PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

NOTE:

Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Growth and Localism’s final determination.

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

DPHBE  Director of Planning, Housing and the Built Environment
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

Decision : Members voted 8-3 for APPROVAL

Approved 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 section S106 to secure 2 affordable dwellings on the site

Updates

Strategic Housing Manager:-
Preferred option is to increase the number of affordable homes on-site to 2. A pair of semi-detached units would be acceptable. If this outcome is not possible, my second preference is a cash contribution in lieu the second affordable home.

Landscape Officer:- No comments to make.

Highway Officer:- No objections to any of the 3 options, subject to a satisfactory layout details being provided.

Parish Council:- Wish to revert to their original view of no social housing as it is inappropriate on the site in relation to the surrounding housing, which is also the option favoured by the developer.

John Overton District Member:- Under normal circumstances I would make sure we get affordable every time, but on this occasion I would go with Framingham Parish Council and take option 1. Payment in lieu of any affordable housing, because the area is fairly dense with trees and mature shrubs, I think the proposed development of seven should remain all as market homes, this will also stay in keeping with the rest of the properties on the opposite side of the road. I have taken into consideration the amount of affordable housing that is presently in the area and what will be available with the new proposed development in the near future.
Neighbours: 3 letters
Letter 1 - Concerns with regard to the procedures.
Letter 2 - No housing built in this area. It is irrelevant what type of housing.
Letter 3 - Support the first option assuming the Council’s revised interpretation of the affordable housing requirement stands. Share the views of the Parish Council Development must be conceived as a coherent whole and designed accordingly and in sympathy with the woodland setting. Including affordable housing would be out of keeping with and indeed detract from this conception, Bearing in mind all the other developments contemplated for the Framingham Earl/Poringland area, the requirement would seem wholly unnecessary and inappropriate in any case.

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>2013/0167/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>Trustees Of The Arminghall Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue, Trowse with Newton, Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 (with one abstention) for REFUSAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (withstanding 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).

Updates

The applicant has provided information and plans detailing how they would address the reasons for refusal. These details are not part of the application documents which form the appeal submission and the Council have not had sufficient time to consider these documents or to consult on them.

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.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved 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
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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

Updates

Agent – Agree to provide 33% affordable housing (8 out of 24)

4 Appl. No : 2013/1647/O
Parish : LODDON

Applicants Name : Halsbury Homes Ltd
Site Address : Land North Of George Lane Lodden 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.

Decision : Members voted 9-1 (with one abstention) for APPROVAL

Approved 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
Updates

The application has been subject to 11 new letters of objection. These letters reiterate the same matters as previously raised, and covered in the report, and that the delivery of a roundabout after 125 dwellings was too late in the process.

County Councillor A. Gunson also provided comments and an objection. He raised the following issues:

1. Although this land has been allocated in your Site Specific Allocations and Policies, objections have been lodged to this application. It is therefore against the spirit of the consultation on Site Specific Allocations to grant a planning permission on such a site before the objections to these allocations have been considered. In other words, the planning permission would be premature.

2. JCS Policy 14 identifies Loddon/Chedgrave as a key service centre which should have up to 200 houses within the plan period. It is premature in my view to give permission for the whole 200 at the start before the site allocations have been approved. If permission is given now there is then no housing land left in Loddon for the whole of the plan period.

3. Loddon is a small service centre where 87 dwellings are already under construction on the old ExPress Plastics site. With 200 dwellings planned for the George Lane site, a total of some 300 new properties will have been erected in two to three years, putting enormous strain on the facilities and infrastructure, as the new building will increase the size of Loddon by nearly 25% - hardly natural growth as it is more than the total built in the last 25 years.

4. The site is in places ¼ mile from the centre of Loddon and the Norwich/Beccles/Lowestoft bus service. There is no bus service along the A146 itself as the bus route goes through the centre of Loddon to Chedgrave. There is no possibility of a regular diversion of the bus service without it missing out a large area of Loddon – larger than the proposed George Lane development. All new residents will need to travel by car, except to the schools, and as the number of jobs in and around Loddon is not increasing the vast majority of new residents who work will be commuters.

5. Surface water drainage is not good in the area of George Lane and Bridge Street/Loddon Mill. In March 2013 the marshes at the back of the western side of Bridge Street were flooded, with some flood water in back gardens. There is also a surface water problem in George Lane in front of the Jubilee Hall with several inches of water on the road at times.

6. Anglian Water state that the foul drainage capacity exists for this development, but the development could affect the sewerage pumping station at Loddon Mill, where residents tell me there are surcharges.

Obviously I welcome the provision of a roundabout at the A146 junction, but in my view this does not offset the disadvantages of this application at the present time.
Thurton PC have also provided the following comments:
We are very concerned about the plans to build two hundred houses behind the medical centre in Loddon and to build a further eighty homes on the old plastic site. The traffic in Thurton in recent years has increased and it is now very difficult to access the A146 during busy periods in the morning and at night.
The council has instructed me to write to you to ask for road improvements in Thurton; such as a roundabout which could possibly be funded from the infrastructure levy.

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

Decision  :  Members voted 10-1 for Approval

Approved 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.

Updates

Officers circulated a letter from local residents to members as requested.
Comments received from Cllr J Overton:

Highways have no objections to the above named development because of the suitable Mitigation package. The mitigation package only looks at the development and not the bigger changing picture of substantial development in the area.

The package looks at a safe primary access including the widening of Caistor Lane, and the provision of a footway to the Norwich Road, enhancing the walk to the school route, including the installation of a Toucan crossing on the Norwich Road in the vicinity of the school. Enhancements to the bus shelter by making them DDA compliant and by providing shelter.

These are enhancements that should have been provided years ago, which would have taken in the safety of the pupils at the 600 pupil High School on the Norwich Road, through the massive development in Poringland which has taken place in the last few years. (not forgetting a pupil has been killed outside the High School and a teacher seriously injured)

These enhancements being proposed for the new development do not dilute a major traffic issue that is appearing on the horizon.

The Developer to provide a traffic plan, has anybody tested the strength of a travel plan, which encourages walking, cycling and the use of public transport. Norfolk Homes had to provide a traffic plan at the cost of £30k on a recent phase in Poringland as one of their conditions imposed by NCC Highways dept. I can assure you it is a complete waste of effort and money.

I carried out an exercise on twelve houses on the phase that travel plan related to on the Norfolk Homes development asking the following question:
1. How many cars do you run.
2. How many people work that live in the household.
3. Would you consider using public transport
4. Would you consider using a car sharing scheme.
5. Would you cycle to work.

1. Average car ownership was two vehicles.
2. Eleven out of twelve would not use public transport as it did not suit arriving at final destinations.
3. Eleven out of twelve would not consider car sharing, prefer to keep their independence.
4. Cycling not convenient and to dangerous.

No adequate mitigation measures in my opinion have been put in place regarding the bigger picture and the future of the Poringland and the Framingham area's, regarding the existing and proposed new developments.

What we are all mindful of is that we don’t become another Long-Stratton seeking a by-pass which as we all know would be a non starter in this area.

Our traffic at peak times, could become much more restricted than the movement through Long-Stratton high street due to all the restrictions we have in Poringland on the Norwich Road.
Example:
Two roundabouts.
Two sets of traffic lights.
600 pupil High School on the main Norwich Road with no drop off or collection area.
(parking on the main Norwich Road.)
All buses have no pull in area's and stop on the main carriage way causing major tail backs at peak times.

I feel and have felt for a long time that NCC Highways should have looked at an overall strategic traffic plan for the area, and not mitigation packages on a piece meal basis as each development is approved.
In my opinion this leads to drivers finding the most suitable way out of the village during peak times (rat running) causing frustrations for all concerned. Traffic rat running out of the village at peak times going via Stoke Holy Cross, adds another danger as they pass the very busy primary School in Stoke again a School with no drop off area, also on a main bus route.

LIST OF DEVELOPMENTS TO BE COMPLETED AND FUTURE PROJECTS WAITING APPROVAL.
1. Norfolk Homes Ltd. 400 houses to be completed.
2. Norfolk Homes/ Badger Building Joint venture.
4. Hardesty. Development of 2acre preferred site on Stoke Road. (Developer to put in application)
5. Small 5/6 house infill on Stoke Road. (Mill Road)
6. Hibett & Key Ltd. 100 Houses, Pigot Lane.
7. New proposed Hospice, 40 acre Plantation, replace Quidenham Hospice. (Developer to put in application)
8. SNC/Roseberry development. 65 Houses, and out of town offices. Shotesham Road, linked to the new spine road exiting on to Stoke Road as an option.
9. Crown Point Estates. 30/40 houses as you leave the village boundary Norwich direction, going down to Arminghall.
10. David Wilson Homes Ltd, 250 Houses, Heath Farm, Stoke Road, Caistor Lane.

This does not take into consideration the traffic that come in from the Bungay and surrounding area on a daily basis and any new development that is happening there.

I would suggest on completion of the above at peak times this would suggest "SEVERE" wording used by Highways. The description "SEVERE" has not been defined by Highways to the residents, the meaning or what would have to be done once the area reached this stage of mitigation.

All we ask is a bit more long term thought towards a strategic traffic plan that can be shared with the residents on the build up of traffic over the next few years, rather than a done and dusted policy from the street plan that is then used as a bible.

Therefore as with the Poringland Parish Council, I would ask the committee to refuse this application on the grounds of an unsatisfactory overall Highways strategic area traffic plan for the future of the area and the planned expansion, together with an unsatisfactory mitigation package for the development for the land on the West of Norwich Road and South of Caistor Lane known as Heath Farm, Poringland.

Poringland Parish Council – confirmation received of their objection and seeking refusal. No reasons given.
### Other Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>2013/1692/RVC</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>2013/1826/F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td><strong>ASHWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL</strong></td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td><strong>COSTESSEY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>Mrs Lucie Hustler</td>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Bunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Rectory Farm Whipps Lane Fundenhall Norwich NR16 1DT</td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land East Of Newhaven Folgate Lane Costessey Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Variation of Conditions 1 &amp; 2 of Planning Permission 2009/1163/F- To allow sports club to use facilities to provide lessons to other members</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Erection of 1 no. detached single storey dwelling to existing site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved 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.

**Updates:**

Additional letter from neighbour raising further concerns regarding the total number of horses and stabling to be considered. This demonstrates why there are concerns from local residents, and this increase will result in a large potential increase in the vehicle traffic on unsuitable roads.

SNDC concedes it never carries out spot-checks and therefore there will be no means - other than expecting residents to be the unpaid policemen - of checking the situation. We have no doubt whatsoever, based on Mrs Hustlers' past conduct, that whatever restrictions are placed on her, she is likely to ignore.

This item was **deferred** to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.
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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.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved 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

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.

Decision : Members voted 9-0 (with one abstention) for Approval

Approved 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

Updates:
Correction – References to 70 dwellings being approved on appeal should be 62 dwellings.

Ecologist Comments –
• Submitted report acceptable
• Recommend conditions in respect of lighting; nesting birds; and avoidance of pollution.

Design Officer comments – reproduced as paragraphs 4.16; 4.17; and 4.18 of the report.
Objections from resident
- Urbanising effect, opening up for further development.
- Consultations should have been wider, as per the original residential application.
- Bridge should be considered in the light of the related residential development.
- Local Plan now up to date so should refuse consent.
- License from Natural England should be required (bats)

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
Decision : Members voted 8-3 for Approval
           Approved 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

Updates:
The agent has advised that drainage will be connected to the existing mains drainage in the
adjacent workshop, not as previously suggested to a new treatment plant.
He has confirmed that the butchery will be used for limited and minor food preparation.
Commercial waste and vermin controls are in place. The existing butchery is being
relocated onto site to provide for the two nursing homes and staff, there will be no retail
sales.
The agent has provided an amended site plan excluding the neighbour’s driveway.

11 Appl. No : 2014/0108/CAN
Parish : BROOKE
Applicants Name : Mr N Baines
Site Address : 2 High Green Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1HY
Proposal : 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).
Decision : It was unanimously agreed by members that there were no
           objections