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Pre-Committee Members' Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 5 February 2014

Time

10.00 am

Place

Cavell & Colman Rooms
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 on items 1 to 5, and arrive at 1.30pm if you intend to speak on items 6 to 11.

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

28/01/2014
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 8 January 2014;
   (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>2013/1904/O</td>
<td>FRAMINGHAM EARL</td>
<td>Land East Of Water Tower Long Road Framingham Earl</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2013/0167/O</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue, Trowse with Newton</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/0854/O</td>
<td>BARNHAM BROOM</td>
<td>Land South Of Mill View Bell Road Barnham Broom</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/1647/O</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Land North Of George Lane Loddon</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/1986/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land To The West Of Norwich Road And South Of Caistor Lane Poringland</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/1692/RVC</td>
<td>ASHWellTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL</td>
<td>Rectory Farm Whipps Lane Fundenhall</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/1826/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land East Of Newhaven Folgate Lane Costessey</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/1887/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>The Oaks Kenninghall Road Bressingham</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2013/1966/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Footbridge At Townhouse Road Costessey</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013/2106/F</td>
<td>SAXLINGHAM NETHERGATE</td>
<td>Saxlingham Hall Nursing home The Green Saxlingham Nethergate</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2014/0108/CAN</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>2 High Green Gardens Brooke</td>
<td>123</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. Enforcement Reports  
(attached – page 126)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  
(attached – page 132)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 5 March 2014
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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.

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A  Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

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?

YES

NO

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

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in recommendations

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

1. **Appl. No** : 2013/1904/O  
   **Parish** : FRAMINGHAM EARL

   **Applicants Name** : Hibbett & Key Ltd  
   **Site Address** : Land East Of Water Tower Long Road Framingham Earl Norfolk  
   **Proposal** : Outline planning permission for 7 no. dwellings and associated works on the former RAF Camp, Long Road, Framingham Earl, including demolition/removal of existing former RAF buildings and structures

1. **Update Report**

1.1 This application and original report (appended) were considered at the January Committee meeting. The recommendation was accepted, but during consideration of a later item on the agenda, an issue arose regarding the interpretation and application of the affordable housing policy in the Joint Core Strategy (Policy 4). The Development Manager undertook to review the approach taken to the calculation of the amount of affordable housing required from this and other relevant live applications, and to report back any that were found to be incorrect in the light of the review.

1.2 The relevant part of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy states as follows.

   “A proportion of affordable housing, including an appropriate tenure mix, will be sought on all sites for 5 or more dwellings (or 0.2 hectares or more). The proportion of affordable housing, and mix of tenure sought will be based on the most up to date needs assessment for the plan area. At the adoption of this strategy the target proportion to meet the demonstrated housing need is:

   • on sites for 5-9 dwellings (or 0.2 – 0.4 ha), 20% with tenure to be agreed on a site by site basis (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5)

   • on sites for 10-15 dwellings (or 0.4 – 0.6ha), 30% with tenure to be agreed on a site by site basis (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5)

   • on sites for 16 dwellings or more (or over0.6 ha) 33% with approximate 85% social rented and 15% intermediate tenures (numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5)

   The proportion of affordable housing sought may be reduced and the balance of tenures amended where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics, including infrastructure provision, together with the requirement for affordable housing would render the site unviable in prevailing market conditions, taking account of the availability of public subsidy to support affordable housing.

   At appropriate settlements, sites that would not normally be released for housing will be considered for schemes that specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes. Such schemes must ensure that the properties are made available in perpetuity for this purpose.”

1.3 Members will note that the amount of affordable housing (AH) required may be calculated either by reference to the number of dwellings proposed, or to the site area. The wording of the policy does not explicitly state how to decide which calculation method to use in any particular circumstance, but logic suggests that it should be whichever produces the higher amount in each case. For ‘low density’ schemes the amount of AH required may be greater when calculated by site area than by dwelling numbers. For proposals of 4 dwellings or less, no AH may be required, but if they are proposed on a site of 0.2Ha or more then AH would be required.
1.4 As noted in the Policy, allowance may be made for cases where the development would be rendered unviable by the AH normally required under the policy. This may arise due to a range of factors such as site conditions creating abnormally high building costs or additional infrastructure costs associated with delivering the development. It is also reasonable to take account of other constraints which may reduce the area of the site that is capable of development (the developable area) and therefore reduce the number of dwellings that can reasonably be accommodated on a site, through no fault or design of the applicant. Factors such as the presence of trees with large root protection zones; areas subject to flooding; or sensitive habitat areas may in some cases justify excluding parts of a site from the calculation of site area and the amount of AH required.

1.5 In this particular case at Framingham Earl, 7 dwellings are proposed on a site with an area of 1.3Ha. Members will note that the previous officer report referred to the provision of only 1 affordable dwelling which was proposed as being the number required by a development of 7 dwellings (20% of 7 = 1.4 rounded down). However, although the area around the site is partly constrained by trees and the character of the area is of low density, the proposed number of dwellings is considered to be lower than is necessary to address the site’s constraints. In these circumstances the amount of AH required should have been calculated according to the site area (1.3Ha) which takes the scheme into the category in the policy requiring the highest proportion of AH (33%). This results in a requirement for 2 affordable dwellings (33% of 7 = 2.31 rounded down).

1.6 Following discussions with the applicant’s agent, 3 options have been offered:

1. A payment of £140,000 in lieu of 2 affordable dwellings with none provided on site, plus 7 market dwellings on site.

2. Provision of 5 market dwellings and 2 affordable dwellings on the site.

3. Provision of 6 market dwellings and 1 affordable dwelling on site (as originally proposed) plus a payment of £70,000 in lieu of 1 additional affordable dwelling.

1.7 Members will be aware that financial payments are not normally favoured unless justified by exceptional circumstances. Option 1 is also not favoured as it would in effect create a total of 9 dwellings, so the affordable housing requirement would rise to 3 units (or financial equivalent of circa £210,000). I consider that 2 affordable units can be designed to be assimilated into the development in a satisfactory manner and this would be the best way to ensure delivery of the affordable housing in accordance with policy. It is therefore recommended that option 2 should be agreed.

2 Recommendation

2.1 That the previous recommendation resolved to be approved is confirmed, but with a Section 106 Agreement to secure 2 affordable dwellings on the site (in addition to 5 market dwellings) rather than 1 as previously referred to in the body of the previous report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Trett 01508 533794
and E-mail: ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
App. No : 2013/1904/O  
Parish : FRAMINGHAM EARL

Applicants Name : Hibbett & Key Ltd  
Site Address : Land East Of Water Tower Long Road Framingham Earl Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline planning permission for 7 no. dwellings and associated works on the former RAF Camp, Long Road, Framingham Earl, including demolition/removal of existing former RAF buildings and structures

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring Reserved Matters  
3. In accordance with amendments  
4. External materials to be agreed  
5. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
6. Details of foul water disposal  
7. Surface Water  
8. Ecology Mitigation  
9. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
10. Retention trees and hedges  
11. Tree protection  
12. PD rights removed within tree protection areas  
13. Existing Access, Widen or Improve  
15. Visibility splay dimension  
16. Provision of parking, service  
17. Archaeology  
18. New water efficiency  
19. Slab levels to be agreed

Subject to a S106 Legal agreement for the provision of affordable housing

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 1980/2940 Proposed erection of 8 detached houses and Refused garages

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse:-
- Former RAF camp - many residents not aware that there was a temporary RAF camp on the site
- Concern re the red line and request clarification
- Details of ownership of boundary ditches or culverts to be provided
- The provision of a bungalow on this site is not compatible with the characteristics of this area. Recommend that this provision of affordable housing is withdrawn
- A written woodland management plan to be provided
- There is no requirement for any more dwellings in this small village

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Housing Strategy Manager No objections

3.4 Flood Defence Officer Support with conditions

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received

3.6 Design Officer Support the design principles.

3.7 Landscape Officer Additional information required
- Tree removal plan
- Further clarification on woodland management

3.8 NCC Highways Support with conditions

3.9 Historic Environment Service No comments received

3.10 Environmental Services (Protection) No comments received

3.11 Representations 12 letters of objections
- Outside the newly accepted planning line which has only just been put forward under the New Local Plan. Would make a mockery of the Council's intentions if they were allowed a breach within a few weeks of the cabinet's agreement.
- South Norfolk already has an excess of its 5 year supply of housing site
- Cllr Fuller is on record as stating South Norfolk has fulfilled its obligation to provide sites and he felt 'enough was enough'
• Not a brownfield site, only one building left. No buildings visible from the road and the site remains a rural one, upon which the fauna and flora depend.

• Houses opposite have TPO's and this should be extended to the whole of Forty Acre Plantation
• Precedent for further development
• Concern of use of sewage treatment plants and impact on volume of water entering the ground
• Flooding
• Detrimental impact on ecology and character of area
• Increase in traffic
• No informal consultation taken place with neighbours
• Concern application in outline, no guarantees the site would be developed and could led to completely different and unacceptable application for full planning permission
• Land better used for natural access area for the use of residents to enjoy
• Number of houses in LDF reached without this development
• Do not need any more houses
• Infrastructure cannot cope with more houses
• This site was included in an application for a larger site which included practically all of Forty Acre Plantation. The developers under 2011/1284 then submitted just the Pigot Lane site, which despite objections received planning permission consent.
• Detrimental impact on ecology

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 7 detached dwellings, 6 market houses and 1 affordable dwelling at Long Lane, Framingham Earl.

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

• The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Framingham Earl together with Poringland as a Key Service Village. Settlements within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) may also be considered for additional development to help deliver the 1800 dwellings 'in smaller sites within the NPA.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities.

• The sustainability of the site's location, having regard to Framingham Earl being defined as a Key Service Village within Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.
The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of the scheme being built and ready for occupation well within 5 years.

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

Brownfield site - Paragraph 111 of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value, The NPPF defines 'previously developed land' as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed), this excludes land which has been previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.

The main issues for consideration in this case are the principle of the proposal in this location; design; highways consideration; drainage; impact on residential amenity; and affordable housing provision.

Principle of the proposal in this location

The application site is situated to the north of Long Lane and is located outside the development boundary for the village. Prior to 1940's the site had been predominantly covered by dense woodland making up part of 40 Acre Plantation. The site was developed for use in the second world war. A range of military structures were built, these buildings were constructed to facilitate and serve the radar station, situated 1km west of the site. Two of the buildings and associated tracks remain on the site. The site is well screened from the road by natural vegetation and the existing structures are located away from the road and therefore are not readily visible from the highway. Whilst the site screens the structures from public view, they are clearly visible within the site and have not blended into the landscape in the process of time. The application proposes to remove the existing buildings and the erection of 7 detached dwellings. As members are aware, applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless there are material considerations of sufficient weight to dictate otherwise. In this case the site can be considered as Brownfield and it is not of high environmental value and therefore NPPF Paragraph 111 gives the material weight to supporting the proposal contrary to the provisions of the SNLP.

The NPPF makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year land supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year land supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%. Whilst material considerations then need to be taken into account, the NPPF advises that development should be approved unless the 'adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'. The demonstrable lack of a housing supply (albeit an improving situation) carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

Framingham Earl has been selected as a Key Service Village as it has a good range of facilities that enable it to meet local needs. These centres also benefit from good public transport services.

There are no known capacity issues or infrastructure constraints that are material to the consideration of this application.

In view of the above, I consider that the principle of development on the site is acceptable and accords with the NPPF.
Design

4.9 The South Norfolk Place-Making Guide confirms that the site falls within the Poringland Settled Plateau Farmland, which is characterised by a densely settled core, predominantly of ribbons of post war development interconnected by older settled areas which have a more distinct character. An analysis of Framingham Earl and its surroundings has also been carried out to inform the design and character of the site, which takes into account the sites landscape and townscape context. The illustrative master plan shows how the proposals could create character throughout the site to add interest and variety to the proposals. The development concept has been designed to respect the existing site features such as the surrounding woodland and retains a strong landscape structure that helps to minimise its impact on neighbouring areas. Generous plot sizes aim to respect the pattern and grain of existing development on the south side of Long Road as well as creating opportunities for green space throughout the site that will promote both recreation and ecological diversity. The scheme has been well thought out and accords with policy and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

Highways

4.10 The highway officer, whilst requiring additional information (which has subsequently been provided), has raised no objections to the proposal. I therefore do not consider the proposal could now be refused on highway safety grounds.

Residential amenity

4.11 No concerns have been raised in respect of the impact of the dwellings on the amenities of the neighbouring properties via noise, disturbance, loss of light or loss of privacy. The development is a reasonable distance from the nearest residential properties and therefore, the proposal will not give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent residential property as to justify refusal of the application on this ground.

Affordable housing provision

4.12 Under the requirements of Policy 4 of the JCS, due to the number of dwellings proposed the requirement for one affordable home is triggered. The application proposes a 2 bedroomed single storey property for rent, which is supported by the Strategic Housing Manager. This will need to be secured by way of S106 agreement.

Drainage

4.13 The Poringland Integrated Urban Drainage Pilot Study (PIUD) indicates that soakaways and other infiltration methods are not always a viable option of surface water disposal within the pilot study area and that where infiltration will work effectively, it can have severe potential implications further down the catchment. In view of the above, the Flood Defence Officer has raised no objections in principle but requires that a surface water drainage scheme for this site, based on the principles of sustainable drainage be submitted and approved prior to any development taking place. The scheme should;

- demonstrate that the proposed surface water management scheme has been adequately sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including 30% for the effects of climate change
- demonstrate that run-off from the development site shall not exceed the existing run-off rates and where possible a reduction in run-off should be achieved
- show that consideration has been given to over-land flow routes and that people and property will be safe from flooding
- provide details of arrangements for the long term maintenance and management of the drainage systems and any boundary ditches within the curtilage of the site.
A number of concerns have been raised in respect of the proposal as set out in para 3.12. I have responded to some of the concerns raised above, however whilst I fully appreciate the other issues raised such as; setting a precedent; TPO should be imposed on the site; already enough housing; comments made by Cllr Fuller, none of these would be material reasons to refuse the application. I also note that the Parish Council has recommended that the affordable provision is removed from the application but this would be contrary to the provisions of policy 4 of the JCS. In respect of the impact on existing trees and ecology, the submitted surveys indicate that the scheme would not adversely impact on these. Appropriate protection and mitigation measures can be secured by condition.

Conclusion

It is accepted that as at March 2013 there is not a five year supply of sites within the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year supply and the requirements of the NPPF are strong material considerations in favour of this application.

The proposed development is considered to accord with Policy 2, IMP8, IMP9 and the NPPF as the site is a previously developed site and therefore this represents, together with the lack of 5 year land supply, sufficient material considerations to warrant approval contrary to the SNLP; the proposed two storey detached dwellings respect the character of the site and its surroundings; the amenities of the nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree; and the proposal would not give rise to a situation detrimental to highway safety. In these circumstances the application should be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2  
Appl. No : 2013/0167/O  
Parish : TROWSE WITH NEWTON

Applicants Name : Trustees Of The Arminghall Settlement  
Site Address : Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue, Trowse with Newton, Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.

Recommendation : Would have refused

1  Insufficient information has been received to demonstrate that the proposals will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the design and layout will comply with the Design Principles set out within the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The application as submitted is contrary to saved local plan policy IMP18, Joint Core Strategy Policy 2, the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide, and does not accord with the requirements of sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF.

2  The loss of a recreational facility without adequate justification or details of a replacement scheme is contrary to saved Local Plan Policy LEI8, and will be detrimental to the needs of the local community.

3  The development as appealed does not provide for 33% affordable housing, with no supporting information having been provided to justify a reduction, and is therefore contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policy 4.

4  The proposed development does not provide for sufficient appropriate and accessible education (in relation to providing a site, individually or in combination with the adjoining part of the TROW1 allocation, for a new primary school). It is therefore contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policies 7 and 20 and policy TROW 1 in the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Local Plan Document (notwithstanding that only limited weight can be afforded to policy TROW 1, as there are outstanding objections to the policy).

5  The proposed development does not provide for a primary vehicle access from White Horse Lane with a pedestrian link to Hudson Avenue. The highways impact is therefore unacceptable, and is contrary to saved Local Plan policy IMP 8 and policy TROW 1 in the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Local Plan Document (notwithstanding that only limited weight can be afforded to policy TROW 1, as there are outstanding objections to the policy).

6  The proposed development would undermine the landscape quality and openness of the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. It therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and is contrary to saved Local Plan policy ENV6.

7  The proposed development does not provide for a cohesive development approach with the proposals for the adjoining site (which are also within the TROW1 allocation), in particular the
linking of highways and provision of a 1.4 hectare site for a new primary school. However, only limited weight can be afforded to policy TROW 1 (due to outstanding objections to this allocation).

NOTE: an appeal has already been lodged in respect of the non-determination of this application in advance of the application having been reported to Development Management Committee (DMC) for determination. Nevertheless it is desirable for DMC to form a view of the application in order to inform the case to be put forward by the Council at appeal.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
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 7: Supporting communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 3: River Valleys
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass of the City
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.5 Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Local Plan Document (November 2013)

TROW1: Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0167 Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas. Appeal against non-determination is progress.
Appeal History

2.2 2013/0167 Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas. In progress.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse

The full Parish Council response is attached as appendix 2.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Additional information required to be submitted

- Lack of Highways connection via development land to the west to White Horse Lane wholly unacceptable
- Interim access to the development is to be via Hudson Avenue. This road does not meet current road standards and a footpath is required to be added on the southern side as an integral part of these proposals to be successful
- Additional information requested on flood risk assessment, retention of turning on Hudson Avenue and differences in the conceptual road layouts from Norfolk residential design Guide standards

3.4 Conservation Officer Refuse as submitted

- Impact on the designated Conservation Area can only be assessed with a full application. Inadequate appraisal of the Conservation Area and an indication that the development within the designated area will be treated differently to the rest of the site. Consider the whole site requires a consistent and sensitive approach
- A clearer analysis of the site and its context including constraints and opportunities and a summary of how the proposal has evolved in response to this would be helpful
- Lack of information to illustrate any connectivity with the proposed development of the site to the west of White Horse Lane, and the integration of the proposal with the existing development
- On street parking will be visually over-dominant if full of cars, layout accesses existing allotments however there is no provision for parking in the vicinity

3.5 NCC - Planning Obligations No objection, subject to securing the provision of a new primary school site.

The County Council in its capacity as local education authority has not raised any objection to the two housing applications in Trowse provided that a suitable site (of at least 1.4 ha on site) and a commensurate contribution towards build costs can be secured through a s106 legal agreement (i.e. relating to both applications). The County Council would wish to secure, through a s106 agreement, a site of 0.4 ha contiguous with the proposed Norfolk Homes school site (1ha) (Application No. 2013/0463).
In the event that the 0.4 ha could not be secured the County Council would have an objection in principle to the housing proposal (Application 2013/0167) as a new on-site primary school of size 1.4 hectares could not reasonably be delivered and would therefore be contrary to Policy TROW1 of the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations Local Plan Document.

The County Council is aware from the Appellant’s Statement of Case that they have suggested locating the new school on land (2 ha site) to the south of the A146, which they had previously cited for the relocation of the allotments. While this site would be larger than the 1.4 ha sought through Policy TROW1, the County Council, as Local Education Authority, would have serious concerns with its identification as a school site for the following reasons:

- The site lies outside the settlement boundary and would represent development in the open countryside;
- The site is physically detached from the settlement when it should be at the heart of the village;
- The site raises potential environmental concerns given its proximity to the busy A146 (i.e. in terms of possible noise and air pollution);
- As this site lies outside the red-line of the application there is no guarantee that it is deliverable i.e. a separate planning application for a new school would be needed.

An alternative school site for the reasons outlined above would not be considered appropriate.

3.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd  Support with conditions
- Surface water drainage
- No hard standing areas to be constructed until surface water drainage works have been completed

3.7 English Heritage  No comments received

3.8 Sport England  No objection subject to condition
- The facilities meet a local rather than a strategic need
- Sport England would however urge SNC to require the applicants to implement an approved relocation strategy for existing users of the sports facilities on the site via a suitably worded condition or Section 106 obligation

3.9 Norfolk Historic Environment Service  Support with conditions
- A written archaeological scheme of investigation to be submitted and approved
- Work undertaken in accordance with the written scheme
- No development until the investigation and post investigation assessment has been undertaken

3.10 Env. Services Flood Defence Officer  Support subject to conditions
- Appropriate sustainable drainage features with controlled discharge limits
- Incorporation of rainwater re-use and water conservation measures
• Management plan for future maintenance of the drainage features serving more than one property

3.11 Housing Strategy Manager

Additional information required to be submitted
• To meet policy requirements one more affordable unit is required
• The tenure mix is acceptable
• Concerns over size and tenure of certain properties
• Revised scheme of affordable housing required and confirmation of amount based on 33% affordable units

3.12 Environment Agency

No objection, subject to appropriate conditions
• Surface water drainage
• Incorporating surface water drainage schemes (SUDS) within the layout
• Clarification of future management of the SUDS
• Ground water and land contamination
• Water saving measures/recycling

3.13 Landscape Officer

No objection, subject to appropriate conditions

3.14 Representations

162 letters of objection expressing the following concerns:-
• Contrary to SNLP policies ENV 3, ENV 7, ENV 8 and lies in the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone
• The proposal is contrary to proposed Policy TROW 1 within the Draft Local Plan
• Highways access and traffic congestion issues
• Loss of Conservation Area planting
• No justification for the development of the YMCA site and loss of sports facilities for the village and primary schoolchildren
• YMCA all weather pitch was provided by Hopkins Homes as part of their development. How can this just be removed to create more new development with no alternative provision?
• Loss of OFSTED rated outstanding school
• New school required to make up for error in provision on Deal Ground site
• Inappropriate development in a conservation area and impact on the character of a model village
• Loss of natural habitat/green field recreation space and mature organic allotments (note: development of the allotments is not part of the application)
• Scale of development could have impact on health and welfare provision including pre-school provision and public transport availability
• The track to the rear of houses in School Terrace is owned by residents and not shown on plans
• The land should be used for a development for those living sustainable lifestyles
4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is located to the south east of the village of Trowse with Newton and adjoins the recent development by Hopkins Homes at Devon Way and Hudson Avenue. These properties are mainly 2-storey in scale. The site also includes the YMCA buildings, which extend into the Conservation Area. The site is roughly triangular in shape and bounded to the south and east by the A146 and A47, and to the west by a hedge with an open field beyond. The rectangular part of the site to the north contains a sports hall, car parking and multi-use games area. The majority of the site is outside the current development boundary. A location plan is attached as Appendix 1.

4.2 This outline application proposes a residential development and associated infrastructure on the majority of the site, and includes the demolition of the YMCA facilities to allow for a vehicular access to the site off Hudson Avenue. This would be the singular point of access for all properties. The indicative layout submitted with the application shows a development of 81 dwellings. Matters of appearance, landscaping and layout are reserved. (An indicative layout plan is attached as Appendix 3.)

4.3 With the exception of the YMCA facility, the site is located with an area that has been chosen as a preferred site for housing for inclusion within the Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, which also includes the field to the west of the site adjoining White Horse Lane. (TROW 1 refers, and is attached as Appendix 4.)

4.4 A separate undetermined application for a development of 99 dwellings on the adjoining site (within the TROW1 allocation area) is been submitted by Norfolk Homes. This recently amended application also includes a 1 hectare site for a new school, adjacent to the boundary with the application site.

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

- The provisions of Policy 12 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Trowse as an urban fringe parish where land will be identified to contribute towards the smaller sites allowance of 1800 dwellings within the NPA required during the period 2011 to 2026. Paragraph 6.2 of the JCS states that Trowse lies within the top level of the settlement hierarchy, Norwich urban area.

- The Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document allocates the wider 9-hectare site (TROW1) for approx. 150 to 160 dwellings and a new primary school (minimum 1.4 hectares).

- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities.

- The sustainability of the site's location, having regard to Trowse with Newton being a Norwich urban area 'fringe parish' in Policy 12 (and paragraph 6.2) of the JCS.
The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years.

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

Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

4.6 It is noted that there has been a significant number of objections from local residents to both this application, as well as the proposed development of the adjoining site, raising a number of issues, particularly in respect of the sensitivity of the site, the potential impact on character of Trowse village and the local school, and the impact on the local highway network. Objections have also been raised to the allocation of the wider site (TROW1) for housing in the Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, so limited weight can be afforded to the requirements of policy TROW1. Taking on board the comments raised, in my opinion the critical issue that members need to address is the principle of the development having regard to:

- The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Accordance with Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document policy TROW1, and the weight that can be applied to TROW1
- Education issues
- Affordable housing
- Indicative layout and design, including the impact on Trowse Conservation Area
- Highway Impact
- Loss of recreational facility (YMCA)
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Drainage & flood risk

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

4.7 Members should be aware that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not remove the need to assess the proposed development having first had regard to the development plan, however the relevant planning policies referred to need to be up-to-date. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities. Whilst material considerations then need to be taken into account, the NPPF advises that development should be approved unless the 'adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'.

4.8 Although the site falls within the Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document policy TROW1 for residential development, this policy is emerging and can only be afforded limited weight at this time because of a number of outstanding objections to this proposed allocation. Having said that, the policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF, and I consider it appropriate to take into account its requirements. I do this in the next section of my report.

4.9 Trowse has a good range of social and community facilities and the village has very good accessibility to Norwich. It has a primary school, although it is located on a very restricted site (in the Conservation Area) with little or no room for expansion. In location terms, I consider the site to be a sustainable location, although it is clear that future development should take account of the need for a new school site to be identified and secured.
4.10 Taking the above into account I feel that the development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a housing supply (albeit an improving situation) carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

Site Allocations Policy TROW1

4.11 The emerging policy requires the developer(s) of the wider 9-hectare site to provide the following:

- Development of the site to be masterplanned to provide a cohesive form of development
- Site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure through S106 or the payment of CIL, including any required improvements to the Martineau Lane roundabout
- Provision of site for new primary school within the site of at least 1.4 hectares to be agreed
- Primary vehicular access from White Horse Lane with pedestrian and cycle access to the sports ground accessed from Hudson Avenue and the amenity space on Devon Way
- Development of the site will need to reflect the context of Trowse Conservation Area with particular consideration given into how the development fronts onto White Horse Lane taking into account the existing buildings opposite, existing pattern of development adjoining the site and the hedge on the site frontage.
- An extension to the footway along White Horse Lane will be provided to ensure there is a continuous footway from the site to the village centre.
- The development will be designed with appropriate landscaping to mitigate for any visual impact from the A146 and A47
- Anglian Water advice regarding foul sewerage capacity

4.12 The proposals put forward by the applicant as shown on the indicative site layout plan do not accord with the above requirements as they do not provide for a school site of 1.4 hectares (either alone or in combination with the adjacent site), do not provide for a cohesive development approach with the proposals for the adjoining site, and do not provide for a primary vehicle access from White Horse Lane with a pedestrian link to Hudson Avenue. Whilst I acknowledge that this policy can only carry limited weight until it is formally adopted, the requirements for a school site and satisfactory access are critical elements that go towards the overall sustainability of the site in NPPF terms.

Education issues

4.13 Although not forming part of the application documents, the Appellant’s Statement of Case suggests locating the new school on land (2 ha site) to the south of the A146. While this site would be larger than the 1.4 ha sought through Policy TROW1, the County Council, as Local Education Authority, has indicated that they would have serious concerns with its identification as a school site for the following reasons:

- The site lies outside the settlement boundary and would represent development in the open countryside;
- The site is physically detached from the settlement when it should be at the heart of the village;
- The site raises potential environmental concerns given its proximity to the busy A146 (i.e. in terms of possible noise and air pollution);
As this site lies outside the red-line of the application there is no guarantee that it is deliverable i.e. a separate planning application for a new school would be needed.

4.14 In my opinion, therefore, little weight should be given to the offer of a school site to the south of the A146.

4.15 The County Council have indicated that in the event that the 0.4 ha could not be secured (the application on the adjacent site allows for a school site of 1.0 hectare) the County Council would have an objection in principle to this application, as a new on-site primary school of adequate size within the TROW 1 allocation site could not reasonably be delivered and would be contrary to Policy TROW 1 of the emerging Local Plan. The lack of certainty of provision of a new primary school site in a location where it is acknowledged that the existing school is at or near capacity, counts against the acceptability of the proposal in terms of sustainability.

Affordable housing

4.16 Policy 4 of the JCS is engaged in this proposal and requires 33% of the development to be affordable dwellings. There should also be an approx. 85% - 15% split between rented and intermediate tenures.

4.17 The current appealed proposal does not accord with Policy 4 of the JCS as it requires an additional affordable dwelling to meet the 33% requirement. Furthermore, there are concerns in respect of the size and tenure of certain affordable properties, and the Strategic Housing Manager has indicated that further discussions with the applicant should take place with a view to amending the proposed affordable housing.

Impact on the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone

4.18 The site lies within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, as detailed in saved Local Plan Policy ENV6 (which is part-consistent with the NPPF). Policy ENV6 says that inappropriate development which would undermine the landscape quality and openness of the zone will not be permitted.

4.19 The proposal would be contrary to ENV6, as it sits within the Landscape Protection Zone and would undermine the openness of the zone. As a piecemeal proposal that does not address a range of design and infrastructure concerns, the lack of a 5 year land supply does not outweigh the impact on the protection zone. It is of note that the site (TROW1) is proposed for allocation in the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, and that policy DM 4.7 of the Pre-Submission Development Management Policies Document (and a change the Proposals Map) propose to remove the TROW1 site from the Landscape Protection Zone; however, both TROW1 and Policy DM 4.7 are the subject of outstanding objections, and so limited weight can be afforded to them.

Indicative layout and design, including the impact on Trowse Conservation Area

4.20 The application is in outline only for access and scale, with appearance, landscape and layout being reserved matters. Although additional information has been submitted in support of the application this is only indicative at this stage. There is a requirement to consider whether development will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, a heritage asset, which can only be properly assessed with a full application or the submission of siting and design details.

4.21 There is a requirement under para 128 of the NPPF to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application suggests that only the small part of the development to the north of the site which lies within the Conservation Area will have an impact on its character. In fact the whole development will impact on the character of the
Conservation Area and its setting and therefore requires a consistent and sensitive approach throughout.

4.22 In conclusion, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposals will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the design and layout will comply with the Design Principles set out within the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

4.23 The application as submitted is therefore contrary to saved local plan policy IMP18, the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide, and does not accord with the requirements of sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF.

Highway Impact

4.24 The application was accompanied by a transport statement, which has been considered by NCC: Highways. In a response dated 11/4/13, they raised concerns with the approach taken by the developer in accessing the site from Hudson Avenue commenting that their previous recommendation as part of the LDF (Local Plan) consultations was that the vehicular access to the site should be provided to White Horse Lane. They also comment that ‘the link indicated on the proposed site layout plan 12.024 021 rev B does not connect to site 151 (application 2013/0463, land adjoining, both in allocation TROW1) and is therefore wholly unacceptable.’

4.25 NCC: Highways do accept that a short term solution to providing access to 81 dwellings could be from Hudson Avenue; however, without a comprehensive access arrangement covering the whole of the TROW1 allocation with the principal access from White Horse Lane serving both application sites, then the proposed access to the site is sub-standard and could prejudice the successful delivery of the housing allocation.

4.26 Furthermore, NCC: Highways have raised a technical concern in terms of the design of the access connection with Hudson Avenue. I have therefore concluded that the proposal is contrary to saved Local Plan policy IMP8 and emerging Local Plan allocation policy TROW1 (notwithstanding that only limited weight can be applied to this policy, as it is under objection).

Loss of recreational facility (YMCA)

4.27 The application proposes the demolition of YMCA sports hall, and the loss of a multi-use games area and associated parking. As far as I can ascertain, this facility has been well used by the public over the years. Saved Local Plan policy LEI8 seeks to resist the loss of these facilities. Amongst other provisos, it states that the redevelopment of existing recreational or amenity land will only be permitted where
- It affects only a small part of the site and does not prejudice sporting or other recreational facilities on the site;
- It involves the replacement of the recreational facilities with another of equivalent or improved quality;
- An assessment of needs shows there is an excess of provision of the facility and it cannot be adapted to meet other recreational needs;
- It is part of the relocation of a sports (or similar) club which will provide an overall improvement in recreational facilities.

4.28 The applicants have indicated that they are working with the YMCA in relocating to alternative premises; however, an alternative site has not been indicated. Furthermore, an assessment of need has not been undertaken, and it remains unclear as to how replacement facilities will be provided. Finally, the YMCA land is covered by a section 106 legal agreement (linked to the adjoining Hopkins Homes development, 1998/1179 refers) that places a legal requirement on the landowners to make the facility available for use by
the residents of Trowse with Newton. As a result, the proposals to redevelop this site would require a variation to this legal agreement, which cannot and should not lightly be set aside.

4.29 In light of the above, I consider that the proposal fails to accord with saved policy LEI8, to the detriment of the local community.

Impact on neighbour amenity

4.30 The majority of the site is bounded to the north by the Hopkins Homes development at Devon Way and Hudson Avenue. The redevelopment of the YMCA facility will be bounded on three sides by existing development. Although the full impacts in terms of neighbouring amenity cannot be considered at the outline stage, I see no reason why the siting and design of the proposed dwellings cannot be accommodated in a way that avoids adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. The use of the Hudson Avenue to access the site will have a negative impact on existing amenity, as this will increase the level of traffic movements to the front, sides and rear of existing neighbouring properties. However, this impact is unlikely to be significant enough to be unacceptable.

4.31 Subject to the submission of a satisfactory detailed design and layout, the proposal accords with saved local plan policy IMP9.

Drainage & flood risk

4.32 Although some parts of the site would be capable of accommodating infiltration drainage (soakaways), the overall drainage strategy provides for attenuation storage. Anglian Water has confirmed that it is possible to connect to the existing surface water drainage system around the site via restricted discharge. Both the Environment Agency and the Council’s own Flood Risk Officer raise no objection the scheme, subject to appropriate conditions requiring any development to be in accordance with the submitted drainage strategy.

4.33 I therefore consider that the scheme accords with section 10 of the NPPF.

5 Conclusion

5.1 As section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires, development must be considered in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of housing sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would help address that deficit. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are significant material considerations in favour of this application. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged, and this requires decision makers to grant permission unless ‘any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole […] or specific policies in the framework indicated development should be restricted.’

5.3 The site is in a sustainable location, and forms part of a wider site that has been chosen as a preferred site for housing for inclusion in the Pre-Submission Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (policy TROW1). However, as explained above, the proposed development does not accord with the requirements of TROW1 in three critical areas; it does not provide for a school site (or part of a school site) within the allocated site area (contrary to JCS Policy 7), does not provide for a cohesive development approach with the proposals for the adjoining site, and does not provide for a primary vehicle access from White Horse Lane with a pedestrian link to Hudson Avenue (contrary to saved Local Plan policy IMP8). Whilst limited weight can be given to this emerging policy allocation, in my view its lack of compliance with this policy is evidence of the unsustainability of the scheme when assessed against the requirements
of the NPPF as a whole.

5.4 The site also lies within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (saved policy ENV6). Although the site is in a sustainable location for development, and is identified as an allocated site (Policy TROW1) in the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, with the site proposed to be removed from the Landscape Protection Zone in the Pre-Submission Development Management Policies Document (policy DM4.7 and the Policies Map), only limited weight can be afforded to the emerging policies as there are objections to both policies. The site therefore does not comply with saved Local Plan Policy ENV6.

5.5 The loss of a recreational facility without adequate justification or details of a replacement scheme is contrary to saved local plan policy LEI8, and will be detrimental to the needs of the local community. This is a further harm that needs to be weighed in the planning balance.

5.6 At the time the application was appealed, adequate affordable housing (33%) had not been proposed, with no evidence as to why this could not be achieved. The scheme therefore does not comply with Policy 4 of the JCS, and this weighs against the proposal in the planning balance.

5.7 As explained above there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposals will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the design and layout will comply with the Design Principles set out within the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The application as submitted is contrary to saved local plan policy IMP18, the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide, and does not accord with the requirements of sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF. This is a further harm that counts against the scheme.

5.8 I conclude that the harms outlined above significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of allowing the development and render it unsustainable.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9 January 2014

Mr Gary Hancox  
Senior Planning Officer - Growth & Localism  
South Norfolk Council  
Swan Lane  
Long Stratton  
Norfolk NR15 2XE

Dear Mr Hancox

2013/0167 – Land South of Devon Way & Hudson Avenue – Appeal against non-determination

Trowse with Newton Parish Council confirms its original recommendation of refusal. It believes that the decision on the application should be to refuse the application, and recommends South Norfolk Council to conclude likewise.

Main Reasons Previously Cited (without change to other reasons given)

- The application is contrary to South Norfolk preserved policies ENV 3 and ENV 6.
- The Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan specifies that it is important that farmland in the conservation area remains farmland. While this proposal does not directly affect the conservation area, it is impractical for only the strip of farmland on White Horse Lane to remain as farmland, and the aspiration of the Character Appraisal can be met only if all of the site 2013/0167 (together with all of application site 2013/0463) remains undeveloped.
- The traffic implications, taken with other site approvals and designations in the area, will result in an insoluble further overload of the Martineau Lane roundabout and of Bracondale.
- Road access via an existing housing estate does not appear to be adequate. The routing via The Street militates against The Street’s traffic-calming.
- The cumulative effect of this proposal together with 2013/0463 (Arminghall Settlement, 81 houses), added to the existing permissions on the Deal Ground and the Kier (May Gurney) sites (670 houses) will be to overwhelm this small village (389 houses in the parish, of which c.330 are in the main part of the settlement).

New Reasons

- The application is premature until SNC proposed policy TROW 1 is confirmed. The Parish Council does not in any case accept the premise inherent in TROW 1, that more housing is needed so that a new primary school can be provided. While Norfolk County Council favours a new primary school in Trowse, it is separately pursuing the allocation of site in Garden Street in Norwich for primary schooling. That, together with Lakenham School, could provide sufficient primary places for the Deal Ground. Trowse School can cope with the schooling needs of the May Gurney site, if necessary restricting
admissions from out of its area. Therefore, housing development in Trowse just to make possible a new school is unnecessary.

- The application does not in any case conform with proposed TROW 1, in that:
  - It falls partly outside the proposed development boundary
  - It proposes the demolition of the YMCA facility, to be replaced by housing and an access road
  - While it offers a replacement of the YMCA facility, that cannot be relied on until planning permission is forthcoming.
  - It does not offer a land contribution to a new primary school within the TROW 1 area.
  - While it offers an alternative school site, that cannot be relied on until planning permission is forthcoming, and it is noted that the offered site is outside any current or proposed development boundary, as well as being isolated from the village.
  - It does not comply with South Norfolk Council's aspiration for a master plan for the whole of the TROW1 site.
  - It does not comply with South Norfolk Council's aspiration for all road access to TROW 1 to be off White Horse Lane, which this Parish Council would support if TROW1 development is approved.

- The five-year land supply in the area is either already achieved or very nearly so (in which case any small shortfall is not sufficient to outweigh the major policy reasons for refusals this application).

Trowse with Newton Parish Council further notes that the application is strongly opposed by many residents, and that the movement and expansion of Trowse Primary School could put its superb attainments at risk.

Yours sincerely

Gina Lopes

Gina Lopes
Clerk to Trowse with Newton Parish Council
16 April 2013

Mr G Hancock
Planning Services
South Norfolk House
Swan Lake
Long Stratton
NORWICH
NR16 2XE

Dear Mr Hancock

Re: Application for Outline Planning Permission With Some Matters Reserved.
Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Reference Number 2013/0167
Proposed Residential Development off Devon Way, Trowse

Trowse with Newton Parish Council have considered the outline planning permission at the recent Parish Council meeting and resolved to recommend REFUSAL for the following reasons:

- The proposals are not in line with River Valleys Policy ENV3. The policy recognises the area is particularly vulnerable to change, stating two strategies for this area:

  "To maintain an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich to provide a green buffer between the city and its rural hinterland"

  and

  "The open views within the valley and from the valley should be protected and we would welcome the enhancement of landscape quality"

- The proposals are not in line with Landscape setting of the A47 Southern Bypass Policy ENV6.

  It was recognised that the Southern Bypass should not come to be regarded as a boundary up to which development is acceptable. It states:

  "Inappropriate development and any other development within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, which would undermine the landscape quality and openness of the zone, or which would lead to the bypass (or any section of it) becoming the outer development boundary of the City, will not be permitted."

As stated in the site assessment table:

- Both sites are on ‘Greenfield’ land
• Both sites will increase the flood risk
• Site 1173 is noted as a site of Archaeological Interest
• Highways state that both sites will impact on Bracondale / Martineau roundabout.

As stated in policy considerations:

• Concerns with regards foul sewerage capacity, already drainage issues along White Horse Lane

Also:

• In the form and Character section it stated that 'newer estate scale development in the village has been located in unobtrusive locations, so as not to have an adverse effect on the historic character of the village core or its river valley setting.'

• Not in keeping with the character assessment outlined in the conservation area character appraisal and management plan, Agreed and produced by South Norfolk Council in September 2012; which states on page 21 'the rest of the Conservation area on this side of the road is still farmland. It is important that it should remain so, in order that the form of the "model village" is not further blurred.'

• English Heritage object to the development of both sites due to impact on character and appearance of conservation areas and traffic management issues through conservation area.

• Trowse village school occupies a restricted site, in the centre of the village it is currently oversubscribed and there is very little scope for expansion. Any proposal to send village children to other schools nearby is flawed in that whilst these schools may be within a 2 mile radius as the crow flies, the exit from the site is in Trowse village. Primary age children could not be expected to walk to any of the named schools as the traffic and road system would make the journey too hazardous. The safety of our children is paramount and this development would have an adverse effect on our ability to ensure that children can safely travel to and from school. The extra traffic would significantly increase the traffic through the village and at the Martineau roundabout. Any plans for a bigger school in the village could distort the nature and high standard of the education provided and run the risk of destroying the ethos that makes Trowse Primary School an outstanding place to learn.

• There are other inherent risks and issues in seeking to expand the current size of the school, which would need to be addressed before such an idea could be considered, none of which has been dealt with in any consultation with the public.

• Students who go to the local High School at Framingham Earl are already having issues with the bus service not having sufficient capacity to be able to
transport them to and return them from the school. Any further developments will further exacerbate this unacceptable situation.

- The entrance to a major housing development of this size will generate a significant amount of traffic in and out of the site particularly in the morning and in the evening, both through the village. In particular, given the proposed number of new houses seeking access (on the submitted plans) through the existing Hopkins Homes site, as many as 150 additional cars could be going through The Street (which has had traffic calming measures on it to reduce it to one car's width), as well as all the construction traffic having to take the same route. In summary, the number of housing units proposed on this development is far greater than the local road infrastructure can handle and will have a significant detrimental impact on the residents of Trowse.

- This increased traffic flow will cause significant problems at the Martineau Lane roundabout (which already has flow issues notwithstanding the box junction at peak times) impacting on the entrance to/exit from the adjacent Fire Station. Trowse is a village already trying to resolve major parking problems, particularly in relation to those people parking who are visiting the County Council and Norwich City Football Club. Any proposed development will exacerbate this situation which already means that there are certain times of the morning and evening when matches and/or local events are on that they are unable to get vehicle access to or from their own properties.

- The village currently benefits from the YMCA leased sports building and all weather sports pitch, which encourages healthy living for any residents and provides a focal point for the village as well as an amenity for the primary school to access conveniently and safely on foot. The loss of this facility will cause significant issues not just to the inhabitants of the village but also in the wider hinterland. No legal or binding commitment has been made to ensure this facility is still available on an alternate local site or what will be constructed, who will run it and what services it will offer. The developers have also not made any commitment to ensure that the local primary school (which currently walks its children to use the facility) will have a permanent way of getting its children to the facility. Without the sports building, can the primary school meet its legal obligations?

- The proposed development has been submitted alongside another proposed development from Norfolk Homes but the Parish Council has little evidence that either developer is talking to the other. As these two developments will have a serious impact on the village of Trowse, it is imperative that these developers work together to reduce the impact that their proposed developments would have on the village when the total of them both is taken into account.

- There is a real issue with ground water and flooding. The Common in Trowse sits on a flood plain and has already flooded this year. The new development will sit effectively at the top of a long slope leading waters down to the lower lying common. At present when heavy rain falls, the rainwaters over flood the drainage and wash down the Street in Trowse creating mini streams into the
heart of the village and the houses there. This problem would be multiplied by a development at the top end of the village.

- Concerns with the development being in keeping with the historic model village ethos.

- Site 151 (has a proposed 150 properties), site 1173 (has a proposed 81 properties) in combination with the “May Gurney/Deal Ground” development (a proposed maximum of 670 properties) giving a total of 901 additional properties to the 450 properties that currently constitute Trowse with Newton. This is tripling the size of the village and with this proposed over-development, the village of Trowse will no longer exist as a village in South Norfolk; it will just be another suburb of Norwich.

- In addition to impact on increased school numbers, speeding and increased traffic from proposed development at Deal Ground / May Gurney site

- Site 1173 will remove a sustainable open space that is easily accessible by walking and cycling.

Yours sincerely

Gina Lopes

Gina Lopes
Clerk to Trowse with Newton Parish Council


**Policy TROW 1 : Land on White Horse Lane and to the rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way**

The site comprises of land amounting to over 9 hectares located between the existing village of Trowse and the A146 Trowse bypass. The land is currently agricultural land severed from other agricultural land by the A146. The land slopes downwards from the A47 in the east into the Yare valley floor in the east and includes a very small portion of land within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 at its western end. It is proposed to allocate the land for mixed use development comprising of approximately 150 to 160 dwellings and a new primary school.

The developer of the site will be required to provide the following;

- Development of the site to be masterplanned to provide a cohesive form of development
- Site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure through S106 or the payment of CIL, including any required improvements to the Martineau Lane roundabout
- Provision of site for new primary school within the site of at least 1.4 hectares to be agreed
- Primary vehicular access from White Horse Lane with pedestrian and cycle access to the sports ground accessed from Hudson Avenue and the amenity space on Devon Way
- Development of the site will need to reflect the context of Trowse Conservation Area with particular consideration given into how the development fronts onto White Horse Lane taking into account the existing buildings opposite, existing pattern of development adjoining the site and the hedge on the site frontage.
- An extension to the footway along White Horse Lane will be provided to ensure there is a continuous footway from the site to the village centre.
- The development will be designed with appropriate landscaping to mitigate for any visual impact from the A146 and A47
- Anglian Water advice regarding foul sewerage capacity
- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources

**Policy TROW 2 : Land north of A146 & east of A47**

Land amounting to some 3.2 hectares is allocated for a Park and Ride Site.

The developer of the site will be required to provide the following;

- A safe access shall be provided on to Kirby Road
- Satisfactory landscaping will be provided in order to minimise the visual impact of the site.

Return to contents
Trowse with Newton (Norwich Policy Area)

Policy 12 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Trowse with Newton as an urban fringe parish of Norwich in which land will be allocated, where appropriate, to contribute toward the smaller site allowance set out in Policy 9, between 1 April 2008 and 31 March 2026.

Form and Character
The settlement was developed during the latter part of the nineteenth century where a model village of workers' terraced cottages and associated social and community facilities were provided by the Colman family. The village is still dominated by these terraces. The historic core and part of the setting of the village is now a large Conservation Area. The village is set on the lower part of the eastern slope of the Yare valley. Two important spaces exist at Trowse Common which contributes to the setting of the terraces on White Horse Lane, and secondly the area north-west of Whittingham Lane which lies in the Broads Authority area, separating the village from the commercial uses to the north, and Norwich City itself.

Between the main part of the village and the city boundary is the former May Gurney site which, together with the Deal Ground on the city side of the boundary, has planning permission for major redevelopment for Norwich City to 670 homes and other uses.

Services and Community Facilities
Trowse has a good range of social and community facilities and the village has very good accessibility to the Norwich. The school however is located on a very restricted site with little additional capacity. Taking into account the development permitted on the May Gurney / Deal Ground site in 2013, any large scale new development in Trowse will require the provision of a new school.

Development boundary and Constraints
The development boundary has been drawn to include the main built form of the settlement, other than those areas that fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. A separate boundary has also been drawn around the May Gurney site which, although within Flood Zones 2 and 3, has been demonstrated to be capable of development with mitigation measures to address this issue through the planning permission now in place for this strategic site. The boundary has also been drawn to include a large new allocation for development but to specifically exclude the allotments which are of important community value.
Trowse with Newton

Local Plan - Site Specific Allocations & Policies DPD - (Please see this map in conjunction with the policy text for this settlement)
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3. **Appl. No** : 2013/0854/O  
**Parish** : BARNHAM BROOM

- **Applicants Name** : Mr R Allen  
- **Site Address** : Land South Of Mill View Bell Road Barnham Broom Norfolk  
- **Proposal** : Development of land for 24 homes, including affordable housing.

**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Reserved Matters  
3. Foul Drainage  
4. Surface water management  
5. Detailed plans roads, footways, cycleways, and drainage  
6. Construction in accordance with condition 5  
7. Roads/footways to binder course before occupation  
8. Visibility splay  
9. Construction parking  
10. Construction Traffic Management Plan  
11. Compliance with Construction Traffic Management Plan  
12. Wheel cleaning facilities  
13. Off site works – footpaths  
14. Completion of Condition 13 before 1st occupation  
15. Contaminated Land – scheme to be submitted  
16. Implementation of remediation scheme  
17. Contaminated land during construction  
18. Lighting  
19. Slab levels  
20. Boundary Treatment  
21. Landscaping  
22. Retention of trees and hedges  
23. Tree protection  
24. Fire Hydrants  
25. External materials to be agreed  
26. Ecological Survey and Management Plan

Approval subject to a Section 106 to secure affordable housing provision at 33%, Norfolk County Council obligations and open space provision or refuse in default.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
- Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 15 : Service Villages
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 5: Streetscape
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 17: Off site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History
2.1 None relevant

3. Consultations
3.1 Parish Council 24 dwellings are acceptable but 8 should be for affordable housing.
3.2 District Member – Cllr Edney To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd No objections. The foul drainage will be in the catchment of Barnham Broom STW which has capacity for this development.
3.4 Design Officer No objection.
3.5 NCC Highways Do not wish to raise an objection in principle. Conditions recommended.
3.6 Environmental Protection No objections. Contaminated land reports will be required before detailed designs are completed.
3.7 Housing Strategy Manager Original proposal The applicants have not proposed 33% affordable housing, or provided financial justification for 17%. I do not support the approval of this application on the basis of the information provided to date.
3.8 English Heritage Do not consider it necessary for application to be notified to English Heritage.
3.9 Natural England No objections.
3.10 Flood Defence Officer No objections. Surface water drainage advice provided:
• Consideration should be given to accommodating overland flows to ensure flood risk from off site sources is managed
• Concur with Environment Agency Comments of 9 July 2013
• Proposed discharge rate is greater than greenfield run off rate
• Need to consider long term management of drainage features

3.11 Environment Agency
No objection subject to conditions relating to flood risk.

3.12 Planning Policy
The site is our preferred site in Barnham Broom, and therefore is due to be allocated for approximately 20 dwellings in the emerging Local Plan. The number of dwellings/site size was intended to reflect the density of surrounding development as well as the requirements of the JCS to allocate 10-20 dwellings in Barnham Broom, a Service Village. At present the emerging Local Plan carries little weight, but the preferred status of the site has been subject to consultation and the parish council support the choice of site (assuming access is directly off Bell Road) while Natural England stated concern that developing the site should have no adverse impact on the SSSI at Coston Fen, Runhall (approximately 1.8 km away).

Barnham Broom is in the rural area, which has a good supply (5+ years) of housing land.

3.13 Landscape Officer
No objection:
• Preference is for external site boundaries to be planted
• Engineering of new access needs to be sensitive to rural character
• Meaningful planting along frontage is important, location of buildings should allow for this

3.14 NCC- Planning Obligations
No objections.

3.15 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
No objections. Design advice provided.

3.16 Public Representations
There have been five letters of representation received. Two of the letters are objections and raise the following issues:

• Concerned about wildlife - owls
• Loss of view
• Loss of house value
• 5 Mill View will end up in middle of housing estate
• Noise pollution
• Lack of screening
• Negative impact on 1 and 2 Mill View
• Comments regarding loss of privacy to existing residents due to details of layout
• 33 houses exceeds housing numbers in Policies
• Major problem with speeding through village
• Bell Road used by traffic and heavy lorries travelling between A11 and A47 which block road and cause verge overrunning
• People on path will be in danger from speeding traffic
• Need path and road narrowing
• Village does not have an hourly bus service
• More cars and pollution
• Services and infrastructure would not cope with increased demand

The three letters of support raise the following considerations:
• Benefit to the village and community
• Opportunities for local people to get on the property ladder
• New families will help support shop, post office, pub, school
• Will provide a better service with more people in the village
• Will slow traffic
• If speed limit of 30mph extended will be of benefit to all residents
• Layout will enhance the village
• Layout will maintain village feeling
• Do not agree that there should be a reduced number of dwellings on the site
• Applaud 11 social houses

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is located on the edge of Barnham Broom on the south side of the village. The site’s immediate context is characterised by adjoining development to the north comprising former local authority housing set well back from the edge of Bell Road behind grass verges and some hedgerow planting.

4.2 The remaining boundaries of the site are characterised by open fields to the south and west. The frontage of the site is very open in character with clear views towards Bell Road from the southern approach into Barnham Broom. This is further emphasised by the site being elevated above the road level and on a slight bend in the road, this reinforces the site’s importance as a ‘gateway’ into the village.

4.3 The outline application proposes that the site be developed for residential purposes, with a yield of 24 dwellings, it has been amended from a proposal for 33 dwellings. The application documents detail the provision of 4 affordable housing units, however the applicant has been advised that 8 affordable units are required (33%) to comply with policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy.

4.4 The outline application does not address any of the reserved matters and the layout plan submitted provides for only basic information to demonstrate that the site can cater for 24 dwellings and also provide for landscaping, roads, footpath connections, SUDs and open space.

4.5 The main issues in this case are: the principle of development; the character and appearance of the area; highway safety; residential amenity; ecology; servicing/infrastructure

Principle of development

4.6 The site is located outside the saved South Norfolk Local Plan Adopted Development Limit for Barnham Broom lies outside the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). Outside the NPA, the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF are met because there is more than a 5 year supply of land for housing. The JCS designates Barnham Broom as a Service Village where Policy 15 identifies Service Villages as a location for 10 to 20 dwellings subject to form and character considerations.

4.7 The site is identified as a proposed allocation for new housing in the emerging South Norfolk Local Plan (BARN 1) where the Regulation 19 representation period on the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document consultation that concluded on 13th December 2013 has not raised any soundness objections to this proposed allocation. As such, the
principle of new residential development of the scale proposed is considered acceptable in this instance.

Design and Landscape

4.8 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development.

4.9 There are a number of designations close to the site, including Mill House; a Grade 2 Listed Building located north-west of the proposed site on the banks of the River Yare. There are no visual connections between the house and the site due to screening created by mature trees and Orchard Way and it is considered that the site will not pose any adverse harm to the listed building in terms of its character or setting. In addition to the grade 2 Listed Building, the site is located close to a County Wildlife Site and is unlikely to cause any significant visual impact due to the distance of the site from the CWS and the screening provided by hedgerows and vegetation along existing field boundaries.

4.10 The development has the potential to respond positively to the existing site context and adjacent land uses. In terms of the layout, the scheme attempts to show how the proposals could be integrated into the surrounding built form by arranging buildings in an informal pattern around a series of cul-de-sacs. While there is limited information about the pattern and urban grain of development this shows how the proposals could respond positively to the existing site context, it is considered that this could be shown at the reserved matters stage should this application be approved.

4.11 There is also an opportunity to create a layout that responds positively to the character of the Yare Rural River Valley by maximising views of the river valley into and out of the site by looking beyond the existing site boundaries at the detailed planning stage. The development should try and capitalise on its role as an 'entrance/gateway to the village' by creating an attractive edge along its southern boundary by positioning buildings strategically to create an interesting street scape as well as providing glimpses into and out of the site.

4.12 Whilst the scheme is in outline only, it is considered that the indicative layout submitted demonstrates that it is possible to accommodate 24 dwellings on the site in a manner which would be appropriate in the context of the site and allow for full compliance with Saved Policy IMP2, JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF to be achieved.

Affordable housing

4.13 Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy states that sites for 16 or more dwellings (or over 0.6ha) are required to provide 33% affordable housing. The application details the provision of only 4 affordable dwellings, there has been no viability information submitted with application to justify this reduction to 17% affordable housing provision.

4.14 The issue was discussed with the applicant and they were advised that without any justification for the affordable housing numbers proposed the proposal would be recommended for refusal, a position reflected in the response from the Housing Strategy Unit. At the time of writing confirmation is from the applicant is awaited to confirm that they will provide 8 affordable housing units to the specifications outlined by the Housing Strategy Manager and that this will be secured through a Section 106. The application should be refused if this is not forthcoming.

4.15 This agreement will ensure that the development meets with the requirements of JCS Policy 4.
Highways

4.16 Saved Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.17 The outline application reserves all matters, including access. The Highway Authority have not raised any objection to the development and as such it can be considered to comply with Saved Policy IMP8. There have been conditions recommend on any grant of approval which would require for the footpath from the Mill Road/Bell Road junction to the adjacent bus stop and an extension of the footpath from Mill View to the site access. There is also a recommendation that the 30mph speed limit be extended along the southern boundary of the site.

Residential amenity

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

4.19 The density of the proposed site, 24 dwellings on 1.21 ha, provides for assurance that the site could be designed so as to not impact on the residential amenity of Mill View residents to a degree which would warrant refusal of the application. It is considered that through the reserved matters application process the full requirements of Saved Policy IMP9 can be achieved.

Ecology

4.20 Protection of local habitats and encouragement of biodiversity is required through Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV15 and this is consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF, which sets out the government’s approach to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide enhancement measures.

4.21 To the west of the site is a CWS which adjoins Coston Fen Runhall Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England have advised that the proposed development will not impact on the SSSI.

4.22 The application does not detail any specific enhancement measures and it is not known to have any ecological constraints. It is considered appropriate that if approval is granted the applicant must provide an ecological survey with a management plan and recommendations to ensure that the intent of Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV15 and Section 11 of the NPPF are met.

Emerging Policy BARN1

4.23 The policy attached to the site in the emerging Local Plan requires the site design to acknowledge the role as a gateway to the village when approached from the south, and a footpath or pedestrian refuge to be provided along Bell Road. Anglian Water stated that there were capacity constraints, so there is also a policy requirement to confirm the water infrastructure capacity prior to development taking place. Due to a representation received from English Heritage, there is a further requirement that there should be no harmful impact on the setting of Kimberley Park, although it is accepted that this would be unlikely given the distance, topography and vegetation between these two locations. The emerging policy also recommends that the site should accommodate 20 dwellings.
4.24 The details provided do not contradict any of the aims and objectives of the emerging policy and as such the development will not undermine the Local Plan process. The provision of 24 units in lieu of the 20 advised through the policy is considered acceptable due to the size of the site and the relatively low density this will result in.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The site lies within a sustainable location and has been identified as a preferred site for new housing for inclusion within the LDF site allocations document. As such, it is considered that the requirements of the NPPF and the Joint Core Strategy for new housing, along with the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweighs Saved Local Plan Policy considerations, and the proposed development should be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8.

5.2 The development will not adversely affect the character of the area or the setting of nearby listed buildings, and will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, drainage or highway safety. As such, the scheme would accord with sections 6, 7 and 12 of the NPPF, Policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, IMP15 and IMP17 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and Policies 1, 2, 3 and 16 of the Joint Core Strategy.

5.3 In all other respects and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and Section 106 Agreement, the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2013/1647/O  
**Parish**: Loddon  

**Applicants Name**: Halsbury Homes Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land North Of George Lane Loddon Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved except access to the site for: Residential development up to 200 dwellings, with access from George Lane and associated infrastructure and open space, including new roundabout junction at A146/George Lane.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Reserved Matters  
3. Approved plans  
4. Management and maintenance of internal streets  
5. Detailed plans roads, footways, cycleways, and drainage  
6. Construction in accordance with condition 5  
7. Roads/footways to binder course before occupation  
8. Roads/footways fully surfaced in accordance with a phasing plan  
9. Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard  
10. 6m driveway length  
11. Minimum garage size 3m x 7m  
12. Construction parking  
13. Construction Traffic Management Plan  
14. Compliance with Construction Traffic Management Plan  
15. Wheel cleaning facilities  
16. Off-site highway improvement works  
17. Completion of 1st phase of highway works (1st occupation)  
18. Completion of 2nd phase of highway works (125th occupation)  
19. Travel Plan  
20. No more than 200 dwellings  
21. Foul Drainage  
22. Surface Water management  
23. Materials Management Plan  
24. Ecological management plan  
25. Public Access Strategy  
26. Noise report  
27. Contaminated Land – scheme to be submitted  
28. Implementation of remediation scheme  
29. Contaminated land during construction  
30. Lighting  
31. Construction Environmental Management Plan  
32. Slab levels  
33. Boundary Treatment  
34. Landscaping  
35. Retention of trees and hedges  
36. Tree protection  
37. Fire Hydrants  
38. External materials to be agreed

Approval subject to a Section 106 to secure affordable housing provision at 33%, NCC planning and transport obligations and open space provision
1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
- Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
- Policy 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
- ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
- ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
- ENV 14: Habitat protection  
- ENV 15: Species protection  
- IMP 2: Landscaping  
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
- IMP 9: Residential amenity  
- IMP 10: Noise  
- LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
- UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
- UTL 15: Contaminated land  
- TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
- TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
- TRA 17: Off site road improvements  
- TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/2011  
Construction of new medical centre, associated car parking and landscaping and new access  
Approved

2.2 2009/0261  
Screening Opinion for proposed residential development and associated infrastructure and open space  
EIA not required

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Loddon Parish Council  
Recommends refusal. The amount of dwellings proposed would have detrimental impact on the living standards of the existing residents and would adversely affect the character and quality of the area.
Development of up to 50 dwellings would be acceptable as this would soften the visual impact of the medical centre. Any development of the site should secure the roundabout through a Section 106 agreement.

3.2 District Member – Cllr Gould

This large application for houses to be built at George Lane gives me grave concern about highway issues, especially since the proposed entry point is near to the Middle School with all the associated traffic and pupil movements, not only from that school but from the High School and the Nursery. I would like to know what additional highway improvements are to be made apart from the round-about on the A146 junction with George Lane, i.e. footpaths, pedestrian crossings and improvements at the George Lane, Bridge Street junction. I would need to be satisfied that the development would not exceed the stated number of units, and that the 200 is not just a starting number. There needs to be reassurance from Anglian Water that there is sufficient capacity in the treatment works to take this and the Ex-Press Plastics development. The surface water run-off arrangements would need careful consideration as there have been flooding issues at the back of Bridge Street from the drain which takes the Filbert Road estate run off. There are other infrastructure queries relating to this proposal which would need clarification, i.e. capacity at the schools, doctors etc. In view of the Highway matters I feel that this application should be determined by the Development Management Committee.

3.3 Broads Authority

The site will not be visible from the BA executive area and, consequently, landscape impacts on the protected landscape of the Broads are limited to the degree that the site forms part of the setting of the Broads area.

The retention of the existing woodland in the north-western corner of the site is welcomed; this woodland is considered particularly important for landscape and ecological reasons. Further extension of the woodland would be welcomed and could reinforce the buffer between the development and wetland area, providing both landscape and nature conservation benefits.

The incorporation of mitigation measures (SUDS) to attenuate run off from the site in order to address issues concerning water quality and flood risk are welcomed and the details of this part of the scheme should be designed so as not to have a detrimental impact on the water quality in the River Chet.

Finally, it is considered that given the proximity to the Broads and protected species habitat, external lighting should be carefully designed to ensure that light pollution is minimised.

Subject to the above comments the Broads Authority raises no objection to the scheme.

3.4 NCC Minerals and Waste

Norfolk County Council is objecting to the application 2013/1647/O on the grounds of mineral resource safeguarding. This is in its capacity as the Statutory Authority for mineral planning in Norfolk.

The County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority objects to the planning application on this site unless:
1. the applicant carries out investigations to identify whether the resource is viable for mineral extraction (and assessment through particle size distribution testing), and

2. if the mineral resource is viable, the applicant considers whether it could be extracted economically prior to development taking place.

It is considered that the applicant should consider the use of a Materials Management Plan, to ascertain the quantities of aggregate which could be obtained from groundworks, sustainable drainage systems etc, and then reused in the construction phase of the scheme.

3.5 Planning Policy

Loddon is identified as a ‘Key Service Centre’ in the 2011 adopted Joint Core Strategy and is earmarked for growth of between 100-200 dwellings. South Norfolk Council are currently preparing a Site Specific Allocations and Policies document to implement the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy and following detailed site assessment are proposing to allocate the application site off George Lane for 200 new dwellings.

Pre-Submission objections have been received to policy LOD1 – Land at George Lane, Loddon and therefore my policy advice is that limited weight can be given to this allocation at the current time.

3.6 NCC Highways

No objections.

Comments on supplementary phasing plan:
The applicant is intending to mitigate the transport impacts of the development by altering the A146/George Lane Junction into a roundabout as well as realigning George Lane along the site frontage. Phasing for the mitigation works has been agreed. All the works associated with the realigned George Lane will be completed before any development is occupied and the roundabout on the A146 will be completed before the 125 dwelling is occupied. The development will be close to local schools and a Toucan crossing is being provided to assist pupils and residents to cross George Lane to gain access to the footway/cycleway network to the schools and Loddon town centre.

A Travel Plan will be provided and this is covered by Condition and will also need a s106 Agreement to secure the necessary funding for the Travel Plan. The Highway Authority recommends no objection subject to completion of a S106 agreement to cover the matters mentioned above and conditions being applied.

3.7 Environment Agency

No objections. Pre-commencement condition recommended regarding detailed drainage information and management.

3.8 Waveney Lower Yare & Lothingland Internal Drainage Board

The applicant will require for Byelaw consent for any changes to the flows of surface water in the board’s district. The board will need to be satisfied with the design and maintenance arrangements for any on-site attenuation. Concern also raised regarding the potential for
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3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objections. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Sisland STW that at present has available capacity for these flows.

3.10 Historic Environment Service

No objections.

3.11 Landscape Officer

To be reported

3.12 Conservation and Design Officer

No objections raised in principle. Additional information will be required to ensure that the development provides a high quality setting to views from Chedgrave Manor listed building and evaluates the impacts of the development on the surrounding countryside with regard to its transition from rural to urban form.

Other than the Old Town Hall in Loddon, I am not aware of other buildings having Dutch gables, which are not particularly distinctive features of the character of the town. I am not therefore convinced of the appropriateness of these as architectural features within the development as illustrated on the indicative perspective view of the site entrance and within the development as shown on the indicative perspective view of Green Lane. The approach of defining character areas is supported however further evidence will be required to guide these.

3.13 NCC Ecologist

No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.14 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objections. Conditions recommended for the submission of contaminated land investigations, further noise evaluation, lighting scheme and construction environmental management plan.

3.15 Environmental Services (Flood Defence Officer)

No objections. There have been a number of objections that raise flooding and drainage issues. As the surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development will drain to the northern boundary watercourse and into the River Chet it will direct surface water away from the main areas of concern in Filbert Road, Garden Court and Beck Way.

Further detailed investigations should be undertaken as part of the detailed design phase to ensure that ground conditions are fully taken into account and that the proposed development is not vulnerable to flooding taking into consideration all sources of flood risk.

3.16 Housing Strategy Manager

No objections

3.17 NCC- Planning Obligations

No objections.

3.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No objections. Advice provided regarding final designs and layouts.
3.19 Public Representations
There have been 42 representations received. 39 of these are objections and they raise the following issues:

- Loddon does not have sufficient infrastructure or services for 200 more homes
- The application does not comply with planning policy
- The development encourages the use of cars
- The development will erode the character and appearance of the town
- Traffic issues will be exacerbated
- Highway mitigation should be installed before any houses
- The development will make drainage issues in Filbert
- Road/Garden Court worse
- Accessing the school and doctors during construction will be dangerous
- The development will lead to more flooding
- There are not enough jobs in Loddon to provide employment for the new development occupiers
- Incorrect location for development of the scale proposed
- Vehicle entrance is in the wrong location
- Increased population leads to further crime and disorder. Policing is light in the town.
- Environmental and wildlife impacts are unacceptable
- Increased vehicular movements lead to noise and air pollution
- Obstruction and loss of views
- Footpaths connecting the new development to the existing are not wanted
- Insufficient demand for the development, houses for sale in Loddon and Express Plastics site still being built out.

The three letters of support only raise the issue that an increased variety of house type could be provided.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located on the north western edge of Loddon and bounded by the A146 to the west and George Lane to the south. To the north lies open countryside and to the east is Loddon.

4.2 The River Chet is approximately 65 metres to the north of the site, the flood plain of which meets the northern boundary of the site. Opposite the site to south is Loddon Junior School, and playing fields to the southwest.

4.3 The site is predominantly a single arable field with a small block of woodland and an area of grassland in the north, roughly rectangular and totalling 14.87ha. The net developable area is approximately 9ha due to the flood plain to the north of the site and the woodland which will act as a landscape buffer.

4.4 On the south east corner of the site there is the recently built medical centre which incorporates its own access. The site is reasonably level with a gentle slope from the south (along George Lane) to the north towards the flood plain. A single mature oak tree stands in the centre of the field.

4.5 Outline planning permission for residential development, of up to 200 dwellings, is sought with all matters reserved except access to the site. The application also proposes to provide for associated infrastructure and open space, including a new roundabout junction.
at A146/George Lane. The proposal includes 66 affordable units which equates to 33% of all units and the roundabout would be delivered before 125 dwellings are occupied.

4.6 Access is proposed to be gained via George Lane with an additional emergency access to the south eastern corner of the site adjacent to the medical centre. The access would include improved footway/cycleway infrastructure as well as a controlled pedestrian crossing opposite the medical centre.

4.7 Approximately 1.5ha of amenity and public space is proposed to be provided within the development. The green buffer to the north of the site would allow for natural drainage to be incorporated as well as provide for a potential ecological refuge for local wildlife.

Principle of Development

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

4.9 The NPPF directs that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing land cannot be considered up to date where a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites does not exist. Loddon is situated within the rural policy area which has a confirmed 5 year land supply of sites. Therefore 5 year land supply is not an issue for consideration within the determination of the planning application.

4.10 However, it should be noted that JCS Policy 14 identifies Loddon/Chedgrave as a Key Service Centre which should within the plan period provide for up to 200 dwellings. The quantum of development proposed is in accordance with the aspirations of the JCS Policy 14.

4.11 The emerging Site Specific Allocation and Policies Document identify the application site as the Council’s preferred development option for Loddon (LOD1 – Land at George Lane, Loddon), although this can only be given limited weight at this stage. The Pre-Submission consultation period closed on 13th December 2013 and this site has received representations of objection.

4.12 The principle of development on the application site cannot be established through the saved local plan policies and therefore unless there are other material considerations which would dictate otherwise the application should be refused in accordance with Saved Policy ENV8 and because the Local Plan process is not at an advanced enough stage to provide any significant weight to the selection of this site for development.

4.13 Given the current policy position detailed above it is essential to examine any other material considerations which may allow for the development to be considered acceptable. Material considerations which could be given balance to the overall decision could include infrastructure investment, ecological enhancements, community benefits and economic factors; and these will be examined within the remainder of the report.

Highways

4.14 The application proposes to provide for two access points, one of which would be for emergency purposes only. The development would also provide for the approach from George Lane to the A146 to be realigned and a roundabout on the A146 to be installed. The applicant has advised that this would be phased within the development programme. The road re-alignment would be begun before the occupation of any dwelling to ensure that access to the site and the A146 junction was maintained. The final stage of the road realignment and the roundabout would be completed before occupation of the 125th dwelling.
The drawing detailing these works is attached as appendix 2 to the report.

4.15 The application would also provide for an enhanced pedestrian network with a footpath/cycleway connection from the development to the roundabout and a toucan crossing on George Lane.

4.16 It should be noted that the emerging Local Plan Policy LOD1 requires for highway improvements to be obtained through the development of the site. This current proposal would provide for a roundabout, which is considered to be a significant infrastructure investment in the local highway network and beyond that envisaged by the emerging policy. The application is considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP8, TRA 1 and TRA 3 and with what would reasonably be expected through the emerging Local Plan Policy LOD1.

4.17 The level of investment proposed in providing the roundabout and realignment of George Lane and the safety improvements this would provide in obtaining access to George Lane/A146/Mundham Road are material planning considerations of significance and must be given due weight in the overall decision making process.

Design and Conservation

4.18 NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 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 development proposal is in outline form for up to 200 dwellings and the applicant has supplied details of an indicative layout for the site which provides for a density which is appropriate when compared with the surrounding development. The layout also demonstrates the ability to accommodate large areas of open recreational space, up to 1.5 ha, which could provide for shortfalls which Loddon may be experiencing in certain types of play facility.

4.20 Within their submission the applicant has acknowledged the need to create a gateway area to the entrance of the site to reflect the Tayler & Green dwellings to the southeast of the site and the importance of designing the site to respect the setting of Chedgrave Manor. However, the application fails to show clear design options for achieving these aims. It should be noted that the application is in outline and should approval be granted these matters could be dealt with through the reserved matters submissions. This is an approach which the Council’s Design and Conservation Team are comfortable with.

4.21 The indicative layout submitted with the planning application provides adequate assurance that the site can accommodate the desired dwelling yield whilst complying with the requirements of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2. The applicants have provided sufficient information to demonstrate an understanding of how the final designs should be considered with the use of the Place Making Guide SPD methodology and the Building for Life assessment. It is considered that with further Council Officer guidance a high quality build out which would respect the townscape, open countryside and conservation characteristics of the locality could be achieved.

Ecology, Landscape and Drainage

4.22 Protection of local habitats and encouragement of biodiversity is required through Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV15 and this is consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF, which sets out the government’s approach to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide enhancement measures.
The majority of the site is considered to be of low ecological value. The areas to the north of site which contain woodland and field drains offer some quality habitats which would require to be protected and enhanced through the development proposal.

The nearest statutory designation is Hardley Flood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), located approximately 1.6km to the east of the site. Hardley Flood is an area of shallow lagoons and reedbeds that act as a spillway for the River Chet, supporting a range of wading birds, nesting wildfowl and other wetland birds. This area is also subject to international designation as part of the Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Broadland Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site.

It is recommended by the County Ecologist that an ecological management plan with provision for appropriate infrastructure features to aid both the protection of water vole breeding habitat and facilitate community use of the space be conditioned. The applicants ecological report also recommends the creation of publically accessible wetlands with pond dipping platforms and pathways. There would also be the requirement to ensure that areas along the northern boundary are fenced off from the public to protect the ditches which form water vole habitats.

The Environment Agency have not objected to the development and advise that the northern boundary of the site lies in Flood Zones 3 and 2. The proposed development has followed the Sequential Approach and is to be located solely within Flood Zone 1, as will the access route therefore there are no flood risk concerns.

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has outlined the proposed surface water drainage strategy. This is proposed to consist of attenuation basins with restricted outfall to the River Chet. This is considered an acceptable drainage strategy providing that infiltration is not feasible on the site. The FRA states that although infiltration testing has not been undertaken the soil types are anticipated to have low infiltration potential and that it is expected that there would be high groundwater levels on the site.

The EA have recommended a condition requiring detailed plans and management arrangements to be submitted should approval be granted. This condition covers the details which would also be required to satisfy the Waveney Lower Yare & Lothingland Internal Drainage Board.

The application details have demonstrated that a 10m wide landscaping belt on the western boundary can be achieved and the indicative masterplan identifies areas for enhancement planting. The application is accompanied with an arboricultural impacts assessment which advises that apart from some vegetation loss to create vehicular access points there should be no requirement to lose any further vegetation.

The combination of attenuation basins, public access arrangements and landscape planting around the site could result in the creation of an enhanced wildlife habitat zone that is also beneficial to the public and wider landscape appearance. This would satisfy the requirements of the relevant planning policies.

Should approval be forthcoming the applicant will require to discharge the relevant drainage conditions to ensure that the development does not add pressure to the existing flood risk areas, including The Mill at Chedgrave, and that the quality of the water flowing to the Hardley Flood Site does not diminish.

Minerals Safeguarding

NCC Minerals and Waste have objected to the application due to the applicant not having carried out investigations into potential mineral deposits within the site. To refuse the application on these grounds at this stage of the Local Plan and planning application process is not considered to be defensible position. The situation has been discussed with
the applicant and it is agreed that a condition on any grant of approval to provide for a minerals management plan will still provide for opportunities to utilise sand and gravel from onsite resources to be used in the construction phases of the development.

4.33 This will improve the sustainability of the project by reducing the need to extract sand and gravel from other locations, reducing the carbon cost of the project by reducing the quantity of aggregate needing to be transported to the site, reducing the quantities of material removed from the site as part of the groundworks operations, and ensuring that resources in other areas are not unnecessarily extracted, so that they can be available to sustain future growth.

4.34 There are also opportunities on restoration for areas in which mineral has been extracted to form part of sustainable drainage systems, areas for recreation/open space, and/or renewable energy schemes, such as ground source heat pumps.

Emerging Policy LOD1

4.35 The Council’s proposed Policy LOD1 provides for the following development requirements:
- Approximately 200 dwellings
- 1.5 hectares of amenity open space
- Density commensurate with adjoining housing
- Road access to the site must be off George Lane
- Highway improvements to the A146/ George Lane junction
- Enhanced footway/ cycleway links to the town centre
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place
- 10m landscaping belt along western boundary within the site
- Provision of natural green space with public access within low lying northern area of site overlapping flood zones 2/3
- Open space provision in accordance with the Councils adopted standards
- Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development
- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources.

4.36 The development proposal is considered to comply with the majority of the requirements detailed above and through the submission of further information on reserved matters and discharge of condition applications the remainder can also be addressed. Accordingly the application is considered to comply with the policy direction.

5 Conclusion

5.1 On balance the application is considered to be acceptable, a basic principle when assessing planning applications is outlined in Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which states:

“If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.

5.2 In this instance regard has been had for the relevant development plan the current local plan saved policies do not support the proposal, however it should be noted that the development is compliant with JCS Policy 14 which is the most recently prepared and adopted policy. Therefore compliance with JCS Policy 14 carries significant weight.

5.3 The material considerations of providing for significant investment in highway infrastructure, recreational facilities and ecological enhancements which would act as benefits to the wider locality have resulted in a balanced judgement being made and recommending the application for approval.
5.4 The site is in a sustainable location which has easy access to the town centre services and local facilities. The applicant has not requested to modify any requirements such as affordable housing or recreation space provision and therefore the site must be considered viable and deliverable.

5.5 Through the reserved matters and discharge of condition processes the development can be designed to meet with all of the relevant policy requirements including drainage, mineral safeguarding and design.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Ian Reilly 01508 533674
Contact Officer, E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2013/1986/O  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: Mr Sean Marten  
Site Address: Land To The West Of Norwich Road And South Of Caistor Lane  
Poringland Norfolk  
Proposal: Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the construction of up to 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Outline permission time limit
2. Submission of reserved matters and Master Plan
3. Ecology mitigation
4. Materials
5. Surface water drainage details
6. Details of foul water disposal (inc. pumping station)
7. Detailed plans of estate roads to be submitted and agreed
8. Works in accordance with agreed details
9. Roads and footpaths to binder course before occupation
10. Phasing plan for road and footpath provision to be agreed
11. Off-site highways drainage
12. Off-site highway works
13. Parking provision in accordance with adopted standards
14. Driveway lengths to front of garages minimum 6 metres
15. Internal dimensions garages 3 x 7 metres
16. Construction vehicle parking TBA
17. Wheel washing details TBA
18. Travel Plan
19. Landscaping
20. Landscaping management plan
21. Fire hydrants
22. Tree and hedge protection
23. Archaeology

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

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.5 Site Allocations and Policies Document (proposed submission November 2013)
POR 1 Land at Heath Farm, Poringland

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/1986 Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the construction of up to 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure Pending consideration.

2.2 2013/0506 Full application for 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure. Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils:
- Poringland Approve – subject to satisfactory design, including appropriate equality and diversity through no segregation of social and affordable housing.

- Caistor St Edmund Comments on additional highway information awaited.

3.2 District Members:
- Cllr Lisa Neal To be reported if appropriate.
- Cllr J Overton To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Planning Policy The application is on a site which is allocated in the emerging Local Plan. The entire Local Plan allocation (on the site stretching from Caistor Lane to Stoke Road) is for approximately 200 dwellings.

There is an application on the southern part of the site for up to 100 dwellings. The two applications combined would take the number of dwellings on the site up to 250. Assuming this allowed suitable mitigation of the site’s features as identified in the site assessment process (surface water drainage, underground water mains, TPOs adjoining the site, minerals underlying the site, the need to
investigate the Historic Environment Record, waste water and sewerage capacity issues and access issues) and assuming the case officer was satisfied with other aspects of the scheme, there would be no policy objection to this level of density.

The level of affordable housing suggested by the Design & Access Statement is 33%, which meets the requirements of JCS Policy 4.

Poringland is in the Norwich Policy Area. At the Examination in Public into the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy the GNPD Councils presented a supply of 4.58 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and 4.66 years for the South Norfolk part of the NPA, at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply, and there is still debate about the assumptions this calculation is based on; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections.

3.5 Flood Defence Officer Request a suitable condition be attached to any permission to address:

- Adoption and management of the drainage proposals
- Demonstrate that the scheme has been adequate sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 year rainfall event.
- Continuity of ditch management.
- Land drainage consents

3.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd No objection

- The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Poringland STW that will have available capacity for these flows.
- The proposed development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water has worked with the developer to determine mitigation measures and has agreed a foul drainage strategy which will mitigate the risk and enable the development to connect. The drainage strategy for the site should cover the procurement of the improvement works.
- A condition requiring the agreed drainage strategy covering the issue(s) is requested.

3.7 Design Officer The DAS provides a very basic assessment of the site context and its setting that identifies the character of Poringland and describes the existing landscape character and land uses. The applicant states that the design of the development will be in keeping with the local architectural styles and will create distinct neighbourhoods. Appearance of units and design will be detailed through Reserved Matters or full application should this application be approved. Care should therefore be taken to ensure that any future proposals respond positively to existing development in Poringland, whilst providing a distinctive and attractive character that help to enhance its immediate setting.
The development should also try and capitalise on its role as an ‘entrance/gateway to the village’ by creating an attractive edge along its southern boundary by positioning buildings strategically to create an interesting street scape as well as providing glimpses into and out of the site and countryside beyond.

Should this application be approved, further work must be carried out to ensure that development proposals meet the policy requirements set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Policy 2 of the JCS.

3.8 Environment Agency No objection.

3.9 NCC Highways No objection, subject to conditions

The application is essentially identical in highway terms to the previous detailed application ref 2013/0506. The Highway Authority recommended no objection to that development with a suitable highways mitigation package. This current application is offering the same mitigation package which includes:

- Safe primary access including the widening of Caistor Lane and the provision of a footway to Norwich Road
- Enhancements to the walk to school route including the installation of a Toucan Crossing on Norwich Road in the vicinity of the High School
- Enhancements to the bus stops on Norwich Road by making them DDA compliant and by providing shelters
- A travel plan which will encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport.

All the supporting information has been considered and whilst the latest Junction Capacity Sensitivity Testing Report uses amended traffic count information the changes are not considered significant nor likely to produce a material change to traffic conditions on the local roads especially at the Norwich Road/Caistor Lane junction. A Travel Plan performance bond will be required and this should be secured by S106 agreement before any planning permission is granted.

3.10 Housing Strategy Manager The application has agreed to provide 33% affordable housing in accordance with policy. A suitable mix of 41 flats/houses for rent and 8 houses for shared ownership has been agreed.

3.11 NCC - Planning Obligations Require developer contributions towards the enhancement of Poringland Primary School, Nursery provision and High School provision.

3.12 Norfolk Wildlife Trust No comments received

3.13 Norfolk HES No objection, subject to an appropriate condition requiring a scheme of archaeological investigation to be agreed and implemented.

3.14 Police Architectural Liaison Officer Has provided general comments to guide the final design and layout of the scheme.
3.15 Representations

28 letters of objection received to submitted plans

- Infrastructure already overstretched
- Caistor Lane not suitable for any more traffic
- Will ruin a quiet lane
- Heath Farm is not fit for purpose to have dwellings built on it
- Drainage problems
- Caistor Lane is a rat-run and it will only get worse
- Unacceptable increase in traffic on a small country road
- Noise and amenity impact from the access to the site
- Too many dwellings proposed
- Traffic congestion on Caistor Lane
- Noise/light impact – loss of privacy
- Dev. Does not comply with policy IMP8
- No requirement for the development

A further 19 letters of objection received following the submission of additional junction capacity testing information.

- Late submission of information is not acceptable.
- The new survey confirms the real problems that the traffic will cause.
- Development is uninspiring
- This development must be taken into account with others. Scheme is unsustainable.
- Increase in traffic will be dangerous to those who live on Caistor Lane
- Flooding
- Noise from the sewage pumping station
- Noise, loss of privacy
- Updated traffic information concerning fiveways roundabout not provided to the Council.

4. Assessment

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

4.2 This application seeks outline approval only for the northern part of the site, with the only access off Caistor Lane. A total of 150 dwellings are proposed along with an access road, drainage attenuation, open space, and landscaping. A sister application for outline permission (100 dwellings) on the southern part of the site was approved by members at the Development Management Committee on the 11th September 2013 (2013/0505 refers).

4.3 With the exception of access, all matters are reserved.

4.4 The submission of this outline application follows the refusal of an application for full planning permission for 150 dwellings (app. no.2013/0506), which was refused on design grounds. At the Development Management Committee members agreed the principle of development.

4.5 The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document identifies this 15-hectare area of land as a preferred site for residential development, and although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration. The site is outside the current development boundary for the village.
4.6 As the site is located outside the current development boundary in an area of open countryside (as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003), the application is clearly contrary to saved local plan policy ENV8. The proposal should therefore be refused unless there are material considerations that dictate otherwise. In my opinion, the following material considerations need to be taken into account in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Poringland/Framingham Earl for further development of between 100 - 200 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026. Settlements within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) may also be considered for additional development to help deliver the 1800 dwellings ‘in smaller sites within the NPA.
- The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document allocates the wider 15-hectare site for 200 dwellings.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities.
- The sustainability of the site's location, having regard to Poringland/Framingham Earl being defined as a Key Service Centre within Policy 14 of the Joint Core Strategy.
- The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years.
- The acceptance of the principle of development when refusing application 2013/0506 on design grounds.
- The environmental impacts of developing the site, including the impacts on existing infrastructure.
- Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

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

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

4.8 In refusing the previous full application on this site (ref: 2013/0505), members did accept the principle of residential development up to 150 dwellings. A material consideration in reaching this conclusion was the fact that the site forms part of a wider 15-hectare site allocated as a preferred site for housing in the Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document. However, as the application now seeks to formally establish the principle of development on the site, I re-assess the acceptability of the principle of development below.
NPPF, JCS & the 5-year land supply of housing

4.9 Members should be aware that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not remove the need to assess the proposed development having first had regard to the development plan, however the relevant planning policies referred to need to be up-to-date. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities. Whilst material considerations then need to be taken into account, the NPPF advises that development should be approved unless the 'adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'.

4.10 Poringland/Framingham Earl has been selected as a Key Service Centre in the JCS as it has a range of facilities that enable it to meet local needs as well as the needs of residents of the surrounding areas. These centres also benefit from good public transport services. In this respect I consider the site to be in a sustainable location.

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

4.12 Having also given weight to the sites’ status as a preferred site for residential development in our emerging Local Plan Site Allocations Policy POR1, as well as members acknowledgement of this in refusing the previous application on design grounds only, I consider that the principle of development can be accepted, subject to consideration of the remaining issues set out below.

Drainage & flood risk

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

4.14 The development will result in a greenfield site becoming impermeable creating an increase in surface water run-off. However, this additional run-off will be contained within a drainage system on the site, prior to controlled discharge to surrounding ditches.

4.15 Key drainage points can be summarised as follows:

- On site surface water run-off will be attenuated to Greenfield rates, utilising improved ditches.
- Discharge to surrounding ditches will be contained prior to controlled discharge to four outfalls. This will reduce the uncontrolled run-off to the surrounding area.
- A swale is proposed to contain runoff from the on-site spring that has historically caused flooding in Highgrove Court.
- Drainage ditches will be managed and maintained by a Management Company.

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

4.17 Anglian Water has also confirmed that capacity exists to cater for the foul flows from the development, and is content with the proposed foul drainage strategy for the site. (This incorporates on-site storage and pumping to a connection point on Caistor Lane.)
4.18 Taking the above into account, I consider that in respect of flood risk, the application is in accordance with the requirements of section 10 of the NPPF, having demonstrated that the site can be developed without an increase in flood risk elsewhere.

Highway Impact

4.19 As per the previous submission on this site, the applicants are proposing to split the site into two phases, with this outline application for 150 dwellings being served off Caistor Lane at a point where there is adequate space to provide the required junction. The remaining 100 dwellings would be served off Stoke Road, as per the approved scheme 2013/0505. The applicants have submitted a Transport Assessment covering the impact of both sites, which has been assessed by NCC: Highways. Whilst it is acknowledged that additional burden will be placed on the local highway network at peak travel times, the highway improvements and the proposed residential travel plan will help to mitigate this impact.

4.20 The current application was submitted with the same Transport Assessment acceptable to NCC: Highways when previously submitted. However, the Parish Council and many local residents were concerned that the survey should have been conducted over a longer period and to cover the school finish peak. The applicants have sought to address this in the submission of the results of additional surveys undertaken over a period of 3 days. This information was submitted to the Council on the 18th December 2013, and a 14-day re-consultation was undertaken with a view to the application being taken to the Jan 8th Development Management committee. However, as the consultation period ran over the Christmas holiday period, an extension of time was agreed with the applicant to allow for additional time for the Parish Council and local residents to consider the additional traffic survey information, and for the application to be brought before members in February.

4.21 NCC: Highways have taken into account the additional information submitted by the applicants, and as stated at para 3.9 of this report, they have maintained their view and do not object to the application subject to appropriate conditions covering the requirement for detailed designs of the road widening to Caistor Lane, a new footpath, a pedestrian crossing to Norwich Road, and submission and implementation of a travel plan which will encourage walking and cycling and the use of public transport.

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

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

4.23 Direct impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties will need to be assessed following the submission of reserved matters detailing the design and layout of the scheme.

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

4.25 Subject to the submission of an appropriate design and layout at the reserved matters stage, in terms of the impact of highway access and egress the application is considered to accord with saved local plan policy IMP9 (Residential Amenity). Indicative layout and design

4.26 JCS Policy 2, Section 7 of the NPPF, and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide require high quality design and great importance is attached to the design of the built environment,
with it being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. An indicative layout has been submitted with the application, purely to show how the scale of the development proposed could be accommodated within the context of the wider site. The Design & Access Statement provides a very basic assessment of the site context and its setting, and the Masterplan for the wider site shows how the development relates to the adjoining site to the south. The applicant also states that the design of the development will be in keeping with local architectural styles and will create distinct neighbourhoods, something that members identified as having not been satisfactorily addressed in refusing the previous full application 2013/0506. The Council’s Design Officer acknowledges this, and advises that any future proposals should respond positively to existing development in Poringland and provide a distinctive and attractive character that will help enhance the site’s immediate setting.

4.27 Subject to the submission of reserved matters in accordance with the Masterplan/Design & Access statement and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide, the development clearly has the potential to achieve a high standard of design as required by JCS Policy 2.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is accepted that as of March 31st 2013 there is not currently a five year supply of sites within the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The lack of a five year supply, the requirements of the NPPF, and the fact that the site is a preferred site for residential development, are very strong material considerations in favour of this application.

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Gary Hancox 01508 533841 and E-mail: ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

6. **Appl. No**: 2013/1692/RVC  
**Parish**: ASWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL

- **Applicants Name**: Mrs Lucie Hustler  
- **Site Address**: Rectory Farm Whipps Lane Fundenhall Norwich NR16 1DT  
- **Proposal**: Variation of Conditions 1 & 2 of Planning Permission 2009/1163/F-  
  To allow sports club to use facilities to provide lessons to other members

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Personal use of stables.
2. Restricted use of arena for non-applicant horses and/or commercial (club) training for max. 24 days per annum, Mondays to Fridays only.
3. Maximum of 10 horses in total on site at one time.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2013/1327**: Conversion of barn and milking parlour to residential use, to create new dwelling; new highways entrance; alterations to existing shed; and new carport; new boundary walls  
**Approved**

2.2 **2013/1328**: Conversion of barn and milking parlour to residential use, to create new dwelling; new highways entrance; alterations to existing shed; and new carport; new boundary walls  
**Approved**

2.3 **2012/0522**: Conversion of barn and milking parlour to residential use; new highways entrance; new vehicle shed; alterations to existing Farmhouse and new carport; new boundary walls  
**Approved**

2.4 **2012/0512**: Conversion of barn and milking parlour to residential use; new highways entrance; new vehicle shed; alterations to existing Farmhouse and new carport; new boundary walls  
**Approved**

2.5 **2009/1163**: Retrospective application for: Demolition of existing horse arena and reworking of site to provided extended arena, erection of wall  
**Approved (except lighting)**
mounted floodlights and change of use of agricultural barns for the keeping of horses.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Need further information to offer a comment:
Insufficient detail on who will be using the facilities and the traffic data was inconsistent.

Need detail of condition imposed on the 2009 permission so that they can familiarizes themselves with the variation.

3.2 District Member

To Committee.
- I cannot see a problem with what is proposed, there being no commercial interests involved, and as it is to allow other equestrians to use the facility in limited numbers traffic numbers should be low.
- Whether conditions to user numbers are necessary is for the committee to decide.

3.3 NCC Highways

Support conditionally:
- Some scope for lessons but should be a restriction on the use of the site by third parties in order to control traffic levels to and from the site.

3.4 Representations

4 letters of objection received
- This is a retrospective application.
- Condition specifically excludes any commercial activity riding school/livery - Carleton Riding Club is a riding school and offers lessons at Fundenhall.
- Carleton Riding Club is not in Fundenhall therefore local residents should not have to suffer nuisance being caused by activities.
- Large horsebox traffic unsuitable for the single track roads.
- Funding for Carleton Riding Club members is not the concern of residents of Fundenhall.

4. Assessment

4.1 The current application is retrospective for the variation of conditions 1 and 2 of the 2009 permission. The conditions allowed the stables and arena to be used solely for the horses of the occupants of Rectory Farm and those of their immediate family and not for any commercial purposes (e.g. riding school/livery). The arena has been used during 2013 by members of Carleton Riding Club (of which the applicants are members) for private lessons. The proposal is for the continued use of these facilities by the club.

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

4.3 During the consultation process for the current application issues were raised which required investigation as part of the application. These issues are as follows: the arena being constructed larger than the approved 2009 permission, the re-location of a field gateway, and the construction of a greenhouse. In addition objections were raised to the current application which are also considered below.
4.4 In 2009 a retrospective application was submitted for the extension and re-configuration of the arena. The application included the change of use of agricultural barns to stables. The arena as revised provided an 'L' shape which extends to the rear of the stable buildings. The size and position of the arena has been assessed following the issues raised. I can confirm that the arena remains as approved at that time and no action is required.

Re-location of the field access

4.5 The field access was historically from Whipps Lane, through the old arena, and through a second gate into the fields to the rear of the farm. As part of the 2009 permission the re-configured arena allowed the existing gate to be accessed without the need to enter the arena, providing a wider independent access to the field gate at the rear of the farm, this situation remains unchanged to date. The access is lawful therefore no action is required.

The construction of a greenhouse

4.6 The greenhouse referred to formed part of the application for the conversion of the barn, although the footprint of the greenhouse was shown on the plan, no plans for the design of the greenhouse were received or approved. This issue has been raised with the applicant and their agent and is being addressed separately, it does not form part of this application.

Issues to be assessed for current application.

4.7 The proposal is assessed on three main areas which are: Intensification of use, impact on neighbours and highway safety.

Intensification

4.8 The purpose of the original conditions imposed on the 2009 permission was to ensure that there was limited impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, and that the number of vehicle movements to and from the site did not have an adverse impact on the highway safety. In this instance, notwithstanding the previous conditions on the 2009 permission, the use of the site and the level of activity needs to be assessed on its own merits.

4.9 From the information received from Carleton Riding Club, the arena has been used on 16 separate days dating from April to October 2013 all Monday - Friday (The dates are published on Carleton Riding Club's website in the clubs diary of events). Each training session is either 45 minutes, or 1 hour duration.

4.10 The applicant has advised that the arena has been used for private lessons between April and October to coincide with the events season which is mainly summer months. However, the number of days requested is 24 to allow flexibility, this number would not appear to be unreasonable given that legislation allows land outside the curtilage of a building to be used on 28 days per calendar year without express permission. The applicant advises that no more than 4 horses would visit the site at a time. With the applicants having a maximum of 6 horses of their own, this gives a total maximum of 10 horses.

4.11 Having assessed the impact this intensification may have on the neighbouring properties it is necessary to impose a conditions to limit the number of horses and to restrict the use to Monday to Friday with no weekend or public holiday use. I acknowledge that we have received objections from the immediate neighbours relating to the increased noise and disturbance resulting from the use, but with a restrictive condition a balance can be achieved between protecting the amenities of neighbours and providing facilities for local
community on a small scale commercial basis acceptable in a rural location.

Residential amenity.

4.12 In terms of impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties there are two issues to consider: The proximity of the arena to neighbouring boundaries, and the level of activity and potential disturbance to neighbours.

4.13 The arena is approximately 40 metres from the wall of the nearest neighbouring property (Home Piece) with no real boundary screening between the application site and the property. Two other residential properties are further to the north east (The Post House and Swifts Barn). Objections have been received from all three properties and the prospective purchaser of Home Piece, relating to the traffic to and from the site, increased noise from the site including shouting from the instructor. This level and type of activity is not considered by neighbours to be appropriate for a rural location.

4.14 Equine activities by nature are located in rural locations, this includes riding schools. However in order to control the level of traffic and impact on neighbouring properties conditions are often imposed to control the level of activities on the site.

4.15 The number of occasions required for this use has been discussed with the applicant and a condition to control the use from Monday to Friday has been recommended as a condition. The reason for this is set out in the section above.

4.16 With the necessary restrictions in place, although the proposal will result in some degree of noise and disturbance to neighbours, the restrictive condition will allow the activities on the site of a commercial nature to be controlled and thereby keep disturbance to an acceptable level.

Highways

4.17 NCC Highways do not object to an increased use of the facilities by persons not associated with the main property. However, to ensure there is no detriment to highway safety, restrictions are suggested to limit the number of days per year that the arena can be used by members of the public. I have had further discussions with the Highways Officer and have concluded that 24 days per calendar year (equivalent to 2 a month) is an acceptable level and will not result in unacceptable levels of traffic to and from the site.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The use of the site for private and limited commercial activity on a basis limited to a maximum of 10 horses and 24 days per calendar year does not result in unacceptable level of disturbance to the neighbouring properties and the level of traffic associated with this level of activity does not raise any objections from the Highways Authority in terms of highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Subject to final comments from Landscape Officer

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 3: River valleys
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0332 Erection of 1 no detached dwelling to existing land
     Refused

2.2 2007/1804 Erection of 1 no. detached single storey dwelling to existing site
     Pending Consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Refuse:
- Backland development
- Outside the current and proposed development plan boundary.
- Queries raised over design, access and services to the site.
- Insufficient track to the site with difficult access onto highway.
- Ownership of access road in dispute.
- Trees in the neighbouring Carr’s Hill wood are protected and could be damaged by the proposal.

3.2 District Member
To be determined by Committee
- Contrary to policy
- Outside Development Limit
3.3 NCC Highways
Recommend same conditions as 2013/0332 – provision of parking and turning only.

3.4 Planning Policy
- No written comments received but verbally agreed comments made in March 2013 remain unchanged, these were as follows:
  - Outside Development Limit for Old Costessey in the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
  - Is Development in Open Countryside.
  - ENV8 relevant.
  - Within River Valley SNLP Policy ENV3 and constitutes inappropriate development.
  - ENV8 and ENV3 broadly in accordance with NPPF.
  - The emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations element of the new Local Plan currently carries limited weight.
  - Site remains outside proposed Development Boundary in the emerging plan.
  - Paragraph 109 of NPPF relevant.
  - Policies 2 and 12 of JCS relevant.
  - Landscape Character Assessment reviewed in 2012 notes threat of incremental development and suburbanisation to the Tud Rural River Valley.
  - Place making guide SPD relevant.
  - Planning permission was granted on appeal in August 2012 for 62 dwellings on the paddocks to the east of the site, which is also outside current and emerging Development Boundaries. Inspector noted proposal would be harmful to character and appearance of area, gave rise to significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, reasonably sustainable location, would not minimise need to travel, some conflict with strategic objectives of Policies 1 and 6 of JCS, taking NPPF as a whole and 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and presumption in favour of sustainable development outweighed the identified harm.
  - Main planning policy consideration is impacts of dwelling on character and appearance of area weighed against contribution to housing land supply.
  - In an appeal decision pre dating NPPF and Inspector concluded that a single dwelling would not make a significant contribution to housing land supply.
  - If land supply outweighs other matters consider reduced time limit for implementation.

3.5 Landscape Officer
To be reported

3.6 Flood Defence Officer
Surface water advisory note.

3.7 Representations
13 letters of objection (multiple letters from Meadow View, Carr’s Hill House and Hillcrest.
- Issues remain unchanged outside development boundary.
- Previous applications refused and dismissed on appeal.
- Access to the site is in private ownership the applicant only has a right to pass and repass. The areas required for the erection of Tree Protection Barriers and protective matting are also in private ownership.
- Access can only be achieved by accessing other people’s land.
- No permission to cut or remove trees to improve visibility or alter the access from Folgate Lane onto the access track.
- Loss of privacy
- Increase in noise levels and reduction of wildlife habitat.
- Existing problems with drainage at Hillcrest (east of the site) proposed connection to the mains drainage through Glenhurst to which Hillcrest connects to will increase existing problems.
- THE GNDP have announced in November 2013 the JCS to be sound and “provides an appropriate basis for planning in the area up to 2026” following further consultation this land remains outside the Development Boundary.
- Levels difference between the site and Hillcrest will result in loss of privacy even with a 6ft fence vehicles would be visible from the downstairs of Hillcrest.

Assessment

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a three bedroom bungalow with an attached garage to be located on a site of 0.15ha accessed by a track leading from Folgate Lane. To the south, east and west of the site are existing dwellings. To the north is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) woodland. Two existing dwellings are currently accessed from the track off Folgate Lane (Meadow View to the east and The Acorns to the west of the site).

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

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

Principle of development

4.4 The site is located outside the Development Limit Designated in the Development Plan. The site is within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) defined in the JCS, but outside the proposed development boundary in the emerging New Local Plan.

4.5 The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply requirement also includes an additional buffer of 5%, brought forward from later in the plan. Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy 2012/13 Monitoring Report shows that there was a supply of 4.42 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area at 31 March 2013. Since March there have been changes to some of the sites that make up the 5-year supply, both increasing and decreasing the supply; however, this remains the most recent published figure agreed by the three local planning authorities.

4.6 Members will be aware from the previous application presented to Committee in August 2013 that planning permission has been granted at appeal in August 2012 for 62 dwellings on the paddocks to the east of the application site. The principle for the development of this site for one dwelling was accepted but the application was refused on design grounds alone.

Design

4.7 The scheme has been redesigned from a hipped roof dwelling with a detached garage, to a gabled roof property with an attached garage. The revised design is more sympathetic to other properties in the wider area of Costessey. The scale of the dwelling as designed will
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not result in significant impact on the neighbouring properties, however Permitted Development Rights have been removed to prevent any alterations to the roof which could result in the loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. The scheme as revised accords with IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Services to the site

4.8 All utility services to the site were proposed along the access track from Folgate Lane. However, since there appears to be some dispute over ownership of the access track the applicant now proposes to route all services through the grounds of Glenhurst onto Townhouse Road, notice has been served on the owners of Glenhurst.

Impact on the Woodland

4.9 Trees to the north of the site which are within the adjacent Carr’s Hill Wood are protected by a TPO, the woodland contributes to the character and appearance of the area. Access to the site would be along a track that runs adjacent to the TPO woodland. The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural report to demonstrate that the development of the plot would not impact on the Woodland.

4.10 However, Sections 4 and 5 of this report (Attached as Appendix 2) refer to the unsurfaced access road to the north of the plot (leading from Folgate Lane to the site). The report sets out essential works required to protect the root systems of the adjacent trees.

4.11 It has become apparent that the ownership of the track remains in dispute and no apparent likelihood of agreement being reached between the parties involved. In these circumstances there is considerable doubt that the necessary works to protect the roots of the TPO’d woodland could be achieved. Without being able to secure protection for the trees, the traffic to and from the site would result in significant harm to the trees which would be in conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and for this reason cannot be supported.

Highway safety

4.12 In the 2008 appeal for two dwellings on the site ref 2007/1804, the Inspector noted that the proposal would not compromise highway safety. NCC Highways have not objected to the current application, but have recommended a condition to ensure vehicles can park and turn on site to enter the leave the highway in forward gear. Therefore, subject to such a condition the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

5 Conclusion
The redesign of the dwelling is now acceptable and with the appropriate conditions to control any alterations of the roof the privacy of the neighbouring properties would be protected. However, the access track needs works to ensure that the root systems of the adjacent protected woodland is protected, and there is considerable doubt that the necessary works can be achieved due to the disputed ownership of the track. In the absence of a mechanism to ensure delivery of the tree protection, the development of this site would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the woodland which would be in conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS and IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3.6 Barriers will be maintained throughout the duration of the works, ensuring that access is denied to the CEZ throughout the process.

3.7 Barriers will be removed only when all construction work is completed.

4.0 TEMPORARY GROUND PROTECTION

4.1 Temporary ground protection will be required as shown on the TPP with orange crosshatching. The ground protection should be constructed as follows depending on the type of traffic that will use it:

- Pedestrian traffic only—a single thickness of scaffold boards on top of a driven scaffold frame to form a suspended walkway, or on top of a compression resistant layer (100mm woodchip) laid on top of a geotextile membrane.
- Light plant up to a gross weight of 2t, proprietary ground protection boards linked to one another on top of a compression resistant layer (150mm woodchip) laid on a geotextile membrane.
- Plant exceeding gross weight of 2t, a specification devised by an engineer will be designed in conjunction with the arboricultural consultant to support the loading that the ground will be subjected to.

4.2 Compaction of the soil can occur from a single pass of a heavy vehicle, especially in wet conditions, and therefore the ground protection must be put in place before any access is allowed.

5.0 ACCESS ROAD

5.1 There is an existing access unsurfaced access road running to the north of the plot. If this surface is not to be improved then the ground protection as specified in section 4 above must be put in place prior to any vehicular access, and for the full duration of the works.

5.2 If a new surface is to be put in place, then it must be constructed using a No-Dig method of construction; the area where no excavation is allowed is shown cross hatched in orange on the Tree Protection Plan Appendix 4.

5.3 A hard surface should be designed to avoid localized compaction by evenly distributing the load over the path or car parking space. The proper source of advice on a finished design are the structural engineers for the project to ensure it is fit for the intended loading and ground conditions. The design must also take full account of arboricultural advice. Appropriate options include three dimensional cellular confinement systems or in some circumstances engineered solutions. The key element is that there will be no excavation.
5.4 In this situation it is likely that a three dimensional cellular confinement system constructed without excavation will be the best solution. Figure 2 below shows a typical construction method of such a No-dig surface using cell web produced by Geosynthetics. It should be noted that there are other manufacturers of cellular confinement systems.

5.5 It will be important ensure that the surface design merges with the level of the other sections of the road. An appropriate depth of confinement system should be chosen and if necessary ramps to smooth out level changes should be constructed.

5.6 Figure 2 shows a typical construction of a No-Dig surface. This example has block paving as the top surface but gravel and a range of other permeable surfaces can be used.

Fig. 2

5.7 The following methodology should be used for the installation of a No-Dig Surface.

5.7.1 The construction of a No-Dig surface must be undertaken in dry weather. There will be no machine movement within the RPA of the trees before the ground is protected by a load spreader and sub base.

5.7.2 Any major protrusions such as flints will be removed prior to commencement. Any hollows will be filled with clean sharp sand prior to laying a fibretex FAM separating geotextile.

5.7.3 The Cellweb panels will be extended to the full length and pinned into place with staking pins to anchor the cells open. Adjacent panels will be stapled together to form a continuous mattress. The surface must be
5.7.4 located at least 0.5m from the base of the retained trees. The mattress will be edged with treated softwood edging boards of sufficient width to accommodate the infill material and held in place with pegs at a minimum spacing of 500mm.

5.7.5 The cells will be filled with a minimum of 100mm of no fines angular granular fill (40 to 20mm). The infill material to be piled at the end of the extended web and pushed over the expanded cells working off the infill material. No machinery will encroach on the ground unless supported by the infill material.

5.7.6 It is recommended that the No Dig Section is not used for construction traffic. If it is, a sacrificial layer of stone should be laid on another geotextile membrane and scraped off at the end of the construction to form the final surface.

5.7.7 To lay the final surface a second layer of Fibretex F4M Geotextile separation fabric will be laid over the in filled Cellweb sections. Then a layer of sharp sand will be laid and compacted with a vibro-compactor plate prior to laying block paver or concrete blocks dry jointed. A range of other surface finishes can be used. However the final surface must be permeable to allow continued water and gaseous diffusion.

6.0 SITE HUTS AND TEMPORARY BUILDINGS

6.1 All site huts and temporary buildings will be sited outside the CEZ.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PRECAUTIONS

7.1 The movement of plant in proximity to retained trees should be conducted under the supervision of a banksman to ensure adequate clearance from the branches of the trees. Hydraulic cranes, forklifts, excavators or piling rigs (other than small rigs used for mini piling) must be avoided in the immediate vicinity the crown of the trees.

7.2 Cement, oil, bitumen or any other products which spillage would be likely to be detrimental to tree growth should be stored well away from the outer edge of the RPA of retained trees. Precautions should include ensuring all toxic liquids are stored in fully bunded containers. Equipment such as barriers or sandbags must be available on site to deal with any accidental spillages that may occur.

7.3 Lighting of fires on site should be avoided. Where they are unavoidable they must be at such a distance from retained trees that there is no risk of the heat causing fire damage to the trunk or branches. Full account must be taken of wind direction. Fires must be attended at all times until they are completely extinguished.
8. **Appl. No**: 2013/1887/F  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr D Aves  
Site Address: The Oaks Kenninghall Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2BG  
Proposal: Full Application - Anaerobic Digestion renewable energy facility and associated landscaping.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Installation of underground tanks.  
4. Construction Traffic Management Plan and route to be agreed  
5. During construction all traffic to use agreed access route  
7. All traffic to use wheel cleaning facilities  
8. Landscape scheme

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 16: Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (Part Consistent)  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0747 Retrospective Change of Use of redundant dairy building to B1(c) for assembly of electronic components; Parking and manoeuvring area Approved

2.2 2008/0625 Proposed steel framed grain storage building Approved

2.3 2003/7004 Importation, sorting, processing & storage of category 1 & 2A waste materials and erection of new building Refused
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Comments on original consultation:
Request extension of consultation time - following public meeting the Parish Council has identified considerable lack of transparency surrounding factors central to this proposal. Logistics concerning transport to and from this facility and impact on public roads; operational process, including odour and noise; presentation and appearance; sustainability and overall environmental considerations are amongst the categories requiring far clearer information and scrutiny.

Comments on updated information:
Refuse:
Claim that the site will be well screened from most public viewpoints - the site is Highly visible from several roads and many viewpoints.

- Applicant suggests a self-contained operation with no importing of raw material or exporting of bi-products. If operation change is necessary from a business point of view and material is to be imported and exported the planning authority will not be able to enforce a limit on heavy traffic movements on inappropriate lanes.
- Initial and ongoing training for the operator.
- Lack of information regarding possible malfunction and resulting hazards.
- A previous scheme approved by County Council should not be relied on to assess this scheme.

3.2 District Member
Can be delegated:
- Unit will produce energy for the national grid will be fuelled mainly be animal waste. Whilst producing green energy it will also reduce the number of miles required for the movement of this waste.
- It will be situated in an extensive agricultural buildings complex and of no more significance than the silos etc. already on site.
A good project.

3.3 NCC Highways
Comments on original application
It should be demonstrated as part of the assessment that the highway network in the vicinity of the site can cater for the additional vehicle movements involved and identify the routes to be used.

The statement indicates that the feed will be from within 5km of the site. It may be useful if the locations could be confirmed. Some movements are noted as being off highway. The percentage of this movement will obviously affect the total. Pig manure - 10 tons per day from Deal Farm. This seems to be a large amount from one location.

Numbers for removal from site of the Digestate. It is not clear whether these are for use on the applicants land or external.

Construction traffic:- As with other applications we will require a construction management plan including a route for construction vehicles. It would be of use for the route at least to be identified at
an early stage. The applicant will need to show that the route is adequate for the types of vehicles involved.

Comments on updates:
Support with conditions:
- Management Plan and Route to be agreed for construction traffic
- Wheel washing facilities for construction vehicles to be used during the construction period.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections

3.5 Environment Agency Comments on original scheme:
No objections to the application subject to the Environmental Permit (Issued by the Environment Agency).

Comments on updated information:
No objection subject to condition relating to the installation of underground tanks.

3.6 Representations 13 Objections letters (2 from Villa Farm, 2 from Shangri-la)
- No notification of proposal.
- Villa Farm (B & B) not mentioned on any of the supporting reports submitted with the application which is only 220 metres away from site.
- All traffic will pass by Villa Farm
- Unacceptable level of noise from traffic associated with the proposal
- Existing problems of noise from barking dogs on the site which are not addressed
- First application was intended to get permission through by adhering to local council request for restrictions on noise, smell and movement, there appears to be of little concern in the new application.
- Movements of large fast tractors and trailers often late at night will increase.
- Noise from the farm already means windows have to be shut at night requiring cooling fans to be provided for guests.
- Scheme is not agricultural diversification.
- Loss of prime agricultural land crops to proposal not in the interest of food production.
- Sound proofing measures have been abandoned, except for tree planting which will be of no benefit for six months of the year.
- Roads and Lanes unacceptable for this industrial scale development. The increase in traffic movements to and from the site would be unacceptable.
- Support the principle of green energy but concerned about air quality, odour and noise.
- The AD Plant will be running 24/7 impact of noise in the quiet rural setting.
- Industrial appearance of the plant, previous scheme was mainly buried; now 12.5 buildings will dominate the landscape.
- No pavements or street lighting in the area.
- Object to proposal unless applicant funds road widening and street lighting.
Far wider radius of properties will be affected by noise and odour than has been identified in the application.

Contradictory information given during public meeting to that experienced by site visit.

Level of traffic movements not clarified - details on supporting statement (Transport Statement) state 'an estimate' the Environment Agency regulatory process does not sufficiently monitor and limit AD daily activities.

Stated that the site is not visible from the roads, this is incorrect the site is open from all surrounding roads.

Weight restrictions for lorries which have been applied to other business in the area.

Daily operation of the plant appears to be on trust rather than accountability, and that extends to the Environment Agency's On-Farm Standard Rules SR2012 No 10. Also concerned about the post two year provider's contract.

To many unknowns - application should not be determined until the facts are known.

Impact on wildlife

Objections received following public visit to a working plant at Risby

- Noise and Vibration from flare. (Site visit to working AD had flare operating for 3 days as CHP unit was broken and had not operated for 3 days, flare had been in operation continually).
- Feed hopper was open to the air all the time so the smell from the pig/chicken/silage feel being churned up would be in the air all the time.
- Appeared to be inadequate training for staff.
- Smell at all parts of the site quite strong.
- Impossible to control once the site is up and running.
- Storage of fodder and waste does smell, and the operation of the plant is noisy.

2 Support letters

- Support providing Council visit a functioning digester of similar size so as to assure Planning Committee members that emissions and traffic assessment data provided by agent are correct and reliable.
- Noise levels be addressed
- Landscaping to be provided
- Applicant should fund four passing zones on Upper Common Road to a highway standard.
- Need for regular monitoring for noise levels.
- Landscaping with a high percentage of native trees to hide the buildings and to provide a greater diversity of wild life in the area.

1 Neither objecting or supporting

Difficult to judge proposal on plans

4. Assesment

4.1 The development comprises two domed storage tanks (around 11.8 metre high x 25 metre diameter, and 10.8 high x 19.4 metre diameter) together with a fermentation tank (8.4 metre high x 14 metre diameter) a Combined Heat Power (CHP) unit, control building, flare, infiltration and two tapered silage clamps with 2.6 metre high walls. The site area comprises 0.97ha of a 335ha farming estate, predominantly used for pig rearing, chicken rearing and arable farming. The proposal is for installation of a 0.5Mw biomass fuelled renewable energy plant to generate electricity. Feedstock will be farm based product
residues (e.g. manures and rotation crops) creating a biogas which will be burnt to generate electricity that will be exported to the National Grid. The site is off Kenninghall Road, and will form part of the range of buildings from which existing farming activities already take place. The site is open to view off Lady’s Lane to the west, Kenninghall Road to the north and Common Road to the east. A previous Thermophillic Digestion Plant and associated plant and equipment was approved by Norfolk County Council in July 2013, this plant was to use mainly manure. The agent has stated that the approved scheme has proven to be unrealistic in terms of its engineering and operation and will therefore not go ahead. Notwithstanding the approved scheme, the application as currently submitted will be assessed on its own merits.

**Principles of development**

4.2 The development will be located within the context of existing farm buildings. The site is located in the open countryside outside of the Development Limits defined in the Development Plan. In the countryside Policy 17 of the JCS permits farm diversification and small scale and medium scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified. Paragraph 98 of the NPPF states renewable energy applications should be approved if its impacts are acceptable. Policy EMP5 of the SNLP permits agricultural development subject to certain criteria. Policy EMP8 permits farm diversification schemes subject to certain criteria. Policy UTL 13 of the SNLP supports renewable energy projects provided the benefits outweigh the harm. Therefore, the principle of the proposal accords with current policy.

4.3 The Government aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by promoting renewable energy projects which would include anaerobic digestion plants. The main issues to assess for this project are the visual impact on the surrounding landscape, the traffic generation to supply feedstock to the plant, and any odour or noise impact on the local residents.

**Impact on landscape**

4.4 The land and surrounding area is flat and open from all surrounding roads, the existing farm buildings are prominent without any screening from trees or hedges. The three elements of the proposal which will be most visible within the landscape are the two domed storage tanks which measure approximately 11 metres in height and the flare (a stainless steel stack that will only be used in the event of maintenance or in an emergency to burn the gas produced by the plant) which is a total of 7 metres in height. The remainder of the development is lower but will remain visible given the open nature of the site. Although the domes will be visible the materials proposed are to be of plain grey concrete finish and are intended to be a recessive element of the landscape with the general appearance of plain, agricultural buildings. With a landscape condition to mitigate the visual appearance of the proposed development, the development will not result in sufficient harm to justify refusal.

**Footpath**

4.5 A public footpath runs to the east of the site from which the development will be obvious, however, the route of the footpath is unaffected by the proposal. And is approximately 300 metres away at the nearest point. No condition is necessary to prevent any obstruction.

**Noise and odour**

4.6 A significant number of objection letters have been received to the proposal and although not the only concerns, the main three issues are that of noise, odour and traffic. The agent has explained that the transport, storage and utilisation of feedstock are likely to represent the most significant odour sources at the facility. The feed stock around 12,500 tonnes of biomass (8,500 tonnes of crops –maize and sugar beet, and 4,000 tonnes of manure) annually. The chicken and pig manure will be sourced from the application site...
and adjacent Deal Farm. The waste which is then spread back onto the land as an organic bio fertiliser and soil improver will be produced from the digestion process, which will be returned to local farms as a replacement for artificial fertilisers and to improve soil quality. Concern is raised by local residents with regard to the odour generated from the transport of feedstock from the adjacent farm to the site, and during the process of filling the hopper with feedstock from the storage clamps.

4.7 There are a total of six properties within 200 metres of the proposed application site, The Rosary to the west, Sunnyside, Villa Farm and Villa Farm Bungalow to the north and Holly Farm and Holly Farm Bungalow to the north east. Consideration has been given to how the farm currently operates including the transportation, storage and spreading of manure which cannot be controlled. I accept that there will be odour during the transportation of feedstock from the adjacent Deal Farm to the site, however, this occurs at present. I do not therefore consider that the supply of feedstock to the site will result in any significant change to the current arrangement which is not controlled through the planning system.

4.8 The plant requires an environmental permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010. The Environment Agency is responsible for the issuing and regulation of the Permit which controls odour and noise, in the event of a breach of the permit the Environment Agency would be the regulating authority. The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the planning application.

4.9 Once the plant is operational it will run continuously. Consideration has been given to the proximity of the neighbouring properties and the Environmental Services team have been consulted and raise no objections or detailed comments and note that Paragraph 122 of the NPPF states as follows.

“…. local planning authorities should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes. Local planning authorities should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities”.

4.10 In these circumstances I do not consider there is justification to refuse the application on odour or noise grounds.

Traffic Movements

4.11 The final issue relates to traffic movements and has also been raised as a point of concern by local residents and the Parish Council. The feedstock for the plant will be generated from the animal waste and energy crop produced and grown on the farm. Much of the traffic movement therefore already exists and will not vary considerable once the plant has been constructed. The main issue raising concern with the Highway Authority relates to the construction traffic given the very narrow nature of the surrounding road network.

4.12 Additional information was sought from the agent with regard to the traffic movements to and from the site and the Highways Officer re-consulted. The Highways Authority supports the proposal subject to conditions relating to construction traffic. I have for completeness and clarity copied below the Highways Authority’s comments:

“I have read through the Design and access statement and the Traffic statement that forms part of this application. I also note the additional information submitted by the Agent with his email of 5 January 2014.

As I understand the proposed digester is to be fuelled from crops grown within a 5km radius of the site with 90 percent being from within 2.5km distance. From the applicant’s existing acreage and neighbouring farms.
The area of land holding is now shown on the `surrounding land plan` included as additional information.

The waste input is noted as being pig manure and chicken litter from Deal Farm at ten tonnes per day. The transport statement indicates that the highest volume of traffic will be for transportation of harvest of maize leading to a total of around six HGV per day during October. For 7 months of the year the development will according to the transport statement generate two vehicles per day. The transport statement does indicate that these are estimated figures.

Whilst there is no guarantee over future activities, It is recognised that the farm already generates a number of vehicle movements on this part of the network through crop /manure transportation. As an agricultural site, the movement of crops and residual waste can currently take place to and from the premises without restriction (other than appropriate licences etc) and outside of the planning system. And the vehicles associated, are already on the local road network.

Whether the sugar beet within the holding for instance is lifted and either taken straight to the factory or brought to the farm for storage or potentially used in the Digester, is not something that we have any control over.

The crop / manure transportation is likely to be fluid (both in terms of material and direction of travel) and therefore unlikely to prove any different to normal farming activity that could take place. This being the case, there is not a great deal that we could do to legally sustain a highway objection.

The only Scenario for objection would be if the operator had no landholding with which to grow crops to feed the Digester, meaning that all feed was supplied externally. Thus all vehicle movements involved were definite new movements to and from the location of the site.

Consideration also has to be given to the fact that consent was recently granted for an aerobic digester plant on the site by Norfolk County Council, albeit of a different type. The construction phase of the development is however a new and fairly definitive aspect. During the construction phase, the transport statement advises that this will continue for 6-8 months and over this time the number of vehicle movements generated by construction traffic is 225 HGV in addition to staff vehicles. Although the total numbers of HGV’s for the scheme is quite high, the average number of HGV movements per day will be low.

However, taking into account the rural routes serving the farm and the total number of construction vehicle movements, we would wish to agree the route to be used by traffic associated with the construction of the facility. In addition to ensure that this aspect of the development does not result in additional highway maintenance at the taxpayers’ expense. Therefore, if a consent is to be granted for this development, please include the following conditions in the consent notice”

4.12 In light of the Highways Authority comments the necessary conditions are included above, the scheme subject to the conditions accords with policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Energy Crop

4.13 Concerns have been raised by the local residents regarding the loss of agricultural land for the sole use of growing energy crops for the benefit of the Anaerobic Digester and the financial benefits for the applicant. However, this plant is small scale in terms of energy
production and consequently I do not consider that there is sufficient loss of agricultural land to have an adverse impact on food production.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 6 and 16 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV8, ENV9, IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, IMP10 and UTL13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The benefits of exploiting a renewable resource in the national interest are not outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality. The proposal will not cause a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway. Subject to the conditions the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the character, appearance or amenity of the area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No** : 2013/1966/F  
 **Parish** : COSTESSEY

**Applicants Name** : Mr Martin Green  
**Site Address** : Footbridge At Townhouse Road Costessey Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Full planning application for construction of pedestrian footbridge with links to existing footways and fencing.

**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. Approved Plans and Docs  
3. Detailed Plans and calculations  
4. Works in accordance with approved calcs  
5. Landscaping - footpath boundary  
6. Footbridge levels  
7. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
8. Agree colour  
9. Lighting details  
10. Tree Protection – method statement  
11. Method statement to guard against pollution of groundwater or river  
12. No tree and hedge removal in nesting season

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
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 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 3: River valleys  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 17: Off site road improvements

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0757 Tree 4 (Oak) - Fell. Tree 6 (Oak) - Remove extended limbs to south; reduce extended limbs on west by 4 metres; thin upper crown by 15% - Approved

2.2 2012/0269 Outline application for a residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south - Deemed disposed of/Withdrawn

2.3 2009/1996/O Proposed outline application for a residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south - Refused

Appeal History

2.4 APP/L2630/A/12/2170575 Proposed outline application for a residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south - Appeal allowed.

3. Consultations

3.1 Costessey Parish Council

Initial consultation:
Recommend refusal – Costessey PC has previously supported the principle of a foot bridge at this location to improve pedestrian safety. However the following issues are raised:
- The application will require tree removal
- The design of the structure is contrary to the place making guide in that it is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- The cladding is heavy and obscures the heritage bridge and could prevent maintenance work to the stone bridge.
- Cladding will be expensive to maintain and the decking will be slippery and dangerous in winter.
- The bridge should be designed to respect historic and ecological issues.

Consultation on amended plans:
Recommend refusal to the amended plans on the following grounds:
- Not in keeping with local environment
- Not in keeping with existing heritage bridge
- Not a suitable link between Old & New Costessey
- Design is too heavy
- Wooden surface could be dangerous – query as to whether proposed safety strips are adequate
- Query as to whether bridge was fit for purpose with pushchairs, pedestrians, wheelchairs, cycles and horses all potential users.
- Wrong colour
- Low level lighting could disturb/affect bat colonies in the area

Local information suggests that the applicants do not own all the land required to construct the bridge

3.2 District Members:
Cllr T East - To be reported if appropriate
Cllr V Bell

Initial consultation:
The application should be brought to committee. NCC Highway Authority raises concerns over safety, structural and maintenance issues.

The existing bridge is a gateway between Old and New Costessey and should be considered to be a heritage bridge. The aesthetics require particular attention. Low level lighting and tree/hedge removals will be detrimental to biodiversity. A footbridge over the River Tudd has long been an aspiration of the community but it needs to be fit for purpose. The option provided by the Highway Authority may be a consideration.

Consultation on amended plans:
The revised design goes some way to addressing the objections to the original design. It still has a heavy appearance but the removal of the panels will allow for views of the bridge, river banks and river to be retained. The bridge surface has not been amended. How durable and effective will this be as a non-slip footway?
The aesthetics of the bridge require to be considered alongside the place making guide and the existing bridges gateway prominence. Low level lighting on the bridge could compromise the bat population and trees and hedges will also have to be removed.

3.3 NCC Highways

Initial consultation:
The Highway Authority is not in favour of the timber cladding fixed to the new bridge structure. It hides the structural members and impedes routine inspections and maintenance. The Highway Authority preference would be some kind of vertical infill rails.

Other issues include:
- The parapet should be at least 1.15m high, measured from the adjacent paved surface (the deck).
- Timber decking could become slippery when wet and would require anti-slip inserts and a gentle longitudinal ‘roll over’ would help prevent water pooling on the bridge.
- The bankseat detail does not make it easy to inspect the bearing.
- The use of brick cladding to the bankseats seems unnecessary as it just introduces a further maintenance issue.

Consultation on amended plans:
No objection subject to conditions.

3.4 Ecologist

To be reported.

3.5 Landscape Officer

No objections subject to compliance with submitted tree protection and method statement. New hedging to east side of new path desirable.

3.6 Design Officer

To be reported.

3.7 Environment Agency

No objection.
- Will not adversely affect flood risk.
- This is Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 and sensitive water course so regard must be had to any risk of creating pathways for any contamination to pollute groundwater or the river.
3.8 Representations

There have been 5 letters of representation received, these have all been in support and raise the following matters:

- Assistance to joggers and walkers is positive due to increase in traffic
- Neat design
- Safety improvements

One of the letters of support did raise a number of issues of concern:

- Surface suitability
- Lighting needs further specification.
- Replacement planting will be required.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located to the eastern side of Roger’s Bridge an existing road bridge on Townhouse Road, Costessey. The existing road bridge is narrow with no pedestrian footpath on either side. The bridge is constructed with mixture of red brick, flint finishing masonry parapets, it also has two small archways through which the River Tud flows. The river embankments surrounding the bridge contain mature vegetation and trees.

4.2 The land on the northern side of the bridge comprises the fringes of fishing lakes, with the land to the south part of a wider paddock area.

4.3 The proposal is linked to the outline planning permission for 70 dwellings further north at Townhouse Road, which was granted planning permission on appeal. One of the main issues for the appeal was the sustainability of the location and the planning application contained a package of measures to improve accessibility to services which included the provision of a pedestrian footbridge.

4.4 Condition 18 of the appeal decision requires a detailed scheme (i.e. this planning application) for the provision of the footbridge prior to the commencement of development and that the works shall be completed before any dwellings are occupied.

4.5 The application proposes to erect a footbridge on the eastern side of the roadbridge, with a 1m separation distance to allow for maintenance of both to occur. The bridge would be galvanised steel, with galvanised steel vertical infill railings. The original application detailed that the bridge would have wooden cladding, this proposal was rejected by the Highway Authority as detailed above. The bridge is proposed to sit lower than the existing roadbridge masonry parapet. It would have no supports within the river and the walkway would be at a similar level to the road surface. The development would require for some works to the river embankments to create stable surface to secure the bridge, this would require some cutting in.

4.6 To facilitate the construction and access it is proposed to remove a section of hedgerow to the northern side and four trees would also be removed. The existing footpath would be diverted approximately 5m on either side of the road to meet with new proposed bridge, these diversions would have post and rail fences to restrict access onto private land and the road.

4.7 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development, the sustainability, ecological, arboricultural and visual impacts of the footbridge. Consideration will also need to be given to the future maintenance and adoption of the footbridge.

Principle of development

4.8 The development proposal was shown indicatively on the plans for the Townhouse Road
development. However, it was not an agreed outcome as it was outside of the red line boundary and it was therefore required by condition to be provided through a separate full planning application. Although the Townhouse Road development is of material consideration, as this proposal is integral to the development being brought forward, the appeal decision does not establish the principle of development. The application must be considered on its own merits.

4.9 The site is located between two settlement limits and is therefore within the open countryside. The site is not in a conservation area and the existing bridge structure is not listed.

4.10 The development is not of a scale, form or function which would undermine the rural character and intrinsic beauty of the locality and could not be considered to be inappropriate development. This is in accordance with the intention of Saved Policies ENV3 and ENV8. Furthermore when considered as a standalone development it is an important infrastructure upgrade for the locality, as it will promote the use of sustainable travel in accordance with NPPF 08 and JCS Policies 6 and 7.

4.11 Due to the development not resulting in an unacceptable or inappropriate rural use being established and its clear sustainability benefits in relation to transport the principle of development is considered to be accepted.

Highways

4.12 The original application had wooden cladding surrounding and as such was deemed by NCC HA to be inappropriate for adoption due to potential maintenance costs. NCC HA advised very specifically what they would find acceptable and the applicant has altered their design to reflect this. The amended details have been reviewed by NCC HA and they have advised that they have no objections to the proposal.

4.13 Currently pedestrians have to use the road bridge to cross the river, the road bridge does not benefit from pedestrian footways. The development would therefore reduce the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. This outcome is in accordance with Save Policies IMP8 and TRA1, and would be provided for through off site highway works required from a larger application as directed by Saved Policy TRA17. It is clear that if constructed and maintained correctly the footbridge has benefits for both pedestrians and vehicle users.

Design and Landscape

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

4.15 The character area is defined as the Tudd Rural River Valley, which is characterised by an important ‘green gap’ between the settlements of Costessey and New Costessey located on the upper valley either side of the Tudd. The applicants Design and Access Statement includes an assessment of the site context and defines how the assessment of the existing character has informed the design proposals for the bridge to minimise its impact on the river valley.

4.16 The bridge has been designed as a lightweight structure and is lower than the existing highway bridge. This enables the bridge structure to be predominately screened by the existing Roger Bridge, minimising the visual impact from Townhouse Road and the River Valley. There are no views of the bridge from the wider landscape setting and the bridge has no direct impact on the green gap between Costessey and New Costessey. The lightweight ‘open’ structure also enables views of the existing highway bridge through the
proposed bridge structure, which help to further limit the impact of the new bridge.

4.17 The development requires the removal of sections of hedgerow and four trees. None of the surrounding vegetation benefits from a TPO and the removal of these specimens will not impact on the overall rural characteristics to a degree which would warrant refusal of the application. On balance the loss of the vegetation to gain the long term sustainability and safety benefits of a footbridge is acceptable. It is proposed to place a condition on any grant of approval requiring for planting to be undertaken along the eastern boundary of the footpaths to be undertaken. This will help to define the public realm from the adjoining private land and soften the appearance of the fencing.

4.18 The footbridge has a very limited visual impact upon the wider character of the river valley and that of the original highway bridge and is therefore in accordance with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD and NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2.

Ecology

4.19 Protection of local habitats and encouragement of biodiversity is required through Saved Policies ENV 14 and ENV15 and this is consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF, which sets out the government’s approach to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide enhancement measures.

4.20 The application is accompanied by an ecological assessment of the bridge and surrounding locality and its methodology and findings are considered to be acceptable.

4.21 The main issues which need to be addressed are the potential to cause pollution to the river; lighting disturbance to foraging bats; and potential disturbance of nesting birds during vegetation clearance. Subject to the final advice of the Council’s ecological advisor, conditions are recommended to address these concerns by requiring a method statement to minimise pollution risk; controlling the time of vegetation removal (unless first checked for nesting birds); and requiring approval of lighting design. Conditions are also recommended requiring new planting and the reporting of any contamination found.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The application is in accordance with Saved Policy IMP8 as it provides for a safe pedestrian passage across the River Tud on a section of highway which does not benefit from any footpath provision.

5.2 The provision of a safe footpath at this section of road will help to promote walking within the locality which meets with the sustainable transport objectives of NPPF Section 4 and JCS Policy 6 and the healthy community aim of NPPF Section 8 and JCS Policy 7.

5.3 The sustainability benefits of the development outweigh the loss of 4 non protected trees and the loss of the trees will not unacceptably impact on the character of the locality in accordance with Saved Policy IMP2. The loss of habitats provided by the trees can be mitigated for and the lighting associated with the bridge can be designed to minimise disturbance to bats. The application therefore accords with the principles of NPPF Section 11 and Saved Polices ENV14 and ENV 15.

5.4 The bridge has been designed to allow for views through it to be provided and it has been set back from the road side and is lower than the parapets of Roger’s Bridge. The bridge will not be an overly dominant feature on the character of the locality and will not create unacceptable visual impacts which would warrant refusal of the application. The application is therefore considered to
Development Management Committee 5 February 2014

comply with aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policy 2 and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett 01508 533794 ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No :** 2013/2106/F  
**Parish :** SAXLINGHAM NETHERGATE

Applicants Name : Mr Alan Bird  
Site Address : Saxlingham Hall Nursing home The Green Saxlingham Nethergate  
Norfolk NR15 1TH  
Proposal : Proposed erection of 6m x 4m Timber Butchery Unit and erection of 6m x 14m Timber Garage/Store/Plant Room

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. Limited hours of use  
4. No generators, air handling plant  
5. No retail butchery sales  
6. Weatherboard and tiles to be agreed  
7. Joinery and fence details to be agreed  
8. No grey cement  
9. Retention trees and hedges  
10. Tree protection

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve subject to condition:-  
- No retail sales from the butchery unit

3.2 District Member  
To be determined by Committee  
- Strong intrusion in residential amenity for nearby residents  
- Location of butchery unit when other buildings are to be on the opposite side of the site  
- Neighbouring residents wish to express their views to Committee

3.3 NCC Highways  
No highways objections to this proposal
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  Approve subject to conditions:-
- Limited hours of use
- No compressors/generators/chilling unit of cooling fan without consent
- No retail sales from the unit

3.5 Conservation Officer  No objections subject to conditions:-
- Joinery details for new doors
- Picket fence details
- Roof tile and weatherboard finish
- No grey cement for fixing roof tiles

3.6 Representations  Five letters of objection from four properties expressing the following concerns:-
- The siting is inappropriate and the building could be moved elsewhere
- The unit should not be located so close to a neighbour’s garden
- Concern about retail sales from the butchery
- Concerns about odour as new package sewerage treatment plant which is proposed
- The unit very close to a peaceful domestic garden with a hedge to be removed and no new screening proposed
- Noise from animals being butchered and the smell of raw meat and blood would affect my enjoyment of my property
- The unit may attract rats and other vermin
- The site is a nursing home only and this use should not be undertaken within the grounds. A second commercial use on the site would be a breach of the conditions of sale for the property
- Noise from generators/cooling equipment would be disruptive

4  Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks consent for the erection of a 6 metre by 4 metre timber butchery unit and a 6 metre by 14 metre timber garage/store/plant room within the curtilage of Saxlingham Hall Nursing Home. Saxlingham Hall is a grade 2 listed building dating back to the seventeenth century with later Queen Ann brick front and recent modern extensions. It is within the conservation area just off the Green.

4.2 The butchery unit is to be erected adjacent to the western boundary and a brick built workshop, to replace a modern timber shed. There is a laurel hedge on the boundary with some gaps which are to be filled with more laurel hedging, an access drive beyond and the garden of neighbouring dwellings to the west. The garage/storage/plant room is to be located towards the north eastern side of the site.

4.3 The proposal is assessed against the National Planning policy Framework (NPPF), The South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies which support the proposed development subject to normal planning requirements. SNLP policies IMP15, IMP8 and IMP9 require that the proposal does not adversely affect the setting of the listed building and wider conservation area, the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers is protected and highway safety is maintained. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 A number of neighbouring occupiers have objected to the proposal, more particularly the
siting of the butchery unit in close proximity to the western boundary and their gardens. They are concerned that the butchery will create noise and smells preventing them from enjoying their gardens, attract vermin and a business should not be run from a nursing home. Tearing down the hedge will allow the unit to be seen from the neighbouring dwellings.

4.5 The applicant already has a contract for the control of vermin within the site and waste is to be carefully controlled in accordance with current requirements. The amended plan showing the position of the western boundary details the retention of the laurel hedge and planting of new, to infill gaps which can be controlled by the imposition of a condition.

4.6 The butchery is an existing business (which was given consent in 2007) that is being relocated from an outbuilding at the rear of a residential dwelling adjacent to the boundary with a neighbouring dwelling. No objections or adverse comments have been received by the Council in relation to the existing premises despite it being in very close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling and housed in a similar timber outbuilding. Conditions can be imposed limiting the hours of use, prohibiting retail use, requiring written agreement to the use of generators/compressors etc. and requiring the retention and planting of laurel hedge to the western boundary which would minimise the potential adverse impact if any upon the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development accords with these policies as it creates employment but subject to the imposition of conditions relating to hours of use, restriction of sales to the public, restriction of use of generators and the retention of the laurel hedge will not adversely affect the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential property to a material degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Cox 01508 533832 and E-mail: hcox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2014/0108/CAN  
**Parish**: Brooke  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Mr N Baines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>2 High Green Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1HY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>T1 - Willow - Re-pollard leaving stem at 8-10 feet, T2 - T4 - Silver Birch - Reduce and reshape by 30%, T5 - Willow - Re-pollard leaving front stem cut 1ft above main fork and rear fork to match, T6 - Fell Hawthorn (dead).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**: No objections

---

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
ENV19: Tree Preservation Orders

1.2 **New Local plan**  
Policy DM 4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2009/0304**  
Fell 1no Willow and 2no Thorn trees DA  
Reduce Silver Birch tree by one third  
Pollard Willow tree

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Brooke**  
No comments received at time of writing report; any received will be reported verbally to the committee.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for reduction works to five trees and the removal of one dead tree within the Brooke Conservation Area. There is currently no valid Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Brooke.

4.2 The trees are all situated within the rear garden of 2 High Green Gardens, which is track leading to only four dwellings. There is a public footpath along the track, however, and this follows the southern boundary of the application (which is also the limit of the Conservation Area at this point).

4.3 For practicality the garden’s fence has been constructed around the hawthorn tree which is now dead; the tree’s trunk is therefore on the footpath side of the barrier. This tree is dead and its removal cannot be prevented by the Council.

4.4 The other trees which are the subjects of this notification are unremarkable garden trees. They are not the only other trees on the site and other, arguably better, specimens will not be affected by these proposals. Notwithstanding the close proximity of the public footpath, it is my conclusion that the proposed works will not be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area.
Conclusion

5.1 In considering proposed works to trees in Conservation areas the Council has two options; to allow the work as specified, or to prevent the work by the serving of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). To pursue the latter option the Council must be satisfied that the trees are of sufficient significance to merit a TPO or consider that there are other factors that would otherwise make the serving of a TPO expedient (for example, to extend the time-period for consideration of any outstanding issues). In this case, I do not consider that the trees are of sufficient significance, nor are there any outstanding issues, to merit the serving of a TPO to prevent the proposed work to the trees. I therefore recommend that no objections be made.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Robin Taylor 01508 533813
and E-mail: rtaylor@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Reports

1. Enforcement Ref: 2013/8147
   Parish: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL
   Site Address: Land West Of South View, Harleston Road, Rushall, Norfolk, IP21 4RT
   Development: Breach of condition 3 of Planning Approval 2013/0091/CU
   Developer: Ms Denise Mason

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to our attention that redundant pig buildings were being let for the keeping of horses. The tenant was invited to submit a retrospective planning application to regularise the use. Planning permission was granted on 9th April 2013 under reference 2013/0091/CU for the change of use from the keeping of pigs to the keeping of horses in the same building. Condition 3 of the permission required a concrete bunded surface to be provided for the interim storage of manure. The reason for this condition was in the interests of the amenities of local residents and to avoid possible pollution. This surface has not been provided and an enforcement notice has been served requiring the concrete bunded area to be provided.

1.2 The tenant has a short tenancy and therefore does not wish to invest in constructing a concrete bunded area when there is no guarantee the lease will be extended. She has therefore suggested that rather than constructing a concrete bund to store muck on site she is prepared to have muck removed from the site daily.

1.3 In view of the revised proposal and the requirements of the enforcement notice a number of options are open to the Council:- (1) It could insist on the construction of the concrete bund and pursue prosecution if this is not complied with. (2) It could leave the enforcement notice in place but agree that no prosecution will be brought whilst the muck is removed daily. (3) It could withdraw the notice and only reserve it if the muck is not removed daily. (4) Allied to (2) and (3) the tenant or owner could be encouraged to make an application to vary the condition.

1.4 Consultations have been carried out with interested parties and the results are reported below.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Promoting Good Design

2.2 South Norfolk Local Plan
   IMP9: Residential Amenity
   UTL15: Contaminated Land

3. Recent Planning History

3.1 2013/0091CU Retrospective application for change of use from keeping of pigs to keeping of horses in same building Approved 09/04/2013

4. Consultation

4.1 Parish Council To be reported if appropriate
4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

4.3 Environmental Services (Protection) Support the revised proposal to remove the muck on a daily and recommend that any storage area be more than 10 metres from any watercourse to reduce any possible run off and contamination

4.4 Local Residents One letter of support
- Support tenants proposal to avoid the need for a concrete bund
- Removal on a daily basis is unrealistic and would be content with weekly or fortnightly
- Suggest muck stored on a trailer, as opposed to ground then remove weekly/fortnightly
- Bags left outside site for subsequent collect is unacceptable

One letter of objection
- The tenants proposal is grounded on two main factors, the removal of urine which drains from manure and from the stable area, cannot be done effectively and cannot be done to avoid it from polluting ditches which ultimately enter my and neighbours properties
- The current disposal by bagging up manure and leaving it on highway for passers by is not an effective way of successfully removing the manure
- Bagging of manure has resulted in it spreading across the highway causing a further health hazard
- This revision is unacceptable and a direct attempt to avoid the requirements

5. Assessment

5.1 The Council are obliged to consider the merits of alternative remedies before deciding whether to pursue enforcement and prosecution action. The 4 options listed above in paragraph 1.3 should therefore be considered.

5.2 Option (1) – Taking in to consideration the circumstances of this case, in particular the uncertainty over the length of the future tenancy and cost of a concrete bund to proceed to prosecution without considering other options which meet the reasons for the condition could be viewed as unreasonable.

5.3 Option (2) – This option put forward by the tenant to remove the manure on a daily basis would meet the reason for the condition. However, if the muck is not removed daily the enforcement notice could still be relied on.

5.4 Option (3) – I do not consider withdrawing the notice to be the best approach because if the muck is not removed on a daily basis there is nothing in place to ensure it is suitably stored and removed from the site so a further delay could occur before effective action could be taken.

5.5 Option (4) – The tenant or owner should clearly submit an application to vary the condition if the concrete pad is not to be provided.
5.6 In view of the above I consider the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of Condition 3 would be to leave the enforcement notice in place, but not to pursue prosecution action whilst and provided that the muck is removed daily. Also to request an application is submitted to amend the condition to incorporate daily muck collection (ie no muck storage on site).

6. **Recommendation**

Subject to legal advice:

1. Enforcement notice to be left in force.
2. No prosecution action provided that any muck currently stored on site is removed within 28 days and whilst muck is being removed daily with no longer-term muck storage.
3. Request application to amend condition to allow for daily collection (with no longer-term storage) as an additional alternative to the provision of the concrete pad.
4. Warn tenant and owner of potential prosecution if existing stored muck is not removed within 28 days and/or further muck storage takes place.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Andy Baines 01508 533840 and E-mail: abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Enforcement Ref**: 2013/8217  
**Parish**: MULBARTON  
**Site Address**: Trevannon, The Common, Mulbarton, Norfolk, NR14 8JQ  
**Development**: Untidy Land and storage of motor parts  
**Developer**: Mr B Cropp

1. **Background**

1.1 The site is a detached bungalow set well back from the highway in a row of similar type houses on the edge of the common and conservation area of Mulbarton. The site is in a very unkempt state and there were eleven cars on the site, nine in various states of disrepair, six of these vehicles in the front garden, one in a car port and two in the rear garden. The other two vehicles are of roadworthy appearance and appear used on the road. The vehicle nearest the entrance is almost completely covered in brambles. The site, both front and rear, is also used for storing out in the open a large amount of car parts including dozens of car tyres. The site is also very overgrown.

1.2 The Council has received complaints about the condition of the site.

1.3 The owner was spoken to and was advised that he should remove a number of cars so that the total amount should not exceed six in number and he has done so. The owner was also asked to clear the externally stored items and to clear the undergrowth and weeds from the site by 29 November 2013, the site was inspected on 9 December 2013 and no clearance work had been carried out.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph 207 Enforcement

2.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2 Landscaping  
IMP 9 Residential Amenity  
IMP18 Development in Conservation Area

3. **Consultations**

3.1 No comments received.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The condition of the site conflicts with SNLP policies IMP 9 Residential Amenity and IMP 18 Development in Conservation Area, being detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and in particular nearby residential dwellings within the conservation area.

5. **Recommendation**

5.1 That authority be given for the serving of a notice requiring the clearance of outside storage not incidental to the residential use, undergrowth and weeds.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Martin Burrows  
and E-mail: 01508 533843 mburrows@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
**Appeals received from 18 December 2013 to 24 January 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/0930</td>
<td>Poringland St Lawrence Bungay Road Poringland Norfolk NR14 7NA</td>
<td>Mr And Mrs Martin Proctor</td>
<td>Outline application for demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 chalet bungalow dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
**Appeals decisions from 18 December 2013 to 24 January 2014**

<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>2013/0211</td>
<td>Stoke Holy Cross Land West Of Whiteford Lodge Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Terry Humphrey</td>
<td>Outline permission for the development of a detached, 3 bedroom dwelling with garage and garden</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>