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Pre-Committee Members' Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 5 March 2014

Time
10.00 am

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Caroline Heasley tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE
Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 - 6, and arrive at 1.30pm if you intend to speak on items 7 - 13.

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

25/02/2014
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 Plan Documents 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 (with amendments to the JCS being adopted in January 2014). It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it is adopted, policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

The remaining ‘saved’ policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) also carry full weight in the determination process, unless officers specifically advise otherwise.

South Norfolk Council is also in the process of preparing various Local Plan Documents: the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton and the Development Management Policies Document. These documents will allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criteria based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. None of these emerging Local Plan documents have yet been submitted for independent examination, and so the weight to be afforded to emerging policies and allocations is assessed on a case-by-case basis.

A further document which also forms part of the South Norfolk Development Plan is the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan. The CNDP was formally ‘made’ (adopted) on 24 February 2014, and full weight can now be given to the policies of the CNDP when determining planning applications in Cringleford parish.

In a number of instances the Council has produced Supplementary Planning Documents which expand upon the policies of the Development Plan; these documents do not change policy or create new policy, but they are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

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

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

- To be genuinely plan-led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets
The factors to be used in determining applications will relate to the effect on the “public at large” and will not be those that refer to private interests. Personal circumstances of applicants “will rarely” be an influencing factor, and then only when the planning issues are finely balanced.

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

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

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 9)

4. Minutes of the meetings of the Development Management Committee held on 29 January and 5 February 2014;
   (attached – page 11)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 33)

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>2013/0463/O</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>Land Off White Horse Lane Trowse</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2013/1415/F</td>
<td>FLORDON</td>
<td>Tas Valley Mushrooms Ltd The Street Flordon</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/0567/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Lodge Farm Phase 2 Development Dereham Road Costessey</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/1274/O</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land North Of Village Hall Stocks Hill Bawburgh</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/1330/A</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>5 Cooper Court The Street Long Stratton</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013/2189/LB</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>5 Cooper Court The Street Long Stratton</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2013/2100/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>Land West Of Blaen Waun Low Road Thurlton</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/2159/F</td>
<td>EAST CARLETON</td>
<td>Subdivision Of Garden Of 2 Hethersett Road East Carleton</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2014/0020/F</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Post Office 38-39 Market Place Hingham</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2014/0021/LB</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Post Office 38-39 Market Place Hingham</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2014/0005/F</td>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2014/0031/LB</td>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2013/2144/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>1-9 Ayton Road Wymondham</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

   Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee with the date and membership to be confirmed.

7. **Planning Appeals (for information)** (attached – page 114)

8. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wed 2 April 2014 (in Colman and Cavell Rooms)
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations included in Recommendations

| CNDP | Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan |
| J.C.S | Joint Core Strategy |
| LSAAP | Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
| N.P.P.F | National Planning Policy Framework |
| 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) |
| S.N.L.P | South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 |
| WAAP | Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in</td>
</tr>
</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.

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?
A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?
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

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

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?

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

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

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No:** 2013/0463/O
   **Parish:** TROWSE WITH NEWTON

   **Applicants Name:** Norfolk Homes Limited
   **Site Address:** Land Off White Horse Lane Trowse Norfolk NR14 8TG
   **Proposal:** Proposed development of up to 99 dwellings including a 1 ha site for new Primary School (revised application)

   **Recommendation:** Approval with conditions
   1. Outline permission time limit
   2. Submission of reserved matters
   3. Materials
   4. Ecology mitigation
   5. Details of foul water disposal to be agreed
   6. Details of surface water drainage to be agreed
   7. Detailed plans of roads, footways and cycleways to be agreed
   8. Highway works in accordance with agreed details
   9. Roads/footways/cycleways to binder course prior to occupation
   10. Construction parking to be agreed
   11. Details of wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed
   12. Off-site highway works
   13. TRO for extension of the 20mph limit
   14. Archaeology
   15. Landscaping management
   16. Fire hydrants
   17. Tree and hedge protection
   18. Contaminated land during construction

Subject to a S106 legal agreement to secure contributions towards education, libraries and open space, and the provision of a primary school site and affordable housing.

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
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

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 ON ADJACENT SITE
Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.
Appeal against non-determination in progress.

2.2 2013/2183 Screening Opinion for reduction in number of proposed dwellings from up to 150 to up to 99 plus the inclusion of a site not more than 1 hectare for the relocated primary school
EIA not required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
The full Parish Council response is attached as appendix 2.

3.2 District Member I oppose the application on policy grounds. The application is premature until proposed South Norfolk Local Plan policy TROW1 (which I oppose) is tested at the examination in public. In the meantime, the application is contrary to preserved South Norfolk policies ENV3 and ENV6.

The school site offered is only 1ha, whereas the TROW1 requirement is at least 1.4ha. The plans assume the balance will come from the adjoining site, but the recently lodged appeal by the Arminghall Settlement makes clear that there is no present intention to offer the balance of the land required for a school from the adjoining site.

No planning application has been lodged for a new school, and without a deliverable and adequate school site to serve Trowse, this application should be refused.

The line taken by the Arminghall Settlement also precludes the achievement of TROW1, since the Arminghall Settlement is clearly not interested in a master plan for the two sites and wishes to preserve its own access road access off Hudson Avenue, despite the proffered access through to White Horse Lane. It would not be appropriate to approve this application in isolation.
The revised application assesses the traffic-generation implications of the site, and concludes that fewer houses mean less traffic. I have no reason to doubt that, as concerns the housing site. But the basis of the reduction of housing is that space is offered for a new primary school, which will also generate traffic. There is no assessment of the impact of that additional traffic. I appreciate that the application does not seek permission for a new primary school, and that would have to be the subject of a fresh planning application. However, since the whole application is predicated on the need for a schooling provision, it would be bizarre if a later application for a new school had to be rejected on highways and traffic grounds.

3.3 NCC - Planning Obligations

It is recognised that the applicant is prepared to provide a 1 ha site, which would be sufficient in size to accommodate a 1 Form Entry Primary School (210 places). This size of school would be adequate to deal with the immediate pressures arising from an increase in pupil numbers, but there would still be a requirement for the remaining 0.4 ha in the longer term (i.e. associated with any subsequent application/s on the remaining draft Policy TROW.1 housing allocation). The County Council intends that the school be built to an expandable design which could accommodate growth in pupil numbers should further housing development later be allocated or permitted by planning permissions. The District and County Councils possess compulsory purchase powers to provide for the proper planning of the area, especially after adoption of a local plan and alternatively also in case of specific need. Therefore providing the ability to expand in the future can be taken into account in design, subject to the additional 0.4ha site being provided, the County Council would not wish to raise any objection to Application 2013/0463 in respect of education matters.

3.4 Norfolk Historic Environment Service

No objection, subject to the following 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

3.5 NCC Highways

No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

The only points I would raise is that on drawing 1031/HWY/001 Rev B the carriageway and footway on the east side of White Horse Lane between Numbers 1 and 5 White House Lane are shown as being less than 6m wide for the carriageway and 2.0m for the footway. This is because of some flint walls along the highway boundary of White horse Lane. The Highway Authority considers that the reduced width of footway and carriageway will reduce highway safety on this bus route. Unless these walls are of such significant planning merit that the Council considers this to outweigh the highway safety issues I would recommend the walls are removed or set back to allow full road and footway widening. Additionally the west carriageway edge and verges of White horse Lane should be protected by kerbing particularly if the full road widening is not provided. These points are not ones that would lead the Highway Authority to object if they not acted upon by the developer but they are considered sensible improvements of the scheme from a highways point of view.
3.6 Housing Strategy Manager  No objection – an affordable housing package has been agreed with the applicants.

3.7 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  Generally supportive of the scheme as it considers the Secured by Design principles.

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No objection, provided that a foul water drainage strategy is agreed that connects to the 225mm foul sewer located in White Horse Lane. Capacity exists at Whittingham STW to accommodate foul flows from the development.

3.9 Conservation Officer  No objection

3.10 Environment Agency  No objection, subject to appropriate conditions requiring attenuated surface water drainage to Greenfield runoff rates, incorporation of SUDS storage features where possible, and management and maintenance details.

3.11 Ecologist - NCC  No objection, subject to the mitigation measures outlined in the Ecology Report being implemented.

3.12 English Heritage  No comments.

3.13 Environmental Services  No objection in principle, however further information was required in respect of air quality and noise. The additional information received is under review, and further comments will be provided at committee.

3.14 Flood Defence Officer  No objection 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

3.15 Landscape Officer  Requires further information about hedgerows – specifically an assessment against the Hedgerows Regulations criteria.

3.16 Representations  96 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 in White Horse Lane and Martineau Lane
- 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 (note: development of the YMCA site is not part of the application)
- 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
- Site should not be allocated for development
- New school will be a burden to Trowse
- Loss of community assets
- Will add to current capacity issues with local bus services
- Strain on local infrastructure
- Flooding and drainage concerns
- Loss of the existing character of Trowse as a village
- Will increase village size by 50%
- Exacerbate parking issue in Trowse
- Application cannot be considered in isolation
- Outstanding legal concerns, including the requirement for an EIA
- School site offered is too small

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site consists of 4.7 ha of agricultural land located on the southern boundary of Trowse. The A146 Trowse Bypass adjoins the site to the south and there are existing dwellings to the west of the site on White Horse Lane. To the north the site adjoins allotments and to the east is an arable field forming the remainder of the preferred allocation TROW1. Beyond this is the A47(T) Southern Bypass. The site is outside the current development boundary. A location plan is attached as Appendix 1.

4.2 The land generally slopes down towards the north-western boundary with a difference in ground levels of approximately 10 metres. The boundaries to the site are well established and consist of a mix of hedgerows, a small number of trees, a short length of brick and flint wall along White Horse Lane and planting belts beyond the eastern and southern boundaries. A small section of the site fronting onto White Horse Lane is within a Conservation Area and Flood Zone 2. The site is also within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (ENV6) and the Tas River Valley designation (ENV3).

4.3 This revised outline application proposes residential development of up to 99 dwellings, and includes a 1 ha site for a new primary school along with vehicular access, provision of open space and associated works. Matters of appearance, landscaping and layout are reserved. (An indicative layout plan and drawings are attached as Appendix 3. An indicative Masterplan is also attached as appendix 4.)

4.4 A separate application for a development of 81 dwellings on the adjoining site (within the TROW1 allocation area) has been submitted by The Arminghall Settlement. The applicants have appealed against non-determination, and the statements have now been submitted by both parties. The outcome of the appeal is awaited. Members at the last Development Management Committee resolved they would have refused this application.

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

- The provisions of 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 For the purposes of this application, the adopted Development Plan consists of:

- The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011; amendments adopted January 2014); and
- The saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP – March 2003)

4.7 It is noted that there has been a significant number of objections from local residents to both this application, and 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
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Drainage & flood risk
NPPF, JCS & the 5-year land supply of housing

4.8 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’.

4.9 Para 49 of the NPPF indicates that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date where the planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. It therefore follows that housing supply policies in the development plan for South Norfolk carry less weight.

4.10 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.

4.11 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.

4.12 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

4.13 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

4.14 Although the proposals put forward by the applicant as shown on the indicative site layout plan generally accord with the above requirements, they only provide for a school site of 1 hectare. However, the submitted masterplan drawing does indicate that a future development of the adjoining site could accommodate the additional 0.4 hectare of land. 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

4.15 In order to provide sufficient primary school places for this development and other planned development in the area the County Council have indicated that they would be looking to build a 210 place (One Form Entry – 1FE) school, which could potentially be expanded up to a 2 Form Entry.

4.16 Whilst this application does not provide the full 1.4 hectare site (as required by TROW1) the County Council recognise that a 1 ha school site is sufficient in size to accommodate a 1FE primary school (210 places) and that this size of school would be adequate to deal with the immediate pressures arising from an increase in pupil numbers.

4.17 The County Council intends that the school be built to an expandable design which could accommodate growth in pupil numbers should further housing development later be allocated or permitted by planning permissions. The District and County Councils possess compulsory purchase powers to provide for the proper planning of the area, especially after adoption of a local plan and alternatively also in case of specific need.

4.18 The County Council have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the nursery and secondary school sectors to cater for the children arising from this development.

4.19 I note that there is considerable objection from local residents to the loss of the existing school. However, the existing school site has no room for expansion, and given the need for future housing growth in the area, it is clear that a site should be found for a larger school. The County Council has also has a capital proposal to make financial provision from a new primary school in Trowse of initially 210 pupils, rising to 315 or 420 if necessary (Children’s Services Local Growth and Investment Plan, November 2013). I consider that a new 1FE 210 place school located within the TROW 1 allocation will be of significant benefit to the local community in terms of a larger, more modern school better able to deliver the future curriculum; This is a significant benefit that weighs in favour of the scheme.

Affordable housing

4.20 Policy 4 of the JCS is engaged in this proposal and requires 33% of the development to be affordable dwellings. The Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that an affordable housing package in accordance with policy has been agreed.
Impact on the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone

4.21 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.

4.22 The proposal would be contrary to ENV6, as it sits within the Landscape Protection Zone and would undermine the openness of the 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 Polices 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.

4.23 However, the proposed development will bring forward significant benefits, and these should be taken account of in the overall planning balance when assessed against this and other relevant planning policies.

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

4.24 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.

4.25 The scheme is supported by a detailed Design & Access Statement which includes an analysis of the architectural and historic character of Trowse. The Trowse Conservation Area Character Appraisial & Management Plan and the relevant design principles within the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide have been taken into account in developing the design proposals. In particular the site layout proposes dwellings set back from the street frontage on White Horse Lane and the creation of green public open space. This will allow the existing urban character of the traditional terraces along White Horse Lane to remain the dominant visual feature of the Conservation Area and allow for a transition to the more rural character towards the south-west of the village. Dwellings to the south-west corner of the site are to be designed to reflect the rural character of the existing traditional converted farm buildings on the opposite side of White Horse Lane.

4.26 The supporting information which is indicative only at this stage demonstrates that there is the capacity to achieve a high quality design when assessed under the Building for Life 12 criteria. However, I consider it appropriate to require the submission of a design code as a condition of any approval to ensure the delivery of a high quality design in accordance with saved local plan policy IMP18, JCS Policy 2 and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD.

4.27 I note that the hedgerows on and surrounding the site have not been properly assessed in respect of their historical importance, although it is acknowledged that only one of them is of any significant age. A hedge running NW – SE within the site is shown to be removed. This hedge, although gappy, does appear on historic maps and therefore a proposal for its removal should be first assessed against the appropriate criterion of the Hedgerow Regulations. Although I do not think the loss of this hedge is a significant issue, members need decide whether or not a full assessment need to take place before determination, or if the loss of the hedge can simply be considered in the planning balance.
Highway Impact

4.28 The application was accompanied by a transport statement, which has been considered by NCC: Highways. The application proposes two accesses onto White Horse Lane to which no objection is raised in principle. NCC: Highways first reviewed the Transport Survey undertaken by the applicants, which included using Devon Way as a comparator for obtaining trip rates, based on a development of 150 dwellings and concluded that the junctions would be able to operate satisfactorily with reserve capacity available. Clearly with a reduction of 51 units in the revised scheme, there is even more capacity for the junctions onto White Horse Lane, and the application remains acceptable in this regard.

4.29 I note the point made by Cllr Lewis that an assessment of the traffic impact of a school on the site has not been undertaken for this scheme. However, I must also have regard to the fact that the NCC: Highways have not objected to the preferred allocation of the wider site (TROW 1) for 150 – 160 dwellings with a new school. I also note the significant level of objection from local residents in respect of highway impact; however, the assessment and conclusion from NCC: Highways is that whilst the scheme will clearly increase the traffic flows in the surrounding area, the impact is not significant enough to warrant a refusal of the application on highway safety grounds. The application therefore accords with saved local plan policy IMP8.

Impact on neighbour amenity

4.30 The only direct impacts on existing residential amenity are to some properties on White Horse Lane to the north of the site, as well as to a lesser extent, properties opposite the site. 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 indicative layout shows that adequate separation distances to the rear elevations/gardens of existing properties can be achieved.

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), and this will be used where possible, the overall drainage strategy provides for attenuation storage. Anglian Water has confirmed that it is possible to connect to the existing 225mm piped surface water drainage system on White Horse Lane 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.

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 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 help 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.

5.3 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), although as noted above, only limited weight can be afforded to this allocation as it is under challenge. The provision of a new 210 place school site (potentially expandable to a 1.5 or 2FE school) is a benefit that weighs in favour of the scheme.

5.4 The requirements of the NPPF as a whole, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the lack of a 5-year housing land supply, and benefits of the scheme (including the provision of a new school site and the delivery of affordable housing) outweigh any identified harm.

5.5 A development in accordance with the submitted key design principles set out in the Design & Access Statement can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policies ENV8, ENV6 and ENV3 which are given due weight as they remain consistent/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 in the Development Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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TROWSE WITH NEWTON PARISH COUNCIL
The Manor Rooms, The Street, Trowse, Norwich NR14 8ST
Email: trowsepc@yahoo.co.uk Tel: 07899 798853

20th April 2013

Gary Hancox
Senior Planning Officer, Growth and Localism
Planning Services
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

Dear Mr Hancox,

Re: Application for Planning Permission for land off White Horse Lane,
Trowse, Norfolk

Proposal: Erection of up to 150 dwellings with associated garages, roads, open space and landscaping – Reference: 2013/0463

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

- The proposal is 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 proposal is 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”.
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As stated in the site assessment table:

- The site is on ‘Greenfield’ land
- The site will increase the flood risk
- Highways state that the site will impact on the Bracondale / Martineau Lane roundabout.

As stated in policy considerations:

- Concerns with regards to foul sewerage capacity, and existing drainage issues along White Horse Lane
- 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; this is limited because of the protected flint wall.

Also:

- In the form and Character section it stated that "neither 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 this site due to impact on character and appearance of this conservation area and traffic management issues through it.

- 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
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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. This site will generate around 280 car movements in the morning and the evening and, added to this could be 150 car movements from the Le Ronde site in the morning and in the evening, if this site's traffic is to avoid passing through The Street in Trowse, a scenario which has already been proposed by the developers.

- **The number of housing units proposed on this development and the Le Ronde development, a total of 231 properties is far greater than the local road infrastructure can handle and will have a significant detrimental effect 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 access and egress 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 vehicular access to or from their own properties.

- The proposed development has been submitted alongside another proposed development from Le Ronde 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 slope leading waters down to White Horse Lane. At present when heavy rain falls, the rainwaters over flood the drainage and wash down and across White Horse Lane. This problem would be multiplied by a development at the elevated side of White Horse Lane.

- This development would have a massive visual impact on the appearance of the historic model village.
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- This site, 151 has a proposed 150 properties and site 1173 has a proposed 81 properties. In combination with the “May Gurney/Deal Ground” development, a further proposed maximum of 670 properties, gives 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

- Loss of farmland next to the City Centre which is a precious commodity

Yours faithfully

Lyn Fabre
Chairperson
For and on behalf of
Trowse with Newton Parish Council
2. **Appl. No**: 2013/1415/F  
**Parish**: FLORDON

Applicants Name: Tas Valley Mushrooms Ltd  
Site Address: Tas Valley Mushrooms Ltd The Street Flordon Norfolk NR15 1RN  
Proposal: Erection of eight plastic covered agricultural buildings. New entrance to site.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1. Full permission time limit  
2. Amended plans  
3. Landscaping  
4. Phasing/ close existing access to commercial traffic  
5. Foul drainage to main sewer  
6. Details of surface and wash-down water drainage  
7. New access  
8. Gates set back  
9. Visibility splays  
10. Any external lighting to be agreed  
11. Hours of working (0700-1800hrs M-F; 0700-1230 Sat, Sun and Bank Hols)  
12. Management Plan for drainage maintenance

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
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 5: The Economy  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 3: River valleys  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
EMP 5: Agricultural development  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 19: Parking standards

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/1204 Proposed erection of two plastic covered agricultural buildings  
Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
- Welcome employment but has to be balanced with negative impacts
- Prevent business traffic from the existing entrance is welcome
- Access from A11 via Wymondham and Hethel is poor and unsuitable for HGVs
- Recommend a condition that all vehicles use southern bypass/B1113
- Impact of employee traffic not been addressed village has no footpaths
- Recommend traffic impact assessment and proper access drawings
- Water extraction has been resolved, but foul drainage, run off and flooding have not so flood risk assessment and environmental impact assessment are required

3.2 District Member Additional comments
- Need to ensure traffic is diverted from village when would new entrance be built this would need to be as soon as possible
- Business activities via the new access will need to be conditioned
- Need to conditions hours of business related to vehicle access
- Access for construction of new development needs to be considered
- Would like application decided by committee.

Have spoken to neighbours.
- Concerns about increased noise pollution and impact on quality of life
- Large application that will have a significant impact.
- Possible light pollution.
- Road safety
- Increase in lorries through village
- Crowding of access

3.3 NCC Highways Original application
- Inadequate highway or transport information
- Likely to increase HGV movements at the existing access due to increased compost requirements
- Information required on how new site will operate in conjunction with existing site
- Subject to the agreement of a new access, and if the scale of development is to be approved, the existing access should be closed off to at least larger vehicles and all larger vehicles should use the existing entrance and routed away from village
- Proposed entrance has substandard visibility, location would need to be amended.

Amended proposal
- Note transfer of traffic to new access
- Modest increase in HGV traffic not unusual for modern farm
- 70% traffic increase is cars
- Access requires 2.4m X 120m splays – plan requires amendment but acceptable with this revision
- Recommend conditions
  - SW drainage
  - New access
  - Gates set back 15m
  - Visibility splays

3.4 Ecologist - NCC

Original submission
- Insufficient information on impact on SSSI and SAC Flordon Common
- Screen for EIA
Detailed information on abstraction of water and any drainage of waste water or waste water treatment

Amended proposal
- Acceptable subject to:
  - Landscaping scheme
  - Management Plan for filtration beds
  - SW drainage details to be agreed

3.5 Environment Agency

Amended comments
- Now visited site and received further information
- Applicant is compliant with discharge consent and effluent has been tested and within limits
- Condition foul water disposal, preference is to discharge into mains sewer

No Objection
- Trade effluent should be directed to foul sewer through a silt trap. Trade effluent consent is required from Anglia Water
- Only surface water from the roof can be discharged into watercourse water from the yard will need to treated
- Advice on oil storage

3.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No comment

3.7 Flood Defence Officer

- The applicant advises of series of open ditches connected to a reed bed within the pond but no further information has been provided, assume there is an overflow into pond
- Due to run off from parking bays and machinery and proximity of SSSI recommend further water treatment feature is incorporated into the water management system to ensure the run off particular in storm conditions is adequately treated
- Water would need to be attenuated so as not to increase flood risk elsewhere
- No information on how waste water will be managed
- Foul drainage is proposed by a sewage treatment plant, as there is a public sewer nearby this should use unless the treatment plant offers more sustainable solution
- If treatment plant is proposed need to consider discharge
- Detailed water management plan is required

3.8 Natural England

No comments received

3.9 Environmental Services (Protection)

Support with hours of use condition as requested by applicant
3.10 Representations

Amended proposal

Three letters of support
- Provide additional jobs
- Part of village for years
- New entrance will be safer
- Further away from village
- Improved hedge screening
- Will be enough room to park lorries off the road
- Drainage issues have been addressed

Three letters of objection
- Noise disturbance operates 7 days week and into the evenings
- Increase in heavy traffic
- Who will control traffic routes
- Roads not wide enough
- Industrial development in small village

Original scheme

Nineteen letters of support from 15 households

Support expansion
- Need to modernise
- Extra employment and revenue
- Will move traffic from village
- Support with agreement on routing
- Turning vehicles may slow traffic movements
- Limited additional traffic
- Villagers able to use car park staff room etc. for events
- Will lead to a reduction in noise
- Addressed drainage issues

Thirty two letters of objection 28 households
- Increase in traffic
- Road safety
- Conflict between vehicles and pedestrian entrance near playing field and Common /school bus stop and no footpath
- Noise disturbance including fork lift alarms
- No detail on position of air conditioning units and generators
- Visual impact in rural landscape
- Loss of hedging
- Loss of wildlife
- Impact of new borehole
- Would additional water requirements affect water pressure
- Impact of hydrogen sulphides
- Potential hazard from bio aerosols air borne health hazard
- Sewage treatment plant will contaminate fresh water spring on Flordon Common which is a SSSI
- Impact on SSSI
- Would need to be passing bays who would pay for these
- Currently lorries reversing in and out of access
- Questions the ability to condition items
- Light pollution
- Smell
This application proposes the expansion of an established mushroom farm by the erection of additional buildings providing 2,940 sqm of additional floorspace. The buildings are approximately 5 metres (m) high and have a form similar to polytunnels with dark green polythene covering. The application also proposes a new staff building and a new access leading to new parking and servicing areas that will ultimately remove commercial traffic and activity from the existing access. Members should note that the proposed development has been amended several times to address issues arising during consideration of the application and the following assessment refers to the latest revisions.

The proposed development is anticipated to increase employment from 30 to 64 full-time staff and from 12 to 16 part-time jobs. Traffic is predicted to increase from approximately 24 vehicles a day visiting the site to approximately 44 vehicles. The majority of the increase is from non-HGV traffic. Tractors with trailers and HGVs are predicted to increase from an average of 3 per day to 6 per day (Mon-Fri).

Taking account of the circumstances of the site and relevant planning policies, the main issues to be considered in assessing this proposal are; the principle of the development; landscape and visual impact; traffic and highway considerations; drainage and ecology; and residential amenity.

Principle of the development

Members will be aware that the NPPF and Joint Core Strategy encourage economic growth, in both urban and rural areas, subject to detailed considerations (NPPF sections 1 and 3, JCS policies 5 and 17). SNLP policies EMP 5 and 6 also promote agricultural development and the expansion of existing businesses provided that the development is in keeping with its surroundings, adequate landscaping is provided and satisfactory access, parking and servicing is made available.

More detailed issues are considered below, but the principle of expanding an existing agricultural enterprise is clearly consistent with national and local planning policy.

Landscape/ Visual impact

The proposed buildings will cover a substantial area, but their modest height (5m), rounded form, and their siting well away from the public highway, will reduce their prominence in the landscape. The dark green colouring of the structures will also reduce their visual impact and the reinforcement of existing hedgerows and further new landscaping can ensure that the development is assimilated successfully into the landscape. Planting will also be required to replace the roadside hedge where removed for the new access. A condition is proposed to control outside lighting so that any light spillage from the site is minimised.

In view of the above, I consider that the visual impact of the development would accord with relevant policies requiring the protection and enhancement of the natural environment including NPPF sec11, JCS policy1 and SNLP policy IMP2.

Traffic and Highways

Considerable concern has been expressed by local people about the potential traffic increase and highway safety implications of the proposed development in view of the narrow, rural nature of the highway network serving the site. There has been discussion regarding the routing of HGVs to the west, rather than through Flordon Village.

Although the development will increase traffic, I do not consider that this is unusual or unacceptable, especially given the characteristics of modern farm traffic which frequently
has to negotiate narrow rural roads in this District. Traffic routing is difficult or impossible to
enforce, and in this case I do not consider that the number of HGVs involved justifies such
a requirement.

4.10 Members will note that, subject to a final amendment to the plans to show 120m visibility
splays, the Highway Authority is raising no objection to the application. The site has ample
space to provide for all necessary parking, turning and operational areas.

4.11 The new access proposed will not only serve the new development, but will also enable the
removal of existing commercial traffic and activity (tray emptying and storage) from the
present access which is located on a bend and adjacent to residential property. I consider
this is a material consideration and a benefit to be derived from the development.

4.12 I conclude that an objection to the development on highway safety grounds could not be
sustained and, although the highway network is not ideal, I consider that the employment
benefits of the proposal outweigh the shortcomings of the roads serving the site. I conclude
that the development is consistent with SNLP policy IMP8 regarding the safe and free flow
of traffic.

Drainage and Ecology

4.13 The application site is adjacent and at a higher level than Flordon Common which is an
SSSI and part of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The development has the potential
to affect the quality of water in the adjacent sensitive area and it is for this reason that
drainage of the development is considered with its potential ecological impact.

4.14 The business does not use artificial chemicals or fertilisers, but it is still important to control
the quality, nutrient level and volume of water discharged from the site. Following
discussions and amendments, the application proposes that foul water (from the staff
facilities) will be discharged to the main foul sewer. Run-off from roofs and hard-standings
will be directed to attenuation ponds (via oil/ silt traps where appropriate) before discharge
to the existing ditch system. Wash-down water from the buildings will be directed to
filtration beds before reaching other watercourses.

4.15 These proposals are considered acceptable by our consultant ecologist who advises that,
subject to appropriate conditions, the development will not adversely affect the SSSI. As
noted above, the design of any external lighting is to be controlled so that any disturbance
to wildlife from lighting is minimised.

4.16 In these circumstances I consider the development is consistent with local and national
policies requiring the protection of important habitats and biodiversity including NPPF
section 11, JCS policy 1 and SNLP policies ENV 13 and 14.

Residential Amenity

4.17 Members will note from the location plan the position of the site in relation to residential
properties and the village of Flordon. I anticipate that the greatest potential for any adverse
impact on the amenities of residents would be noise from traffic and on-site activities. The
relocation of the loading/ unloading and tray emptying areas further from the built up part of
the village is of benefit in this respect.

4.18 A condition controlling hours of operation is proposed (0700-1800hrs M-F; 0700-1230 Sat,
Sun and Bank Hols). This reflects the applicant’s requested working hours, except that the
applicant indicates work would cease at 16:30 Monday to Friday. I consider that the
continuation of operations until 1800hrs Monday to Friday would be more reasonable and
enforceable as a condition, even if the applicant does not choose to operate for all of this
time.
4.19 In view of the agricultural nature of the development, the established business on the site, the controlled operating hours and the degree of separation from residential properties, I consider that the proposed development is not likely to create unacceptable disturbance to the residential amenities of the area.

5 Conclusion

5.1 I conclude that the expansion of this established agricultural business is in accord with national and local planning policy. The impacts of the development are acceptable and can be controlled and mitigated by conditions relating to details of the new access, landscaping, drainage and hours of operation. The proposal would bring economic benefit to the rural economy and in all these circumstances the application should be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  
Chris Trett 01508 533794  
ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2013/0567/F  
   **Parish**: COSTESSEY  

**Applicants Name**: Mr Tucker & Mr Bryan  
**Site Address**: Lodge Farm Phase 2 Development Dereham Road Costessey  
Norfolk NR5 0SX

**Proposal**: FULL application for 495 dwellings, associated infrastructure, open space and allotments and OUTLINE permission for reserve site for a single form entry school, small convenience store, sports pavilion including changing facilities, small meeting room, associated parking, demolition of 4 dwellings and associated farm buildings  
(Amended 27/01/14)

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

---

**Outline**

1. Outline Permission Time Limit
2. Standard outline requiring RM
3. In accord with submitted drawings
4. Phasing plan

**Full**

5. Full Planning permission time limit
6. In accord with submitted drawings
7. External materials to be agreed
8. New Water Efficiency
9. Renewable energy
10. Historic Building Recording
11. Archaeological work to be agreed
12. Unidentified archaeology
13. Full details of external lighting
14. Contaminated land - submit scheme
15. Reporting of unexpected contamination
16. Cycle Parking and Refuse Storage
17. Tree protection
18. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
19. Implement landscaping scheme
20. Landscaping management plan
21. Details of foul water disposal
22. Surface Water
23. Construction work
24. Construction Traffic (Parking)
25. Construction Traffic Management
26. Ecology Mitigation
27. Bird breeding season

Subject to S106 to cover delivery of highway improvements, school, the sports pavilion, provision and maintenance of playspace and open space, affordable housing, contribution to libraries, school, travel plan and green infrastructure, and phasing and delivery of housing, open spaces and landscaping.

---

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   
   NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
   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
NPPF 13:Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

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 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)
ENV 3: River valleys
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting (Part Consistent)
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
ENV 19: Tree Preservation Orders
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (part consistent)
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
SHO 2: Retail development impact test (Part Consistent)
SHO 9: Shop sites in major residential development
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities
LEI 4: Indoor leisure facilities – sequential test (Part Consistent)
LEI 5: Indoor leisure facilities – impact test (Part Consistent)
LEI 6: Smaller scale leisure facilities (Part Consistent)
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
HOU 2: Overall distribution of site specific housing land allocations (Part Consistent)
HOU 3: Strategic land reserved (Part Consistent)
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns
HOU 18: Loss of residential accommodation (Non consistent)
UTL 12: Hazardous installations and underground pipelines
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
UTL 15: Contaminated land
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 13: Corridors of movement
TRA 17: Off site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards
CS16 – Safeguarding mineral and waste sites and mineral resources

Proposals maps

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide 2012

1.7 Procedural Matters Relating to the Development Plan and the NPPF

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.

1.8 Other material considerations

Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (2011)
The Localism Act 2011 – s143 Local Finance Considerations

1.9 Emerging Policies

The Site Specific Allocations and Policies document (Regulation 19 submission 2013) and Emerging Development Management Policies document (Regulation 19 submission 2013) have a number of policies that are relevant to this site as detailed below. However these policies have little weight at present as they are not adopted.

COS1: Land West of Lodge Farm, Dereham Road
COS2: Land South west of Lodge Farm, Long Lane
DM1.1: Sustainable development
DM1.2: Infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3: Sustainable location of development
DM1.4: Environmental quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.4: Location of main town centre uses
DM3.1: Housing quality
DM3.2: Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.9: Design principles
DM3.11: Promotion of sustainable development
DM3.12: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14: Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15: Pollution, health and safety
DM3.16: Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.17: Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.1: Buildings fabric energy efficiency, carbon compliance and allowable solutions
DM4.2: Renewable energy
DM4.3: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.6: Landscape character areas and river valleys
DM4.7: Landscape setting of Norwich
DM4.9: Protection of trees and hedgerows
DM4.10: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11: Heritage assets
2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1130 Application request for Screening Opinion to provide up to 580 dwellings, 1 Form Entry Primary School, Community Hall and Local Shops. Environmental Impact Assessment - not required

2.2 2011/0433 Application request for Screening Opinion to provide 500 dwellings, strategic landscaping, open space and vehicular accesses Environmental Impact Assessment - not required

3. Consultations

3.1 Costessey Parish Council

   *Original proposal*
   No objection subject to concerns being addressed. Concerns raised over cumulative impact of all development within the surrounding area particularly on highways, design of slip road, design of play areas, open space and allotments, access to sports pitches, shared road surfaces, bin storage and safety of children with drainage swales. The school is welcomed but the trigger point is questioned.

   *First revision to proposal*
   No objection subject to traffic mitigation measures. Parish Council willing to take on management of play space and open spaces, concern that retail store not viable. School should be delivered in first phase. Also request involvement in reserved matters applications.

   *Second revision to proposal*
   No objections subject to traffic mitigation. Particularly disappointed over change in national guidance removing the requirement for the slip road. Traffic mitigation measures not considered to be sufficient. Recommend further consideration given to ensure traffic flow.

   Bawburgh Parish Council

   *Original and first revision to proposal*
   No objections

   *Second revision to proposal*
   Concern over traffic congestion, need for three lanes on William Frost Way and concerns over traffic travelling from Easton to Bawburgh.

3.2 District Member

   No comments received

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd

   Concern over foul sewage disposal, resolved with developer but a drainage strategy should be conditioned.

3.4 Conservation Officer

   Concern raised over buildings to be removed on site.

3.5 Design Officer

   No objection - following detailed design advice.

3.6 Environment Agency

   No objections - subject to conditions on contamination, surface water and sustainable urban drainage systems.

3.7 Ecologist - NCC

   Concern raised over mitigation and compensation measures for protected species, resolved with further information received.

3.8 EDF Energy

   No comments received
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.9</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>No comment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Environmental Health - No objection subject to consideration to contamination, sewerage from school, noise mitigation measures, lighting to non-residential uses and a construction management plan. Flood Officer - no objection. Details to be agreed through condition over management of surface water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Fisher German</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>No objection - following discussion proposed highway improvement works acceptable. See appendix 1 for consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Historic Environment Service</td>
<td>Objection - high potential for heritage assets in surrounding area. Targeted trial trenching required prior to determination and assessment of historic buildings on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Health And Safety Executive</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Housing Strategy Manager</td>
<td>No objections - affordable housing provision acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Waste &amp; Environmental SNC</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Landscape Officer</td>
<td>No significant objection but consideration into hedgerows and root protection areas to be considered, along with adoption of public areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
<td>No objection - the developer is reminded to contact National Grid before commencing works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>To be reported at committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer</td>
<td>Objection on grounds of mineral safeguarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>NCC- Planning Obligations</td>
<td>No objections - contributions required to schools, fire hydrants, library and monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>Police Architectural Liaison Officer</td>
<td>Requirement for contribution to policing function. Concerns initially raised over safety of parking areas in some courtyards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>No objections - preferred site in emerging local plan. Issues to be considered around sustainable transport links, highway impact, mineral resource, landfill gas migration, sewerage capacity and primary school provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>British Gas Transco</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.25 | Representations | 1 letter of support 37 letters of objection received, from 25 different people, siting the following issues:  
- Highway capacity and safety issues  
- Loss of agricultural land |
• Unfinished state of phase 1
• Overdevelopment of area and environmental impact
• Air quality
• Residential amenity
• Pedestrian and cycle links
• Phasing of works unclear
• Location of play area onto Lord Nelson Drive unsafe
• Impact on protected species and natural habitats
• Need and affordability of houses
• Impact on property and value of property prices
• Potential changes to plans at a later date
• Renewable energy provision not clear
• Misrepresentation of support for application
• Insufficient consultation
• Increase in numbers from original plans
• Not enough large open areas

4 Assessment

Site context and constraints

4.1 The site is located at the junction of Dereham Road (A1074) to the Southern Bypass (A47) to the west of Norwich. The site forms 38ha within a triangle of land bounded by these roads. The use of the land is currently as a farm, with the land being grade 3 agricultural land. The land is at a slightly lower level than the A47, with the overall levels of the land sloping down to the south towards the river valley.

4.2 To the east of the site is the first phase of the redevelopment of Lodge Farm, forming 488 dwellings. The site of this application is identified as a preferred site in the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies document. The area of land has also been identified in the Joint Core Strategy as an area of strategic growth.

4.3 The site is also subject to several other constraints, most significantly it is outside the development boundary for Costessey forming part of the open countryside, part of the Southern Bypass protection zone and a strategic gap, and identified for mineral safeguarding in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework.

4.4 The A47 and A1074 are identified within the local plan as corridors of movement, forming a significant entrance point into Norwich from the west of the county. The site is also within a site of archaeological interest and contains existing farm buildings of some historic interest. There are trees along the boundary with Dereham Road that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders, and other significant trees and vegetation on the site.

4.5 The site is also adjacent to Longwater retail park and land allocated for employment uses to the north of Dereham Road. There is also a former landfill to the north of Dereham Road. Other constraints include a high pressure gas pipeline through north east section of the site. The site is in flood zone 1, the lowest risk flood zone.

Principle of development

4.6 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.
4.7 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. At the Examination in Public into the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy the GNDP Councils presented a supply of 4.58 years for the whole Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and 4.42 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. Therefore in this instance the direction of Saved Policy ENV8 can be discounted and the site should be assessed on its deliverability, availability, sustainability and all other material issues.

4.8 This area within the Norwich Policy Area is identified for significant residential growth within policy 10 of the Joint Core Strategy. The site is also in line with the emerging policy site allocation policies, but as this is yet to go through formal examination it has less weight in planning terms than adopted policy.

4.9 The site benefits from public transport routes, access to employment areas, shops and leisure facilities. The full 33% affordable housing provision required is also proposed on the site in line with policy 4 of the JCS. To consider whether this development should be granted on this site outside of existing development limits however, the adverse impacts of granting permission should be considered against the benefits.

4.10 Therefore a full consideration of all material planning issues must be considered. These include the principle of a school, retail unit and sports pavilion on the site, heritage impacts, mineral resources, highways and access, design and landscape, residential amenity, water and energy resources, ecology and trees, gas pipeline, contamination and local finance considerations.

**Principle of school**

4.11 Land of 1.1ha has been identified for a primary school on the site, with a financial contribution of £791,792 being made to Norfolk County Council for future school provision. The principle of the school at this location has been considered, and is likely to serve the immediate surrounding area with the existing and proposed growth in this application. This is therefore considered to be acceptable as it would be in an accessible location for surrounding communities in line with paragraph 38 of the NPPF.

**Principle of retail and sports pavilion**

4.12 The proposals also entail a small convenience store and a sports pavilion. The exact design and appearance of these facilities are to be determined through reserved matters, as only outline permission is sought for these.

4.13 The principle of retail is considered to be acceptable as the site area of 0.6ha dedicated to this use is only likely to serve the surrounding catchment of Lodge Farm, in accordance with policy SHO9 of the local plan. The principle of the sports pavilion is also considered appropriate to the scale of development at Lodge Farm, providing changing facilities and community space to be used in association with the sports pitches. This development would be broadly in accordance with policy LEI6 of the local plan.

4.14 The delivery of these community facilities are to be secured through the S106 agreement to ensure that they are delivered alongside the dwellings.
Heritage impacts

4.15 The development on site would result in the loss of the existing farmhouse and 4 dwellings on the site. The net gain of dwellings would outweigh the loss, but the heritage interest of the buildings must first be considered.

4.16 The buildings are not designated heritage assets and so do not have any statutory protected. They are noted to be of some interest as a non-designated heritage asset. The loss of these buildings must be considered in terms of the importance of the heritage asset as set out in paragraph 135 of the NPPF. The benefits of this scheme however would deliver a significant number of dwellings along with community facilities in a sustainable location. In this instance it is considered that provided a detailed photographic record of the buildings is made prior to demolition through condition to any permission, that the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the loss of these buildings.

4.17 The site is also likely to contain artefacts of heritage interest in terms of archaeology. Whilst policy ENV9 of the local plan requires full evaluation to be carried out prior to permission being granted, paragraph 128 of the NPPF does not require these surveys in advance of permission being granted. In line with paragraph 128 of the NPPF a condition is therefore recommended for trial-trenching field evaluation to be carried out prior to commencement to identify any artefacts of interest and arrange relocation as required. A condition is also recommended to any approval made to ensure works stop if any further artefacts are found.

Mineral resources

4.18 The site is within an existing waste site as identified in policy CS16 of the core strategy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (2011). This site however no longer accepts waste and so no issues are raised in relation waste disposal.

4.19 Norfolk County Council has raised an objection on the basis of mineral safeguarding due to the potential for the site to contain mineral deposits. The site is identified within the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (2013) as a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel. The wording of policy CS16 identifies that sand and gravel are not as scare as other resources such as silica, but still should be safeguarded and not ‘needlessly sterilised’ by other development. This policy direction is reiterated in paragraph 143 of the NPPF. However, this paragraph within the NPPF goes on to identify that this protection will not create a presumption that these resources will be worked.

4.20 Policy CS16 of the core strategy also identifies that investigations should be carried out to see whether the safeguarded mineral resource has any economic value, and if so whether extraction could be carried out prior to development taking place.

4.21 The economic value of deposits under the proposed development site has been investigated by the applicant. The deposits under the site were found to have a high content of clay and therefore considered to be less workable. Extraction prior to future development of the site is therefore considered to not be economically viable and less likely. The applicant has indicated that any resources found on site would be used where possible in the construction of the proposed development. Any useful minerals would be used as it would save costs on importing identical new materials.

4.22 The issue of the impact on mineral workings on the existing residents of Phase 1 of the Lodge Farm development is also a consideration. Whilst the precise operation of any potential mineral extraction is not known, the close proximity of existing residential properties would be a key material consideration.
4.23 Whilst paragraph 144 of the NPPF identifies great weigh should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction including the economy, the potential for extraction appears limited on initial investigation and the benefits of the proposed development must be considered. Under paragraph 14 of the NPPF the adverse impacts must significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. In this instance the adverse impacts are not considered to be significant enough on the grounds of mineral extraction to justify refusal of the application on these grounds, in particular when considering the significant housing the scheme would deliver in a sustainable location.

Highways and access

4.24 There have been extensive negotiations over the improvements to the surrounding highway network in relation to this site. Saved Policy TRA17 requires highway improvements to mitigate any impacts of the development. The original plans submitted with the planning application identified a dedicated left turn lane from Dereham Road, south onto the A47 to be delivered with this development.

4.25 However, in September 2013 central Government issued Circular 02/2013 on The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development. Under previous guidance the transport assessment was required to consider the fully occupied development and background growth in the following ten years from the request for permission. The new circular now requires the fully occupied development to be assessed, but in the opening year only which leads to the background traffic growth not being considered. This in effect reduces the traffic impact as all the other planned growth does not need to be taken into account. This in effect has led to the removal of the requirement for the developer to provide a direct slip road to mitigate the impacts of the development. However, the land for this slip road is still available leading to it being possible to implement this project at a later date when funding is available to do so.

4.26 In lieu of this improvement other highway mitigation measures have been agreed, including the widening of Dereham Road to create a left hand turn land at the junction of the A1074 and the A47 roundabout to head south east onto the A47. These improvements are to be secured through a S106 agreement with South Norfolk Council and a S278 agreement with Norfolk County Council.

4.27 In the view of the highway authority, Norfolk County Council, the development has proposed mitigation measures in excess of the minimum requirement now identified within the above Circular. Therefore there are no objections on highways grounds. Contributions are proposed to be made through the S106 agreement for a travel plan for this site.

4.28 As noted in the letters of representation, there are a number of other developments coming forward in the surrounding area. Concern has been raised over these and the ability of the transport network to cope with the additional growth. A series of junction upgrades between Longwater and Easton have been identified and are in the process of being programmed for implementation. Under policy 10 of the JCS the future planned growth is dependent on the upgrade of the junction of the A47 at Longwater. The release of further consents for development would be dependent on the delivery of further junction improvements.

4.29 Parking spaces have been provided for all of the new dwellings in general accordance with the adopted Parking Standards for Norfolk 2007, which are referred to in Saved Policy TRA19 of the local plan. In some instances garages are also provided in addition to the spaces provided. These garages will be expected to store refuse bins and cycles as well and so in this instance it is considered the parking spaces are provided to an acceptable level.

4.30 Concerns have been raised over the potential highway safety with the design and layout of roads within the development, in particular parking over the access roads. The only way to control parking would be to introduce parking restrictions, but it is not the policy of the
Highways Authority to do so in residential areas. Parking provision has been provided within the development, at some points exceeding parking standards, and so it is difficult to recommend inappropriate parking as a reason for refusal to this planning application. It would be unreasonable when adequate provision has been made in line with adopted parking standards.

4.31 Concerns have been raised over the road widths within the development. The highways department at the County Council have considered the internal road layout of the development and are satisfied with the design and layout. The connecting road between phase 1 and 2 have been raised as a concern that additional traffic from phase 2 would use the existing road network within phase 1, leading to a disruption to existing residents. Phase 2 has its own high capacity signal controlled junction onto Dereham Road. In the opinion of the highway authority residents from phase 2 are less likely to use the exit from phase 1 onto Dereham Road when the junction provided would give a more direct route to Dereham Road.

4.32 The connection of this site to the wider cycle network has been considered. This site proposes further growth adjacent to existing growth. The provision of strategic cycle links to this site is therefore difficult to request on the basis of this application alone. The discussions with the county council over highways have led to improvements being secured and no objection being raised over accessibility. The scheme is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of accessibility. Cycling parking provision can be made in either the garages or rear gardens of dwellings. For communal flatted buildings a condition is recommended for cycle storage to be agreed.

4.33 The bus rapid transit route proposed along Dereham Road has been raised as a concern. The route has been identified in previous consultations by the county council as a rapid transit bus route, but this has not yet been implemented. The precise design of the transit route has not yet been determined. The road capacity is being increased through this application through an additional lane on Dereham Road heading west. The existing road capacity is therefore being increased which may be of assistance to the rapid transit route in future. Therefore there is no reason this development would prevent the rapid transit from coming forward.

Design and landscape

4.34 The development site is in a prominent position both through its visibility to motorists using the A47, surrounding residents and from the river Wensum valley to the south of the site. The application has gone through extensive discussions over the appearance of the development, the street scenes and key vistas of the development. Revisions suggested by the council have been made by the applicants to lead to the development now being of acceptable appearance, meeting the requirements of good design of Saved Policy IMP5 of the local plan, policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF. A condition is recommended for materials to be agreed.

4.35 The landscaping of the open space, communal areas and key street scenes have been discussed and plans amended to ensure the overall appearance of the development meets a good standard in both terms of extent and quality. Planting specification and management have been submitted for these areas. The landscaping for the development within the boundaries of dwellings has not been submitted. To ensure a good standard of landscaping in line with Saved Policy IMP2 a condition is recommended for the landscaping, specification, planting and management of these areas, along with a replacement landscaping condition for all areas. The provision of communal open spaces is also secured through the S106 agreement.
Amenity of existing and future occupiers

4.36 The amenity of existing residential occupiers requires consideration under Saved Policy IMP9 of the local plan. The amenity of existing and future occupiers requires full consideration. The key existing residents that would be affected by the proposed development are the residents of the development that has already occurred at Lodge Farm. The new development would lead to overlooking, a loss of outlook, loss of daylight, loss of direct sunlight, additional noise and lighting to some areas of the new development.

4.37 The dwellings on the west boundary of the existing development on Lodge Farm would be most affected by the proposed development. The majority of the neighbouring houses would be at a sufficient distance to not be significantly adversely affected through overlooking, overshadowing, a loss of direct sunlight or noise. The dwellings adjacent to the school could potentially suffer from additional noise from school children, but appropriate boundary treatment would mitigate this concern to an acceptable degree.

4.38 Dwellings at 38-40 Dolphin Road and 4 to 6 Lion Close would be closer to proposed development. The dwellings on Lion Close would be around 30 to 40m from new dwellings which would include both two and three storey development. This proximity would lead to some loss of privacy, outlook, and potentially daylight and direct sunlight in late evenings in summer. However, due to the layout of development dwellings would be staggered and in effect no new windows would look directly to existing dwellings. Therefore whilst the loss of amenity to these dwellings is noted, it is not considered to be sufficiently detrimental to merit refusal of the application on this ground.

4.39 The dwelling at 38 Dolphin Road in particular would be at a much closer proximity to new development at 15m. The new development at plot 70 would only be two storeys however. The new development has been designed to not directly face the existing dwellings, and the main outlook for Dolphin Road from different elevations to the west elevation that would be most affected.

4.40 The amenity of future residents of the proposed housing is also of key consideration under paragraph 17 of the NPPF. The overall layout of the development would lead to some limited outlook and overlooking for new residents, but this would be within the acceptable boundaries for new development that is built to a more dense form.

4.41 It is considered however there would be sufficient space around dwellings for gardens, parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse storage. In accordance with Saved Policy UTL14 refuse storage is provided in communal areas for flatted buildings and dwellings on private driveways. Some refuse collection areas are not specified, but this could be agreed through condition.

4.42 The lighting from future recreation uses to the south of the site would require careful consideration under Saved Policy IMP25 of the local plan, both for the impact on residents and the surrounding natural environment. A condition is therefore recommended for any lighting scheme to be agreed through condition.

4.43 The impact of noise also requires consideration under Saved Policy IMP 10 of the local plan. Noise from the proposed residential use would have some impact on existing residents, but not to a degree that would lead to a significant loss of amenity. The noise from the A47 however is of key concern in relation to the amenity of future residents. An earth bund along the west boundary of the site has been agreed. This is proposed to be implemented with the first two phases of development to provide adequate noise protection for the dwellings. Delivery of this would be secured through a phasing plan which is recommended to be conditioned.
It is also recognised that as phase 1 is partly occupied there is potential for disturbance from the construction of phase 2. Given the size of the development it is likely to take several years to complete phase 2. To ensure that disturbance is minimised to the residents of phase 1 a construction management plan is recommended to be conditioned. This will seek to reduce noise, dust and other associated disturbances from the construction phase.

An air quality assessment report has been submitted with the application considering the impact of future traffic associated with the development and construction traffic during construction. The additional emissions were considered to be negligible for the future development with minor to moderate impact on adjacent residences during construction. The construction management plan recommended for condition will mitigate this to an acceptable level.

**Water and energy**

The site is not in a high risk flood zone but the surface water of the developed area would require careful consideration under policy 3 of the JCS and paragraph 103 of the NPPF. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application identifying flood management measures, including sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS). This is recommended to be conditioned to ensure this is followed. The SUDS system will entail significant landscaping which has been identified within the phasing plan for the scheme and accompanying S106 agreement. This is already recommended for condition as referred to above.

New development should consider the impact of wastewater on surrounding networks under policy 3 of the JCS. Concern was raised by Anglian Water over foul sewage disposal. Through discussion with the developer this matter was resolved, provided a drainage strategy was conditioned to be agreed.

The dwellings would require at least 10% renewable energy and all dwellings to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water efficiency, in line with policy 3 of the JCS. The retail and community uses would also be expected to meet the same level of renewable energy demand and be of high water efficiency. Conditions are recommended to this effect with details to be agreed.

**Ecology and trees**

The site currently forms farmland with farm buildings and some dwellings. The ecology survey for the site has identified protected species using the site including roosting, foraging and commuting bats, breeding birds, reptiles and great crested newts. The impact on these requires careful consideration under Saved Policy ENV15 of the local plan. The impacts on the majority of these protected species could be managed through appropriate mitigation measures.

Concern had been raised through the application that the relocation of protected bat species would not be effective. However, through appropriate relocation methodologies, protected bat species could be temporarily re-homed before works commence, with future development containing bat bricks to enable roosting within the proposed development. Appropriate lighting schemes would also be required to ensure bats could still forage in appropriate natural corridors. The S106 agreement also requires payment towards green infrastructure provision.

There are a number of trees on site including protected trees along Dereham Road. The protection of these trees and general habitat on site is important under Saved Policies ENV14 and ENV19 of the local plan. Information submitted with the application indicates that significant trees will be protected. Whilst there may be some loss of biomass from
removal of self-sown trees this will be mitigated against through proposed replanting. Both tree protection and re-planting are recommended to be conditioned.

4.52 A survey of the hedges present on site was also carried out. This indicated they were predominantly species-poor and not classed as important under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Appropriate enhancement measures through planting on site would provide an opportunity to improve the species diversity of planting on site.

Gas pipeline

4.53 There is a high pressure gas pipeline under part of the site to the north east corner. The National Grid have been consulted and provided advice on carrying out work in the vicinity of this pipeline. The area above this pipeline is proposed to be open space, forming an informal recreation space. The development would not therefore adversely affect the pipeline in accordance with Saved Policy UTL12 of the local plan.

Contamination

4.54 The site was in previous use as a farm. The potential for contamination requires further consideration under Saved Policy UTL15 of the local plan. A desk-top study submitted indicated no likely contaminants would be found. However, further site-based investigation work is recommended. Therefore conditions are recommended for further investigation works to stop if unidentified pollutants are found.

Section 106 agreement

4.55 This report has identified the delivery of highway improvements, the sports pavilion, provision and maintenance of playspace and open space, and affordable housing to be delivered through a Section 106 agreement. Whilst the exact commencement of the development cannot be required, the phasing of improvements once started will be as agreed with the council. This agreement will also require financial contributions to libraries, green infrastructure, travel plan and financial contribution to and provision of land for the school. The phasing of the housing delivery including when open spaces and noise protection through a landscape bund is provided.

Other matters raised in representations

4.56 Concerns have been raised over the unfinished state of phase 1, the impact on property values and the physical buildings by additional traffic, potential changes to plans at a later date, increasing number from original plans, insufficient consultation and a misrepresentation of support for the application.

4.57 The council cannot insist the developer finishes the commenced development on phase 1 unless this relates to a matter secured through a legal agreement, for example a community facility. The impact on property values is not a material planning consideration so cannot be given any weight in the decision making process. The physical impact of additional traffic on existing houses would be considered at the construction stage of those houses. The structural integrity of a building would be a building control issue. The nature of traffic within the estate is unlikely to be significant heavy vehicles even with the connection to phase 2. This is not a planning matter as it relates to building construction however.

4.58 The suitability of any further amendments to the scheme would be considered as and when they are submitted. The council could not insist the original plans are not amended. All public consultations have taken place by the council in accordance with planning regulations, along with pre-application consultation by the developers and consultation under the site allocation process being carried out by the council. The applicants have presented comments from their community consultations, and whilst there is concern these
may have been misrepresented, the comments made on this application have been received by the council and considered within this report. Appropriate consultations are therefore considered to have taken place.

4.59 The concern over the environmental impact of development within the area has been considered by the council. A screening opinion was carried out, but there were not considered to be significant impacts to merit a full Environmental Impact Assessment.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development would be on agricultural land that is not currently identified for development with the current adopted local plan. Therefore approving the proposed development would be a departure from the adopted local plan. However, there are other significant material considerations when considering this site.

5.2 There is currently no 5-year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area which this site is within. As such, the housing policies of the local plan must be considered out of date according to paragraph 49 of the NPPF and there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As defined within paragraph 14 of the NPPF, a presumption in favour of sustainable development means approving planning permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

5.3 The issues first raised by the development have largely been resolved through negotiations through the planning application. Ongoing negotiations over highway improvements have concluded that the developer has reasonably proposed adequate improvement measures and the development meets the requirements of the highway authority. Also land is available at a later date for a dedicated slip road heading east onto the A47 when funding becomes available.

5.4 Significant concerns have also been raised over the sterilising of safeguarded mineral deposits and the loss of non-designated heritage assets on site. In the instance of both of these the benefits of additional housing in a sustainable location has been balanced against the adverse impacts to mineral supply and the heritage assets. On further investigation of the mineral assets the quality was not found to be great reducing the potential for working the site in future for mineral extraction. The heritage significance of the buildings to be demolished was also considered further but the heritage importance was not considered significant enough to merit refusal of the application. In the instance of both of these the adverse impacts were not considered to outweigh the benefits the scheme would deliver.

5.5 In terms of residential amenity it is also noted that there would be an impact on the residents of phase 1 of the development at Lodge Farm. These adverse impacts have been considered but again are not considered sufficient enough to merit refusal of the application. Conditions are recommended to ensure the amenity of residents is protected during the construction phase of the development.

5.6 The application has therefore been considered by weighing the adverse impacts against the benefits. In this instance the key adverse impacts on highways, accessibility, safeguarded minerals, heritage significance and residential amenity are not considered to outweigh the benefits this scheme would deliver of significant additional housing in a sustainable location within the Norwich Policy Area. Therefore subject to the recommended conditions and accompanying S106 agreement the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jo Hobbs 01508 533674 jhobbs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Dear Ian

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 2010
PLANNING APPLICATION: 2013/0567
PROPOSAL: FULL application for 495 dwellings, associated infrastructure, open space, allotments and new access slip road onto A47
LOCATION: Lodge Farm Phase 2, Dereham road, Costessey.

Further to my letter dated 12 December 2013 I have been made aware that discussions with Norfolk county council have reached a conclusion.

I therefore write with my formal response to your planning consultation and confirm that on the understanding that the highway works now proposed and shown on drawing number E2177/37 revision L (21 January 2014) produced by Wormald Burrows Partnership Limited entitled Proposed A47/A1074 Dereham Road Junction Upgrades originally dated 5 December 2011 are to be constructed and opened to traffic before the occupation of the 100th dwelling, I would raise no objection.

I enclose a TR110 dated 29 January 2014 to reflect the above.

Yours Sincerely

Roger Chenery
NDD East Asset Development
Email: PlanningEE@highways.gsi.gov.uk
Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads
Highways Agency Response to an Application for Planning Permission

From: Divisional Director, Network Delivery and Development, Eastern Region, Highways Agency.

To: South Norfolk Council

Council’s Reference: 2013/0567

Referring to the notification of a planning application dated 23 July 2013, your reference 2013/0567F, in connection with the A47. FULL application for 495 dwellings, associated infrastructure, open space, allotments and new access slip road onto A47 Lodge Farm Phase 2, Dereham road, Costessey. Notice is hereby given under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 that the Secretary of State for Transport:

On the understanding that the highway works now proposed and shown on drawing number E2177/37 revision L (21 January 2014) produced by Wormold Burrows Partnership Limited entitled Proposed A47/A1074 Dereham Road junction upgrades originally dated 5 December 2011 are to be constructed and opened to traffic before the occupation of the 100th dwelling

a) offers no objection;

b) advises that planning permission should either be refused, or granted only subject to conditions

c) directs conditions to be attached to any planning permission which may be granted;

d) directs that planning permission is not granted for an indefinite period of time;

e) directs that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see Annex A).

(delete as appropriate)

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 27 January 2014

Name: MARK KIRK . Position: ASSET DEVELOPMENT TEAM LEADER.

The Highways Agency:
2nd Floor,
Woodlands,
Manton Lane,
Bedford, MK41 7LW
Other Applications

4. **Appl. No:** 2013/1274/O  
   **Parish:** BAWBURGH

   **Applicants Name:** Mr David Ward  
   **Site Address:** Land North Of Village Hall Stocks Hill Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LL  
   **Proposal:** Erection of 5no dwellings following demolition and removal of old piggeries

   **Recommendation:** Approval with conditions
   - 1 Outline Permission Time Limit
   - 2 Standard outline requiring RM
   - 3 External materials to be agreed
   - 4 New Water Efficiency
   - 5 Single storey dwellings only
   - 6 Ecology Mitigation
   - 7 Standard Outline Condition
   - 8 Levels to be agreed
   - 9 Boundary treatment to be agreed
   - 10 No additional windows at first floor
   - 11 PD rights for roof alterations removed

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for one, two bedroom, single storey affordable dwelling.

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 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 16 : Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   ENV 14: Habitat protection  
   ENV 15: Species protection  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP18: Development in conservation areas

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

2.2 No appeal history
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse:
- Too many houses for the size of the plot.
- Design and layout of inappropriate for a conservation area and development on the skyline.
- Properties on west boundary will overlook properties on Church Street
- Stability of bank on the west boundary
- Proposal to remove trees and shrubs from the eastern boundary
- Implied destruction of established trees and hedges is not acceptable in a conservation area.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Historic Environment Service No comments or conditions.

3.4 NCC Highways No objection in principle but include conditions:
Surface water drainage
Visibility splays
Access arrangements
Parking provisions in accordance with adopted standard
Turning Areas

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments to make.

3.6 Planning Policy Support: identified as a preferred option site to support 5 dwellings.

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections but include an advisory note for surface water drainage.

3.8 Norfolk Wildlife Trust No comments received

3.9 Ecologist Support subject to conditions suggested in ecology report.

3.10 Conservation Officer Original comments-Refuse insufficient information
Revised comments: - Support principle of 5 dwelling on site but need full details to reflect conservation area and South Norfolk Place Making Guide detailed in the reserved matters application.

3.11 Representations 6 Letters of objection
- Density of development not in keeping with conservations area should be reduced and it is not necessary for an affordable property to be included.
- Design of dwellings no details or material quality.
- Access to the development would be at a point in the village where visibility is limited introducing hazard for both pedestrians and vehicles.
- Lack detail in scheme
- Noise and disturbance
- Light pollution
- Loss of privacy of properties in Church Street due to land level
- No adequate boundary treatment
Development Management Committee  5 March 2014

2 Letters of support
- Agree in principle: but raise concern regarding exact proximity of dwellings to Village Hall boundary
- Maintenance of that boundary
- Retention of trees and hedges
- And possible future complaints from functions at the village hall.
- Will be an improvement to the area as site is currently overgrown.
- Properties should be single storey only.
- Vegetation on the north boundary of the site should be kept to 2 metres in height as suggested on the plan.

4 Assessment

4.1 This outline application is situated to the south of the main village centre of Bawburgh but immediately adjacent to the Village Hall. The site is a former piggery which is significantly overgrown and includes mature hedging to all boundaries. An existing access to the site is off Stock Hill. The site is outside the existing Development Boundary, but falls within the Conservation Area.

4.2 The application seeks outline approval for 5 single storey dwellings including one affordable property. With the exception of the access all matters are reserved.

4.3 The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document identifies this 0.37 hectare area of land as a preferred site (BAW 1) for residential development, and although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration.

4.4 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 consequently contrary to the saved local plan policy ENV8. The proposal therefore should be refused unless there are material considerations that dictate otherwise. The following material considerations need to be taken into account in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) in which Bawburgh is defined as an Other Village makes provision for small groups of dwellings subject to form and character considerations.
- The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocation document allocates this 0.37 hectare site as suitable for 5 dwellings. The size of the site triggers the requirement of one affordable property.
- 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 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 being delivered within the next 5 years.

Scale of development

4.5 Many local residents and the Parish Council consider five properties on this site too many which will have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The site has been identified through the Preferred Options Procedure as a site suitable for 5 single storey dwellings subject to the design of dwellings respecting the context of the conservation area and the river valley location.
4.6 An indicative plan has been submitted to demonstrate 5 plots can be achieved, however, the plan suggests 4 properties border the village hall with the fifth on the boundary of Stocks Hill. This plan is not acceptable and the end layout should form more of a ‘close’ however the layout of the site remains a reserved matter.

4.7 Having regard to the gradient of the site, single storey dwellings will be necessary to ensure there is no adverse harm to the wider context of the landscape and of the Conservation Area. The site has already been identified as suitable for development through the Preferred Options Consultation Procedure. At present the overgrown appearance of the site detracts from the Conservation Area. To ensure that the site can be developed, enhance the area while protecting the privacy of the neighbouring properties on Church Road, dwellings on this site need to be single storey. A condition has been included to ensure that the reserved matters take account of this requirement, while a further condition removes Permitted Development Rights for future roof alterations which would otherwise result in unacceptable harm to the conservation area and the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Impact on neighbours

4.8 Concern has been raised by properties along Church Street regarding loss of privacy resulting from the development of this plot. This issue has been addressed by restricting the design to single storey only and removing permitted development (PD) Rights for any roof alterations.

4.9 Boundary screening will be retained by the existing hedging and the necessary condition has been imposed to ensure this is retained, and in the event of loss through damage, or disease the hedge will need to be replaced. The boundary treatment protects the privacy of the neighbouring properties on Church Street, and of the proposed development while retaining the character of the boundaries of the site.

4.10 The development of this site for single storey properties only and with boundary treatments accords with policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Access

4.11 The proposed access to the site remains as at present which served the former piggery. Alterations will need to be made to ensure that the access accords with the requirements of the Highways Authority in terms of visibility splays, and the reduction of the vegetation to either side of the access.

4.12 The gradient of any drive will need to be designed not to exceed 1 in 12 to meet highway requirements as the levels of the land are considerably higher than road level.

4.13 Also a requirement is the provision of a foot link from the access point to the existing footway along the front of the village hall.

5 Conclusion

5.1 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.

5.2 The site is identified as preferred options site under the Site Specifics Allocations suitable for residential development. Although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration.
5.3 Although the site is currently outside the Development Boundary and contrary to ENV8, in the absence of a 5 year land supply, consideration must be given to development in sustainable locations which make a contribution to the land supply shortfall. On balance the site is within a sustainable location, is a preferred options site, and provides five dwellings one of which is for affordable housing. On balance, although only outline, the principle of developing this site is acceptable, however, all matters with the exception of the access are reserved and will require careful design to respect the conservation area and residential amenities of neighbouring properties. For these reasons the recommendation is that of approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number       Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail:                            jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2013/1330/A  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr R Hadzhiyski  
**Site Address**: 5 Cooper Court The Street Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XG  
**Proposal**: Proposed internally illuminated box sign (retrospective application)  
**Recommendation**: Refusal  
1. Contrary to policy  
2. Unsympathetic form of development

6. **Appl. No**: 2013/2189/LB  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr R Hadzhiyski  
**Site Address**: 5 Cooper Court The Street Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XG  
**Proposal**: Proposed internally illuminated box sign (retrospective application)  
**Recommendation**: Refusal  
1. Contrary to policy  
2. Unsympathetic form of development  

Authorise Enforcement Action to secure removal of box sign

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas  
IMP 19: Advertisements (Part Consistent)  
IMP 21: Illuminated advertisements (Part Consistent)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1922  
Retrospective application for change of use from retail to cafe/takeaway  
Pending consideration

2.2 2012/1924  
Retrospective application for change of use from retail to cafe/takeaway  
Pending consideration

2.3 2012/0163  
Change of use from previously approved planning permission 2010/0308/LB from retail to takeaway/restaurant  
Withdrawn

2.4 2012/0162  
Change of use from previously approved planning permission 2010/0307F from retail to takeaway/restaurant  
Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No objections to this retrospective application

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer No objections to the principle of an illuminated sign but the internally illuminated design is unsympathetic to the historic character of the listed building and conservation area.

3.4 Representations 2 letters expressing support.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is a former outbuilding to a Grade II listed building which is in a prominent position in the conservation area. It is brick and pantiled in construction and now part of a collection of businesses known as Cooper Court which are housed in the original roadside property and associated outbuildings set to its rear. The property lies within the conservation area for Long Stratton and is used as a cafe.

4.2 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies IMP19, and IMP21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan, because those policies remain partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework, however the significant impact of this advertisement does warrant detailed assessment. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, because this policy remains consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 An internally illuminated box sign has been erected over the entrance doors to the property without either advertisement or listed building consents. The signage consists of a black panel with white lettering and two chicken images set in a silver frame. The majority of the approved signage at Cooper Court is blue and white in appearance although there are some black and white signs elsewhere in the central area. The sign has a bulky appearance which can be seen in profile from The Street due to the orientation of the building at right angles to the main highway. The sign is also internally illuminated. This appearance is at odds with its location on a listed property within the conservation area. There are no other approved internally illuminated signs within the immediate area, including at The Chip Inn restaurant and other nearby take away premises where illumination is provided with either a trough lit system or downward facing spotlights.

4.4 Given the nature of the business there is no objection in principle to the use of illumination for signage at the site, only to the form in which this illumination is utilised. An amendment was sought to the proposals to remove the illuminated box sign and for it to be replaced with a blue and white externally illuminated sign which would be more in keeping with the area. The applicant agreed to the change of colour for the sign but failed to provide revised details for it. Additionally comments were made indicating that the Chip Inn nearby had internally illuminated signage, which is not the case. Following this correspondence the applicant submitted a listed building application for a blue and white sign but still internally illuminated which was contrary to policy.

4.5 Following further contact it was suggested that the front panel of the existing sign could be re-affixed to the property with external illumination as a compromise. This would maintain the appearance of the business premises as established whilst resolving the issues relating purely to the type of illumination. To date no response has been received to this proposal and as such the scheme would not comply with section 12 of the NPPF or policies IMP 13 and 19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
5 Conclusion

5.1 As submitted the signage is contrary to policies within the NPPF, JCS and SNLP documents in relation to design and appropriate development in conservation areas or on listed buildings. No amended proposals have been submitted as requested, and the proposal is consequently recommended for refusal and the authority sought for enforcement action to secure the removal of the sign.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Cross 01508 533960 hcross@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No** : 2013/2100/F  
**Parish** : THURLTON

Applicants Name : Mr William Morgan  
Site Address : Land West Of Blaen Waun Low Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6PZ  
Proposal : Temporary permission for 5 years for change of use of land for private site for 1 No Traveller residential pitch, including the siting of 1 'log cabin' style mobile home, 1 touring caravan, 1 'log cabin style' day room, parking for 2 vehicles and retention of gates and walls.

Recommendation : Part Approval with Conditions

1. Temporary TWO year consent  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. No more than 1 pitch comprising of 1 log cabin style mobile home, 1 touring caravan, 1 dayroom  
4. Laid out in accordance with approved plan  
5. Restrict occupation to Gypsies or Travellers  
6. Foul water drainage to be agreed  
7. Surface Water to be agreed  
8. Existing Access, Widen or Improve  
9. Access Gates - Configuration  
10. Visibility splay  
11. Provision of parking, service  
12. Retention trees and hedges  
13. Planting scheme to be agreed  
14. Full details of external lighting  
15. No commercial activities to take place on site, including storage of materials  
16. Flood Evacuation Plan/Flood response plan to be adhered to  
17. Minimum finished floor level

Recommendation : Part Refusal (Gates and walls)

1. Out of character and does not respect the local distinctiveness  
2. Contrary to Policy 2 of JCS

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
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  
Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (CLG 2012)

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

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
2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0811 Change of use of land for private site for 1no traveller residential pitch, including the siting of 1 'Log cabin' style Mobile Home, 1 touring caravan, 1 'log cabin style' day room, parking for 2 vehicles. Refused

2.2 2013/1062 Erection of 2 storey dwelling house and detached double garage and retention of existing recessed entrance gates with reduction in height of brickwork to provide visibility splays to meet Highway requirements Withdrawn

2.3 2013/0003 Change of use of land for private site for 1no traveller residential pitch, including the siting of 1 static caravan, 1 touring caravan, parking for 4 vehicles, improvements to main entrance and removal of all structures. Development of entrance wall and gates (retrospective). Withdrawn

2.4 2003/1061 Proposed erection of a livestock shed Refused

2.5 2003/1060 Proposed erection of a livestock shed Refused

2.6 2000/0940 Erection of an agricultural dwelling Approved

2.7 1998/1036 Erection of 3 dwellings - remove existing livestock buildings Refused

2.8 1996/1033 Erection of two buildings for agricultural use including accommodation of calves Approved

2.9 1995/0594 Erection of agricultural building for livestock Approved

2.10 1993/1380 Extension to farm building (building C) Approved

2.11 1993/1379 Retention of extension to farm building (building A) and relocation of agricultural building (building B) Approved

2.12 1992/1678 Use of existing farm building to accommodate livestock Approved

Appeal History

2.13 1998/1036 Erection of 3 dwellings Appeal Dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse:
- Outside the development boundary and therefore change of use would only be allowed in exceptional circumstances being affordable housing and agricultural dwellings
- We appreciate that sites for travellers and gypsies can, on occasion, be approved, consider a single occupancy site does not relate to current national and local policy
- Highway safety on a single track road without safe pedestrian access to amenities
- Applicant has no family links to Thurlton
- Set a precedent for travellers to purchase any piece of agricultural land, outside the development boundaries and obtain permission for change of use
- SNDC planning committee meeting made it clear that 3 bedroomed cabin plus a dayroom with kitchen and bathroom is excessive
- The applicant has an existing address and other sites that he has been involved in developing
- Site is unsustainable
- Access to the village is via a single track road with few passing places and unsafe for children to walk along, therefore this would necessitate the use of a car
- The flood risk assessment is flawed as the road to exit the site would be flooded and occupants of the site would be stranded in the event of flooding
- Out of character with the surrounding area
- Applicant has already started developing the site, building a large front wall and gates which are totally unacceptable in a rural setting
- Concerned that any conditions would not be respected

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Flood Defence Officer Support with conditions

3.4 Environment Agency Support with conditions

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) No comments received

3.6 NCC Highways Support with conditions

3.7 Ecologist - NCC No comments received

3.8 Broads Authority Support with conditions

3.9 Gypsy Liaison Officer No comments received

3.10 Representations 9 letters of objection
- 1 letter on behalf the residents of Lower Thurlton
- Reasons for refusal are still valid, nothing has changed
- Temporary consent is farcical
- Gates and walls built without planning permission, are still there and the Council has not enforced against them
- Land is agricultural
- Is in the flood plain with flood risk problems
- Development will be an eyesore
- 5 years is a long time
- Not sustainable location
- Misleading inaccuracies in application
• The October 2009 LPA assessment of 82 potential Gypsy and Traveller sites, Home Farm a few 100yards from the application site ranked joint 79th out of 82 sites in terms of its suitability and sustainability
• No connection with the applicants and the locality
• Applicant already has a site
• Detrimental impact on wildlife
• Why the need for a log cabin style day room
• Refers to previous residential use but the plot was never given planning permission and was not used permanently for almost 10 years
• Manor Farm buildings have been sold for continued agricultural use and there may be a genuine agricultural need for further grazing land nearby
• No public transport
• Limited resources in the village

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks temporary planning permission for the change of use of land for a private site for 1 no traveller residential pitch, including the siting of 1 'Log cabin' style Mobile Home, 1 touring caravan, 1 'log cabin style' day room, parking for 2 vehicles for a period of 5 years and retention of gates and walls. The site is located to the south of Low Road and until recently formed part of the Manor Farm complex. Agricultural buildings line the access drive to the west with a hedge to the east. A mixture of panel fencing and hedging form the boundaries of the site. The brick walls and pillars together with the ornate gate have been erected adjacent to Low Road. Members may recall that planning permission for a permanent consent was refused at 9 October meeting.

4.2 The Council have not yet adopted criteria for allocating or assessing Traveller Sites. However, the CLG publication 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' sets out issues which should be considered when considering applications for Traveller Sites of which the following are particularly relevant (paragraphs 22 to 25).

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

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

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

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

25. Subject to the implementation arrangements at paragraph 28, if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to date five year supply of deliverable sites, this should have significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission.”

28. The policy set out in paragraph 25 only applies to applications for temporary planning permission for traveller sites made 12 months after this policy comes into force. This application was submitted in December 2013 so the 12 month period identified by the NPPF has expired.

4.3 In the light of relevant policies, the circumstances of the site, the refusal of the permanent planning application and the concerns raised, the main issue for consideration in this case is the need for Traveller Sites.

Need for Traveller Sites

4.4 The Joint Core Strategy requires provision of 28 Traveller pitches within South Norfolk in the period 2006 to 2011 and a further 38 in the period 2012 to 2026. These requirements have not been met. This unmet need for Traveller Sites results in unauthorised encampments with problems compounded by difficulties in taking enforcement action when there are no sites available to relocate the persons concerned.

4.5 Notwithstanding the fact that para 25 is no longer in force for this application, the advice to give 'significant weight' to the absence of an adequate supply of Traveller sites has been reinforced by the appeal decision at Forncett. The appeals were against the Council's refusal of planning permission for 2 traveller caravans and an Enforcement Notice requiring removal of 1 caravan already installed. Despite supporting the Council's refusal of permission (finding that the development would cause harm to the landscape and to highway safety), the Inspector found that the absence of an adequate supply of alternative sites carried significant weight to outweigh this harm in respect of the caravan already on the site. He decided to uphold the appeal against the Enforcement Notice and grant a temporary permission for 4 years, calculating that this was the time required for the sites to be made available through the LDF (Local Plan) process. Members may recall temporary consent has been given for a site off Chepore Lane, Spooner Row due to the lack of traveller sites.

4.6 In view of the above decision, strong consideration should be given to the grant of a temporary permission, unless the development in question causes such harm as to outweigh the benefits of such consent in alleviating the shortage of Gypsy and Traveller sites. The reasons for refusal for the 2013/811 application were as follows:

‘The local planning authority considers that the proposed development, by virtue of its positioning to the rear of the site, without road frontage, would be out of character with and would not relate to the existing pattern of development in the vicinity. Such development would be contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy which promotes good design.’
'The proposed development is located within the open countryside, outside a defined development boundary and would be remote from local services. Such a location is not sustainable and would be in conflict with the provisions of the Communities and Local Government ‘Planning Policy for Travellers Sites.’

‘The development is located to the rear of the site and proposed to be enclosed by 1.8 panel fencing, which would not positively enhance the local environment and would give the impression the site would be isolated from the rest of the community, contrary to the provisions of the CLG ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.’

4.7 The other issues raised under the 2013/0811 application (but not a reason to refuse it) were concerns regarding flood risk and highway safety. The Flood Risk Assessment included a topographical site survey and details of the flood levels for the River Yare to the north east. The site levels in the location of the proposed caravan, mobile home and day room etc. puts the site into Flood Zone 1, the low probability flood zone. Therefore the Environment Agency removed their objection to the proposal. As part of this application a Flood Evacuation Plan has been submitted as required by the Environment Agency. The NCC Highway Officer again has not raised any objections to the application. Also the Housing Standards Manager Mr T Cooke confirmed that the applicant is a member of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

4.8 Whilst the development in this case does cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, this has to be weighed against the lack of alternative Traveller sites. On balance I consider that the harm would be sufficiently outweighed over a temporary period. It is to be hoped that adequate sites will be identified through the Local Plan process, with public consultation later this year. The actual delivery of sites will take longer and therefore I consider that temporary permission for 2 years should be granted.

4.9 To the site frontage adjacent the road, brick walls and ornate iron gates have been erected and this application seeks to retain them. This area of Thurlton is characterised by boundary treatments of native hedging and farm style gates. The erected walls and gates are an alien feature in this part of the village, out of character and do not respect the local distinctiveness. I therefore recommend that this part of the application is refused and enforcement action is authorised to remove the walls and gates.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The absence of alternative sites for traveller accommodation is a factor in favour of granting temporary permission which outweighs the harm caused by the development. A temporary permission is appropriate to meet the immediate accommodation needs of the applicant for a period within which the relative merits of this, and other sites, can be assessed through the Local Plan process for allocation as Traveller sites.

6 Reason for Refusal of the Gates and walls

6.1 The brick walls and ornate iron gates do not respect the local distinctiveness and adversely affect the character and appearance of this area of Lower Thurlton, which is predominantly native hedging and farm gates, contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2013/2159/F  
**Parish**: EAST CARLETON  

Applicants Name: Mr S Black  
Site Address: Subdivision Of Garden Of 2 Hethersett Road East Carleton Norfolk NR14 8HX  
Proposal: Proposed two storey dwelling  
Recommendation: Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 17: Small Rural Communities

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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2001/1718 Erection of two storey dwelling Refused and Dismissed on Appeal.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: No comments received  
3.2 District Member: Refer to Committee – whilst contrary to policy, there is a doubt about status of NPPF and lack of 5 year housing supply in SNC.  
3.3 Flood Defence Officer: No objection subject to advice in respect of surface water, foul water and land drainage.  
3.4 Property Team - SNC: Confirms South Norfolk owns the ditch running along the front of 1 to 4 Hethersett Road and there have been flooding problems in the past. An agreement would need to be reached between the applicant and SNDC as landowner in respect of drainage into and access over this ditch.  
3.5 NCC Highways: No objection in terms of highway safety subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of access, parking and turning arrangements. However, concerns also raised in respect of the sustainability of this location for new housing.
3.6 Environmental Services (Protection)  
No comments received

3.7 Representations  
Three letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents on the following grounds;
- Loss of privacy to rear gardens and block sunlight
- Destruction of mature trees
- Increase in traffic using the access causing danger to highway safety
- Would set undesirable precedent for other sites to be developed in the village
- Impact on character of area and out of keeping with existing pattern of development.
- Contrary to policy
- Previous application/appeal unsuccessful
- Narrow plot unsuitable for development

One letter of support has been received on the following grounds;
- Dwelling fits well into the streetscene and is in keeping with the character with existing development in the vicinity
- Would not impact negatively on amenities of nearby properties in terms of privacy.
- Dwelling is of a sympathetic scale and design
- Provides a dwelling for a family to help support the village.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two-storey detached dwelling on a parcel of land which lies to the north west of a property on Hethersett Road in East Carlton.

4.2 The dwelling would be constructed in red pantiles and multi-stock bricks and would comprise of a living room, dining room, kitchen and integral garage at ground floor level, with four bedrooms and two bathrooms at first floor level.

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

4.4 The main issues in this case are; the principle of development, the design, scale and character of the development, residential amenity, highway safety and drainage.

Principle of development

4.5 The site is located outside any designated development boundary as defined by Policy ENV8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and not within any of the preferred development limits set out in the site specific allocation for the new emerging local plan.

4.6 Policy 17 of the JCS identifies the village of East Carlton as a ‘smaller rural community’, with its lack of access to key facilities and services and remoteness making it an unsustainable location for new residential development. This stance has been reflected in the preparation of emerging South Norfolk local Plan where East Carlton has not been considered suitable for consideration for the instatement of a settlement boundary for these reasons.

4.7 Policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek to ensure that new dwellings are within sustainable locations, are of a good design and do not adversely affect residential amenity of surrounding properties. As stated above the site lies outside any development limit,
however the site also falls within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council accepts there is a short fall in its 5 year land supply. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply and therefore policy ENV8 in this case is out of date. This application has therefore in terms of its housing policy has been determined in accordance with Para 14 of the NPPF and the JCS.

4.8 Although the lack of a 5 year land supply gives a presumption in favour of sustainable development under Para 14 of NPPF it also states unless the adverse impacts of approving the application would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. A number of permissions have been granted by the Council and others have been allowed at appeal outside existing development limits because the seriousness of the shortfall in the five year land supply has outweighed other considerations. However, all these permissions have been for a considerable number of dwellings which would make a significant impact on the land supply deficit, whereas this application is for only one additional dwelling which will have little impact on the deficit. Combined with the fact that East Carlton is identified as being an unsustainable location for new residential development in the JCS and emerging Local Plan due to its remoteness and lack of access to key facilities and services, it is considered that the construction of a dwelling in this location is unsustainable which should be given significant weight against the presumption in favour of development.

4.9 Members will also note from the history that planning permission for a dwelling to be constructed on the site was previously refused and dismissed on appeal in 2002.

Design, scale and character

4.10 The proposed dwelling is considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and materials. Furthermore, whilst the existing development in the vicinity of the site is characterised by semi-detached properties set forward on relatively large plots, the erection of a detached dwelling on this plot as proposed would reflect the character of a similar development to the south-east of the application site. As such, it is considered that the scheme would be in keeping with the pattern of development in this part of the village and the proposed dwelling would accord with Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Impact upon residential amenity

4.11 Concerns have been raised by local residents in respect of the impact of the proposed dwelling on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, particularly in respect of privacy, light and noise. Notwithstanding these concerns and the fact that the proposed dwelling is two-storey, the dwelling has been designed in a manner to avoid any windows on the south-east or north-west gables. Combined with the degree of separation between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent properties, it is not considered that the scheme would result in any significant impacts on the residential amenities of the existing or future occupants in regards to light, noise and privacy. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Highway safety

4.12 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. The proposed dwelling would be served by an existing access onto Hethersett Road which would be shared with the adjacent property (No.2). The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and whilst raising concerns in respect of the sustainability of the location for new housing, have raised no objections in terms of highway safety subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of access, parking and turning arrangements. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices IMP8 and TRA19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
Drainage

4.13 The Council’s Flood Defence Officer has raised concerns in respect of known surface water drainage and flood risk issues associated with this area. As such, in the event of the application being approved, it is advised that conditions are imposed in respect of surface and foul water drainage.

Conclusion

4.14 The application site falls outside any designated development limit as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 where development would be contrary to Policy ENV8, however the site also falls within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council accepts there is a small short fall in its 5 year land supply. In these circumstances paragraph 14 of the NPPF requires that an application for sustainable development should be approved unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In this case the modest benefits of a single new dwelling are significantly outweighed by the unsustainable location of the development.

4.15 Combined with the fact that East Carlton is considered to be an unsustainable location for new residential development in the JCS and emerging Local Plan due to its remoteness and lack of access to key facilities and services to support new residential development, it is considered that the construction of a dwelling in this location is unsustainable and should be given significant weight against the presumption of development. On this basis, the application is recommended for refusal.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Liz Starling 01508 533681 lstarling@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2014/0020/F  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Jeremy Dore  
Site Address: Post Office 38-39 Market Place Hingham Norfolk NR9 4AF  
Proposal: Change of use of part of the ground floor of the property from (A1) post office and shop to residential accommodation.

**Recommendation**: 1 Contrary to Policies SHO5, SHO8 and EMP7, insufficient justification, loss of key retail use in key service area

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
EMP 7: The retention of rural employment and services (Part  
SHO 5: Mix of uses within Central Business Areas  
SHO 8: Local and Rural Shops and Services  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2014/0021 Change of use of part of the ground floor of the property from (A1) post office and shop to residential accommodation including removal of post box and internal fittings. Pending consideration

2.2 2004/1074 Proposed replacement of existing windows Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Approve.

3.2 District Member Should be determined by Committee due to being contrary to policy of retaining local services.

3.3 NCC Highways No objection.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections.
3.5 Planning Policy  
Recommend refusal on the grounds of Policies SHO5 and EMP7 unless it can be demonstrated that the predominant use within the Central Business Area would continue to be Class A1 shop use and that all possibilities for the retention of the unit for retail use have been fully explored without success.

3.6 Representations  
One letter of objection has been received from a local resident on the following grounds:
• Removal of post box harmful to appearance of the market place and any replacement may detract from appearance of area.
• Concerns raised marketing report accompanying application for change of use is inaccurate, out of date and does not demonstrate alternative retail uses have been sought, or property has been marketed at a realistic price given market conditions.
• Commercial element of property is comparable in size and window area/frontage to other commercial premises nearby.
• Loss of high profile site in a prime location in the centre of thriving village.
• Impact of loss of post office on rural community.

4 Assessment  
4.1 This application seeks full planning permission to change the use of part of the ground floor of 38/39 Market Place in Hingham from A1 use as a shop and post office into residential accommodation to be used in connection with the main dwellinghouse. The property is situated in a central location within Higham market place and comprises of a grade II listed two-storey semi-detached building within the designated Conservation Area. The scheme comprises of predominately internal works to facilitate the conversion of the retail space into living accommodation, with the external facade of the building remaining unchanged other than the proposed removal of the post box on the north elevation.

4.2 Members will note that an application for Listed Building Consent for the proposed internal and external works is included on this agenda for consideration.

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

4.4 The main issues for consideration in this case are; principle of development, impact upon the listed building/Conservation Area, residential amenity and highway safety.

Principle of development  
4.5 The site lies within the Central Business for Hingham in the South Norfolk Local Plan where Policy SHO5 states that the Council will only permit at ground floor level, uses within Classes A1, A2 and A3 provided that they do not require the loss of a Primary Area Class A1 shop and that the predominant use within the Central Business Area concerned remains Class A1 shops. Policy SHO8 also seeks to control the loss of premises in villages in use for retailing and service provision with Policy EMP7 requiring that the use of buildings for non-employment uses will only be permitted where the retention of the use has been fully explored without success. Policy 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework also seeks to support the vitality and viability of villages through the retention of local services.

4.6 In this case, the change of use of part of the ground floor area to residential use would result in the loss of an A1 shop/post office, located in a prominent position within both the village and the Central Business Area. Whilst a marketing report has been submitted in support of the application, it identifies that the business has not been marketed since March 2010 with the focus of the marketing based primarily on the post office element as opposed to fully exploring other retail/employment re-uses.
Furthermore, the retail space available within the unit, whilst limited, is typical of many other retail/business units within both Hingham and other villages which has the potential to attract a suitable retail/commercial re-use.

As such, it is considered that the scheme would result in the loss of A1 retail use and a key service in the form of the village post office, in a prime location within the Central Business Area of the village where insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate that the other retail/employment reuses have been fully explored without success. As such, it is considered that the application would be contrary to requirements of Policies SHO5, SHO8 and EMP7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and paragraph 28 of the NPPF.

Impact upon streetscene and listed building

Internal works are proposed to facilitate the conversion of the post office and retail space into living accommodation, whilst the only external works proposed involves the removal of the post box on the north elevation.

Concern has been raised by a local resident in respect of both the removal of the post box impacting on the character of the listed building and streetscene. Notwithstanding these concerns, the application has been assessed by the Conservation Officer who has raised no objection to the internal alterations proposed, given that they would not affect the structure or layout. Whilst concern has been raised to the removal of the post box, it is considered that given no other alterations are proposed to the external facade of the building, it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application on this ground.

As such, it is considered that the scheme would preserve the architectural and historic character of this grade II listed property, and would accord with Policy 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Highway safety

The application has been assessed by the Highways Authority who have raised no objection to the proposal on the grounds that it would not detract from highway safety, and therefore would accord with Policies IMP8 and TRA19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Impact upon residential amenity

Given the nature of the changes proposed, it is not considered that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of any neighbouring properties, and as such the scheme would accord with Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Conclusion and Reasons for Refusal

It is considered that the application to change the use of the ground floor from A1 retail and Post Office would result in the loss of A1 retail use and a key service in a prime location within the Central Business Area of the village where insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate that the other retail/employment re-uses have been fully explored without success. As such, it is considered that the application is contrary to Policies SHO5, SHO8 and EMP7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and paragraph 28 of the NPPF. On this basis, the application is recommended for refusal.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Liz Starling 01508 533681 lstarling@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2014/0021/LB  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

- **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Jeremy Dore  
- **Site Address**: Post Office 38-39 Market Place Hingham Norfolk NR9 4AF  
- **Proposal**: Change of use of part of the ground floor of the property from (A1) post office and shop to residential accommodation including removal of post box and internal fittings.

**Recommendation**: 1 Listed Building Time Limit

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

1.3 **Supplementary Planning Document**

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2014/0020** Change of use of part of the ground floor of the property from (A1) post office and shop to residential accommodation. Pending consideration

2.2 **2004/1074** Proposed replacement of existing windows Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**: Approve.

3.2 **District Member**: To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 **Conservation Officer**: No objection to the change of use of the building. From a listed building/conservation area perspective, the proposal would not alter the external appearance of the building, whilst internally the change of use would not affect the structure or layout of this grade II listed building.

However, the loss of the post box is regrettable given it constitutes an interesting piece of street furniture.

3.4 **Representations**: One letter of objection has been received from a local resident on the following grounds;
- Removal of post box harmful to appearance of the market place and any replacement may detract from appearance of area.
- Concerns raised marketing report accompanying application for change of use is inaccurate, out of date and does not demonstrate alternative retail uses have been sought, or property has been marketed at a realistic price given market conditions.
- Commercial element of property is comparable in size and window area/frontage to other commercial premises nearby.
- Loss of high profile site in a prime location in the centre of thriving village.
- Impact of loss of post office on rural community.
4 **Assessment**

4.1 This application seeks Listed Building Consent for the carrying out of internal and external alterations to the part of the ground floor of 38/40 Market Place to allow its change of use from A1 use (shop and post office) to residential accommodation to be used in connection with the associated dwelling.

4.2 Members will note that an application for full planning permission to change the use of the ground floor of the property from A1 use to residential use is included on this agenda for consideration (ref: 2014/0020).

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

4.4 Given that the application is for listed building consent, the main issue for consideration relates to whether the proposed works would preserve the historic and architectural character of this grade II listed building.

**Impact upon the setting of the grade II listed building**

4.5 Internal works are proposed to facilitate the conversion of the post office and retail space into living accommodation, whilst the only external works proposed would involve the removal of the post box on the north elevation of the building.

4.6 Concern has been raised by a local resident in respect of the impact that the removal of the existing post box would have on the character of the listed building and on the surrounding streetscene.

4.7 Notwithstanding these concerns, the application has been assessed by the Conservation Officer who has raised no objection to the internal alterations proposed, given that they would not affect the structure or layout. Whilst concern has been raised to the removal of the post box, it is considered that given no other alterations are proposed to the external facade of the building, it would be difficult to justify refusal of the application on this element alone. As such, it is considered that the scheme would preserve the architectural and historic character of this grade II listed property, and would accord with Policy 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5 **Conclusion**

5.1 The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 12 of the NPPF and IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 The nature of the internal and external works proposed would preserve the historic and architectural character of this grade II listed building, and would accord with the policies referred to above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Liz Starling 01508 533681 lstarling@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No:** 2014/0005/F  
**Parish:** SWAINSTHORPE  
Applicants Name: Mr Simon Cruickshank  
Site Address: The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe Norfolk NR14 8PU  
Proposal: Change of Use of agricultural land to extend curtilage of the public house. Relocation of LPG cylinder and provide enclosure, alterations to soil stacks, provide new boiler house and wood pellet silo, demolish chimney stack, revised door and window positions in kitchen extension, renew no 9 spot lights to front and gables, renew sign post and lights, cladding to bbq building, alterations to fence layouts and provide 1 no lights to garage and no 1 to kitchen gable

Recommendation: Part Refuse (Front fencing, brick wall, piers and railings)  
1. Contrary to policy  
2. Detrimental to the setting of the listed building  

(Authorise enforcement action to secure removal of frontage fence, brick wall and piers and railings and lighting columns)

Part Approve (Works other than front fencing, brick wall, piers and railings)  
1. Full permission time limit

12. **Appl. No:** 2014/0031/LB  
**Parish:** SWAINSTHORPE  
Applicants Name: Mr Simon Cruickshank  
Site Address: The Dun Cow Norwich Road Swainsthorpe Norfolk NR14 8PU  
Proposal: Change of Use of agricultural land to extend curtilage of the public house. Relocation of LPG cylinder and provide enclosure, alterations to soil stacks, provide new boiler house and wood pellet silo, demolish chimney stack, revised door and window positions in kitchen extension, renew no 9 spot lights to front and gables, renew sign post and lights, cladding to bbq building, alterations to fence layouts and provide 1 no lights to garage and no 1 to kitchen gable

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with details submitted

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0249 Retrospective application for: rebuild of 2 no chimneys, rebuild of top of both parapet walls to main roof, Re-location of bar counter top, re-new broken tiles to front main roof surface, repair of front dormers, windows and doors and replacement of windows and doors

2.2 2013/0419 2 no single storey rear extensions, new 3 bay garage, car park and garden lighting, erection of wall and railings to front, resurface carpark, earth works to grass bank at rear, garden works, landscaping, photo voltaic panels to roof and provision of extract system flue

2.3 2013/0420 2 no single storey rear extensions, photo voltaic panels to roof and provision of extract system flue

2.4 2013/1169 Change of use of first floor from residential to bed and breakfast. New entrance porch extension. Retention of garage. Single storey covered catering area.

2.5 2013/1170 Alterations to first floor from residential to bed and breakfast. New entrance porch extension. Single storey covered catering area.

2.6 2007/2039 Construct a timber structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds.

2.7 2007/2038 Construct a timber structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds.

2.8 2007/0706 Construct a steel and glass structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds.

2.9 2007/0447 Construct a steel and glass structure to the rear of the property which includes a retractable canvas roof. Development also includes a decked area flush with door thresholds.
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  No views or comments.

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  No highway objections but advise that if application is approved a condition be included relating to the external lighting.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections received.

3.5 Representations  None received.

4 Assessment

4.1 The Dun Cow is a grade 2 listed building of early 18th century date, two storeys with attics, brick and tiled. It is close to the main A140 and a prominent building in this part of the village. The building has undergone considerable change since the 1950s both inside and outside with recent extensions and alterations being carried out by the present owner who purchased the building in December 2012.

4.2 The majority of the works currently underway were subject to approved applications 2013/0419 and 2013/1169, but some of these works were modified by the owner without reference to the Council, or carried out without compliance with conditions attached to these permissions. An enforcement report was taken to the committee at the meeting on the 8th January 2014 outlining the position at that time. One of the recommendations accepted by the committee was to require appropriate applications to be submitted to try and regularise the situation and to assess the changes in that context.

4.3 The various works are outlined in the application proposal. Most of the works have been carried out: the extension of the curtilage to accommodate an access and storage area for a gas tank; the erection of a new boiler house and wood pellet silo; various minor alterations to the building with windows and door positions and designs; the removal of a modern rear chimney; and the erection of a new front boundary wall, railing and fence. Renewing the spot lights attached to the building and signage has not been carried out, while lighting columns have been installed as part of a proposed lighting scheme for the car park. The lighting columns are proposed in response to condition 16 of 2013/0419. We have advised the owners that although the highways authority and the environmental protection team do not object to the lighting design, we are not prepared to accept this option in terms of its impact on the setting of the listed building, and have refused to discharge the condition. The unauthorised lighting columns erected are considered harmful to the setting of the listed building and authority is requested for enforcement action to require their removal.

4.4 Our main concerns have been on the treatment of the front boundary and its impact on the setting of the listed building. The original scheme showed a simple low wall with plain railings for the most part of the highway boundary, with a 1.5 metre railing and hedge at the south end. Conditions were imposed to require details of these boundaries to be approved. The owner advised in September that he had purchased some railings at an auction that did not match those suggested on the approved elevations. In addition, the railings would not extend to the required length and brick piers would be needed. However, no details were submitted for formal approval before the wall, piers and railings were erected. Subsequently the approved railing and hedge at the south end of the frontage was also replaced by a close boarded fence with concrete posts and rails without any reference to the Council.
4.5 The combination of the unauthorised fence, wall with piers, railings and the lighting columns has created a harsh and unduly bulky appearance which is not sympathetic to the character of the listed building. Collectively, the boundary treatment and lighting columns have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building. Approval would not have been given to the use of a modern timber and concrete fence in this setting. The line of the fence is on the highway boundary so no hedge can be planted to screen it and the owner has only offered to paint the concrete parts brown. The impact of the 7 metre high street light columns has further exacerbated the situation and lead to the refusal to discharge the condition. The owner is aware of these concerns but is unwilling to look at a more sympathetic lighting scheme.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Many of the works to the building have been carried out sympathetically and represent a considerable investment by the owner. His practise of carrying out works without consent has been unfortunate and has contributed to complications in dealing with the application. While approval can be given to some parts of the planning application, the impact of the works on the roadside boundary is harmful to the setting of the listed building and as such is contrary to policies noted in section 1. These elements of the planning application (frontage fence, brick wall and piers and railings) should be refused, although the remaining elements can be approved. Authority for enforcement action is requested to remove the unacceptable elements along with the unauthorised lighting columns.

5.2 The lighting columns and front boundary works do not require Listed Building Consent so they do not form part of the application for Listed Building Consent. That application can consequently be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application on land owned by South Norfolk Council

13. Appl. No : 2013/2144/A
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr David Rogers
Site Address : 1-9 Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QQ
Proposal : Proposed 2no eternally illuminated fascia signs, 2no non illuminated fascia signs and totem sign

Recommendation : Approval subject to removal of illumination
1-5 Standard advertisement conditions
6 In accord with submitted drawings

1. Planning Policies
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 19: Advertisements (Part Consistent)
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

2. Planning History
2.1 2011/1251 Change of use of existing D2 building to A1 comprising retail floor space of 743 sq.mtr. and storage space of 186 sq.mtr. with access, parking, servicing, landscaping and highways improvements Approved
2.2 2009/1988 Change of use for retail (non-food) purposes Withdrawn
2.3 2000/1914 Erection of 3 fascia signs Approved
2.4 2000/1350 Change of use to children’s indoor activity centre Approved

3. Consultations
3.1 Town Council Approve
• Signage to be illuminated during opening hours only
3.2 District Member No comments received
3.3 NCC Highways Conditional support
• Condition required on source of illumination
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No adverse comments
3.5 Representations

- Object to externally illuminated facia signs due to potential unnecessary light pollution at night. There is no need for the signs to be externally illuminated

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site has recently opened as a branch of The Original Factory Shop. This application is for the associated signage which is now in place. The site is owned by South Norfolk Council and therefore the application needs to be determined by members of the Development Management Committee. 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.

4.2 Policy IMP 19 requires that advertisements are well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use, and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

4.3 The site is located in the Ayton Road industrial estate and as such the surrounding area has a commercial character. The building itself is a large commercial shed on which the signage erected is proportionate and does not appear incongruous. Additional signs in the parking area and on the site boundary are also of a scale that is appropriate with the location. There are no other existing signs on the site, nor any in close proximity which results in the signs having an unacceptable cumulative impact.

4.4 As originally submitted the signs were to be illuminated, which have been the subject of letters of objection from two local residents. The site is in a location where illuminated signs would not be permitted unless the business is reliant on the evening trade (to accord with SNLP policy 19). The illuminated signs are therefore to be removed from the proposal.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Subject to removal of the illumination, the signage erected for the retail use now established are in proportion to the scale of the building and appropriate for the commercial character of the locality and therefore accords with Policy IMP 19.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533801 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals received from 25 January 2014 to 21 February 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/0579</td>
<td>Loddon</td>
<td>Mr Reg Holmes</td>
<td>Proposed housing development on land west of Express plastics, Beccles Road, Loddon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land West Of Express Plastics Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1620</td>
<td>Long Stratton</td>
<td>Miss Amy Eleftheriades</td>
<td>Erection of fencing to replace existing wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 St. Marys Road Long Stratton Norwich NR15 2TT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals decisions from 25 January 2014 to 21 February 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>2013/0734</td>
<td>Mulbarton Unit 2 The Common Mulbarton Norfolk NR14 8AE</td>
<td>Mr Zheng Ding Xu</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 3 of permission 2010/1863/CU - to allow opening on Sundays 4.30pm to 10pm</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1212</td>
<td>Ditchingham Land North West Of 4 Lamberts Way Ditchingham Norfolk</td>
<td>Badger Building (E.Anglia) LTD</td>
<td>Extension of Lambert's way and erection of 4no. dwellings</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>