategy which requires the development to be of a high standard of design, in keeping with its surroundings by respecting the local distinctiveness. 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 A letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring occupier and from the parish council stating that it will set a precedent for the erection of fencing by other plot owners; such a profusion of fencing would be a blight, and would make the maintenance of the land impossible by the farmer who currently maintains it with large equipment. The plots are not marked accurately and permission for fencing may encourage storage/parking of vehicles on site.

4.5 There have only been two planning applications during the intervening ten years in respect of the two parcels, one shortly after the imposition of the Article 4 for cattle fencing which was refused and one more recently for the erection of post and rail fencing across the field at the rear of Fairmead and to the south of the larger parcel of land which was approved. It is unlikely that there will be a proliferation of applications to erect fences around many of the plots as it is probable that many were acquired speculatively with no intention to use for agricultural purposes. The ability of the farmer to maintain the remainder of the site is not a material planning consideration. In any event the maintenance is unlikely to be affected unless there were a considerable number of applications. Owners are unlikely to want the expense of fencing unless they are intending to use or maintain the plots.

5 Conclusion

5.1 By allowing post and rail fencing of a type that is routinely seen in the open countryside it will enable the applicant to keep livestock on the plot with minimal adverse impact upon the open character of the landscape and accords with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.
6. **Appl. No**: 2013/1783/F  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL  

- **Applicants Name**: Mr Stephen Long  
- **Site Address**: Plot 42 Common Farm Common Road Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4PJ  
- **Proposal**: Erection of fence around Plot 42  

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**  
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

2. **Planning History**  
2.1 Article 4(1) Direction  
26 February 2003

3. **Consultations**  
3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse:  
- there are no location markers,  
- the road entrance is not a road entrance and no application has been made for one and  
- it would set a precedent.  

3.2 District Member  
To be determined by committee; it is open agricultural land with no current fences.

3.3 Representations  
3 Letters of objection:  
- Would establish a precedent opening the floodgates and given the number of plots would result in a profusion of fences which would become a visual blight on the village.  
- The number of fences would make maintenance of the land by large machinery impossible.  
- The plots are not marked or inaccurately identified.  
- The number of fences would affect the value of property.

4. **Assessment**  
4.1 The proposal seeks consent for the erection of post and rail fencing around a plot of agricultural land, situated outside any development limits for the parish of Dickleburgh.

4.2 Ordinarily planning permission would not be required for the erection of post and rail fencing. However, in excess of ten years ago two parcels of land, having been divided into 186 plots, were marketed for sale on the internet. Concerns were raised that the subdivision of the land into numerous plots would result in the proliferation of temporary structures and enclosures, out of character with the open countryside and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. As a consequence, an Article 4 direction was imposed, removing permitted development rights for the erection, maintenance, improvement or
alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure or for the provision of buildings, movable structures, works plant or machinery required for the duration of operations being carried out on, in under or over the land or adjoining land.

4.3 The proposal is assessed against Policy 2 of the joint core strategy which requires the development to be of a high standard of design, in keeping with its surroundings by respecting the local distinctiveness. 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 Letters of objection have been received from three neighbouring occupiers and the parish council all stating that it will set a precedent for the erection of fencing by other plot owners; such a profusion of fencing would be a blight, and would make the maintenance of the land impossible by the farmer who currently maintains it with large equipment. The plots are not marked accurately and the entrance shown on the plans is not an entrance.

4.5 There have only been two planning applications during the intervening ten years in respect of the two parcels, one shortly after the imposition of the Article 4 for cattle fencing which was refused and one more recently for the erection of post and rail fencing across the field at the rear of Fairmead and to the south of the larger parcel of land which was approved. It is unlikely that there will be a proliferation of applications to erect fences around many of the plots as it is probable that many were acquired speculatively with no intention to use for agricultural purposes. The ability of the farmer to maintain the remainder of the site and affect upon property values are not material planning considerations. In any event the maintenance is unlikely to be affected unless there were a considerable number of applications. The entrance shown on the plans to Harvey Lane is a field entrance at which a post was erected by South Norfolk Council containing details of the Article 4 direction.

5 Conclusion

5.1 By allowing post and rail fencing of a type that is routinely seen in the open countryside it will enable the applicant to keep livestock on the plot with minimal adverse impact upon the open character of the landscape and accords with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Cox 01508 533832
and E-mail: hcox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2013/1886/CU  
**Parish**: LANGLEY WITH HARDLEY

Applicants Name: Mr Christopher Townsend  
Site Address: Langley Abbey Langley Green Langley Norfolk NR14 6DG  
Proposal: Retrospective application for change of use of field for playing polo, with occasional vehicle parking

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. No PD for fences, walls etc  
4. Full details of external lighting  
5. Retention trees and hedges  
6. Hours of Use

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 18: The Broads

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
LEI 1: Extensive and noisy leisure uses (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0236 Proposed change of use of grass field to practice & play polo on. Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse  
- It is another retrospective application from Langley Abbey  
- Causing disturbance to local residents  
- Agricultural holding certificate has not been signed

3.2 District Member  
Comments to be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  
Support with conditions  
- Surface of access needs to be upgraded

3.4 Broads Authority  
No objection subject to existing landscaping being retained.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Support subject to an hours condition

3.6 Landscape Officer  
Support subject to the retention of existing vegetation
3.7 Representations

Three letters of objection

- Already one polo field with the access opposite my house
- The entrance is opposite the house causing noise pollution day and night, caused by lorries and vehicles accessing the fields
- Not limited to hours claimed in application and I fear that will just make things worse.
- Field was previously used for growing potatoes before it was levelled, seeded and irrigated.
- Horse boxes and cars have been parked in the fields and a portaloo which stood there for several weeks.
- Concerned about bad language being used on the site.
- With the access to the current site, problems created by large vehicles negotiating the entrance and dragging stones on the road.
- Rural area and the disturbance annoying for residents in the nearby cottages
- Has been issues with balls landing in gardens and causing damage
- Concern ball could land in road
- Further development will exacerbate all the above problems. noise traffic movements on the field will be closer to the properties causing more distress for residents
- Access to and from the site will cause similar problems as the access to the current polo field
- As area is predominately agricultural do not think further commercial / recreational development should not be allowed.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to the field opposite Langley Abbey it is accessed directly off Ferry Road. This application is a retrospective application to change the use of the agricultural field to polo field. Planning permission was granted in 2010 application number 2010/0236 to change the use of a field off Stone Lane to a polo field. Permission has also been granted by the Broads Authority on the opposite side of the road for the change of use to allow commercial polo activities including playing arena, redundant farm buildings to become indoor school, stables and visitor toilets. Langley Abbey itself is open to the public and there is a visitor’s center and farm shop. The frontage of the site is within the Conservation Area. There are a small number of residential properties close to the site.

4.2 The polo club, which is part of a farm diversification scheme, has become successful. The club now has 33 members and holds the Norfolk Polo Festival annually which includes holding HPA international matches which attract large numbers of visitors to the area and the club hopes to become the HPA Eastern Centre of Excellence for polo. The club has a partnership with Langley School with tuition being provided to pupils in addition to the Langley School Polo Academy which has just been set up.

4.3 The success of the polo club has resulted in the need for an additional polo field as there is a need for the polo fields to rest and not be constantly used. It is the applicant’s intention that only one field is used at a time, the field subject to this application will largely be used for practice with the original field being used for tournaments. Both fields would however, be used at the same time for the polo festival.

4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework supports sustainable rural leisure development that benefits businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors and Policy 8 in the Joint Core Strategy supports new leisure facilities. Policy LEI1 in the South Norfolk Local Plan permits extensive and noisy leisure uses subject to there being no harm to the environmental characteristics and resources of the site and its surroundings. No harm should be caused by the nature, scale, extent and frequency or timing of the proposed leisure activities including noise, any structures required, lighting, number of people on the site and degree of dispersal, harm caused by land forming works. Accessibility by public
transport, bicycle and foot, and suitability of the road network also need to considered. 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 LEI1 is only partially consistent because it does not refer to the Council's leisure strategy.

4.5 The polo club is an existing rural business/leisure facility and requires a rural location. It is therefore supported in principle. The key issues for assessment are residential amenity, highway safety and impact on the local landscape.

4.6 Concern has been raised by nearby residents regarding noise and disturbance which can be late at night. The field is only used May to September, as due to the winter weather conditions it is not possible to use the site, so any disturbance is limited to the summer months. The club has an all-weather arena the other side of the road. It is acknowledged that the use will result in some noise and disturbance to residents. However, on balance the noise and disturbance is not considered sufficient enough to warrant refusal. Events like the polo festival would cause more disturbance. However, they could be carried out without planning permission as a temporary use under Part 4 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

4.7 The Environmental Services Team has not raised an objection to the application but has suggested a restriction on hours of use of the field in line with the applicant's letter 09:00 to 20:00 hours. However, I am still awaiting clarification from the applicant as to whether these hours are realistic having regard to the objection letters and especially during events such as the polo festival. An update will be given at the committee meeting regarding this.

4.8 The Highway Officer has raised no objection to the application and the use of this field, subject to the surface of the access being upgraded to prevent mud going on the road. The access is located away from the neighbouring properties so will not result in vehicles turning in front of dwellings.

4.9 The site is screened with hedging along the road frontage and there is also vegetation fronting the field adjacent to the residential properties. Subject to the retention of existing vegetation the Broads Authority and the Landscape Officer raise no objection to the application which would not significantly adversely affect the local landscape. The proposal does not adversely affect the Conservation Area.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The application will authorise the extension of a rural business leisure facility which will benefit the local economy without significantly adversely affecting highway safety. The use does cause some noise and disturbance to local residents, however, this is not considered significant enough to warrant refusal of the application in this instance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : TACOLNESTON
Applicants Name : Mrs S Dinneen
Site Address : The Old Hall Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1ED
Proposal : Amendments to Listed Building Consent 2013/0496, to include: internal and external alterations, 2 additional velux windows, external alterations to west elevation glazing.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Planning Policies

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0495/H Replacement of front gates to match existing, replacement of 2 no rotten dormer windows in roof at rear, repair of 2 no dormer windows in roof at rear, re-paint front and back doors, renovation of attached disused building to become games room/garden room for existing dwelling Approved

2.2 2013/0496/LB Replacement of front gates to match existing, replacement of 2 no rotten dormer windows in roof at rear, repair of 2 no dormer windows in roof at rear, re-paint front and back doors, renovation of attached disused building to become games room/garden room for existing dwelling Approved

2.3 2013/1947/NMA Non material amendment to planning permission 2013/0495/H for: 2 additional velux windows on west elevation, amendments to glazing on west elevation and internal alterations. Approved

2.4 2010/0094 Proposed rebuild of wall and replacement of wooden gate posts with brick pillars. Approved

2.5 2010/0093 Proposed rebuild of wall and replacement of wooden gate posts with brick pillars. Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No response received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 English Heritage Recommend original design is implemented and the proposed amendments not incorporated as the change of materials and detailing dilute the success of the original scheme and make it less in sympathy with the established character of the historic building.

3.4 Conservation Officer Approve

3.5 Representations No responses received

4 Assessment

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

4.2 This proposal is a re submission of a previously approved application incorporating some amendments to the approved scheme. The amendments are for the re instatement of an internal wall which was to be demolished; the extension of the glazing on the west elevation down to ground level; removing the proposed plinth wall; and the insertion of 2 velux windows both in the west elevation one at single storey height in the utility room and one at first floor level in the living room which was previously to be a gym.

4.3 Policies in the Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that the proposal is of a good design and does not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the building residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as the policy remains consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 With regard to the comments from English Heritage, the removal of the low plinth wall in the location of the glazed area simplifies the design and the fact that the proposal uses aluminium frames opposed to timber is not in my opinion reason to object to them. The roof light is required to comply with building regulations. Although the proposed roof light is not ideal and does detract from the overall appearance, it is within a later addition to the main dwelling, is not in a prominent position and is necessary to upgrade the building to provide accommodation that cannot be created within the principle house. Therefore, on balance, I consider that the amendments are acceptable in this context.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The alterations and amendments proposed will not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building to a significant degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
**Appeals received from 24 October 2013 to 21 November 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/0105</td>
<td>Hempnall Land Surrounding Busseys Loke North Of Bungay Road, Hempnall And Including Land Adjacent To The B1527 And At The Junction Of The B1527 And B1332, Woodton, Norfolk</td>
<td>Streetwood Wind Farm Norfolk Limited</td>
<td>Erection of 3 wind turbines with a maximum height of 126.5m and associated development for a period of 25 years, including control building, electricity transformers, underground cabling, access tracks, crane hard standing, new vehicular access, culvert and off-site highway works. <strong>NOTE:</strong> An appeal against non-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0973</td>
<td>Morley Land East Of Brecon Lodge, Home Farm Lane Golf Links Road Morley St Peter Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tubby</td>
<td>Erection of two detached dwellings and garages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
**Appeals decisions from 24 October 2013 to 21 November 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>2012/0959</td>
<td>Great Moulton Meadow View The Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane Great Moulton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr R Brown</td>
<td>Retrospective application for retention of mobile home</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1961</td>
<td>Aldeby Land North Of Mistletoe Common Road Aldeby Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Goronwy Jones</td>
<td>Outline planning permission for one chalet bungalow with access road/parking</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0397</td>
<td>Carleton Rode Fen Lake Fishery Fen Road Carleton Rode Norwich NR16 1RT</td>
<td>Mr B Chetwynd</td>
<td>Removal of condition 6 (restricting occupancy of dwelling to persons employed in the adjoining fishery) of planning application 2007/0167/O granted on appeal by the Inspector's letter dated 17 April 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>