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Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
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Wednesday 2 April 2014

Time
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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.

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

25/03/2014
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.
AGENDA

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 8)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 5 March 2014;
   (attached – page 11)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 23)
   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>2013/2100/F</td>
<td>THURLTTON</td>
<td>Land West Of Blaen Waun Low Road Thurlton</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2013/0265/O</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/2011/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Between London Road And Suton Lane London Road</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/2201/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Land North Of 30 Norwich Road Brooke</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/0039/F</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Hingham Congregational Church Chapel Street Hingham</td>
<td>69</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.

   (attached – page 74)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  
   (attached – page 79)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 30 April 2014
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

<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 used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNDP</th>
<th>Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAAP</td>
<td>Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D.</td>
<td>Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Development Management Policies Document – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAP</td>
<td>Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Does the interest directly:  
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?  
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?  
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council  
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own  
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in |
| If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary. |
| Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days. |
| Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above? |
| If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting. |
| Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item. |
| Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting. |

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

NO

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

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?
Applications Referred Back to Committee

1. **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.

   **Recommendation** : 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
   18. Details of hardstandings to be agreed

1. **Update Report**

1.1 This application and original report (appended) were considered at the 5 March 2014 meeting where members resolved to approve a two year temporary planning consent for the traveller pitch and refuse consent for the retention of the gates and walls. At the meeting it was suggested by the agent acting on behalf of local residents that the Council was unable to issue a split decision. Members requested legal advice be sought in respect of this. NPLaw have advised that a Council is able to issue a split decision, however the applicants have to agree and no one should be prejudiced by the split decision (for example in this instance a resident that did not object to the proposal because the gates and walls screened the proposal from view). Subsequent to the meeting the walls and gates have been removed from the site and the application has been amended to remove their retention from the proposal. In view of the changes made, the application is referred back for consideration.

1.2 Updates given at the last meeting:- The District Member Cllr Kemp raised concern that the applicants have not corrected false information submitted in their Design and Access Statement for the last application and have simply resubmitted it uncorrected. He therefore does not
consider that the application can be determined at this committee meeting other than refusal on the grounds of insufficient information. The alternative is that we are approving an application we know to be false and misleading which raises the question of maladministration and will leave the Council vulnerable to a Judicial Review.

Issues of inaccuracy are:-

1) There is no Post Office and pub does not serve food regularly  
2) Bus Service - only 1 bus on Wed and Fri other bus services are 1.8km walk away  
3) The personal circumstances of the applicant appear different from earlier application  
   (earlier application claimed the applicant was for a couple and children had left home) this  
   application is for an 'extended family plot and 6 trips will be made to school a day  
4) Existing access arrangements are to be used but the design and access statement says  
   the access will be extended to form a turning head and hardstandings will be provided for  
   a minimum of 2 vehicles and this is contradictory as it implies that there will be a reduction  
   in vehicles

Other issues:

a) No evidence as to why they wish to locate to Lower Thurlton  
b) Site is not sustainable  
c) Applicant has not provided any justifiable evidence that he is a member of the traveller  
   community

Officer’s response to the above:

Whilst I fully appreciate that the post office has closed, that the PH may not serve food regularly, that the site is not served regularly by a bus service, these statements by the applicant’s agent would not constitute a reason to refuse the application on insufficient information or make it invalid. Nor can we refuse the application because the applicants still believe the site to be sustainable notwithstanding the fact that the Council does not.

With regard to the applicant applying for an 'extended' family plot, notwithstanding what has been applied for before, this application has to be determined based on the proposed development put forward which is for 1 log cabin style mobile home (with 3 bedrooms), a utility/dayroom, touring caravan. They also state that 'it is anticipated that total vehicular movements to and from the site, including 'school runs' where necessary, will not exceed 6 per day for the site'. Again whilst I appreciate local residents consider these statements are contradictory when taking into account the previous application, they would not be a reason to refuse the application on insufficient information or invalidate it.

Tony Cooke has confirmed the family are members of the travelling community and have been served with a number of 'Direction to Leave Land' and 'Notice to Vacate' notices for land at Queens Hill, land at Longwater, land at Costessey and land at Newton Flotman. I consider sufficient information has been provided to assure the Council the family are members of the travelling community.

The existing drive will be used, however this is to be extended to provide a turning area and parking for two vehicles, notwithstanding the applicant’s agent’s claims that there will be a reduction in parking spaces from 4 to 2, this application has been assessed by the highway officer who is satisfied with the parking, turning and access arrangements proposed for the development. Again in my opinion this would not be a reason to refuse the application.
1.3 Another issue raised at the meeting on 5th March was in relation to flood risk. The Environment Agency has raised no objections subject to a condition regarding finished floor level. They have given advice to the Council that we should consult with our Emergency Planner to determine that a Flood Response Plan and evacuation procedures are adequate to ensure the safety of the inhabitants. The Council’s Flood Defence Officer has commented that the key consideration is the residual risk imposed by the low level of the access and egress route. An Emergency and Flood Evacuation Plan will be made available to the occupants of the site and the owner will sign up to the Flood Warnings Direct to provide warnings to the occupiers. Therefore the residual risk will be managed by implementing flood warnings and evacuation procedures. The only outstanding issue was whether there is any residual risk to emergency services. The Flood Defence Officer has orally advised that due to the site being in an existing group of residential properties with the same or possibly higher risk from flooding, the proposal would not create a greater risk than already exists.

2 Recommendation

2.1 That the application be approved as set out above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@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 100 yards 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 sites
   b. 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 Claire Curtis 01508 533788 and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications submitted and on land owned by South Norfolk Council

Parish : LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council  
Site Address : Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2UY  
Proposal : Outline application for the demolition of Cygnet House and development of up to 50 residential units (class C3) and up to 800 square metres (class B1) floor space, together with associated highway works

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1 Outline Permission Time Limit  
2 Standard outline requiring reserved matters  
3 Details of roads, footways and surface water  
4 Roads to be constructed in accordance with specifications agreed  
5 No occupation of dwellings/commercial unit until roads/footways constructed to binder course  
6 Commercial units to provide for at least 26 cars and provide Light goods delivery vehicle parking and turning  
7 Details of Cycle Parking  
8 Contaminated land - submit scheme  
9 Full details of external lighting  
10 Details of construction work  
11 Details of foul water disposal  
12 Details of Surface Water based on sustainable water drainage principles  
13 New Water Efficiency  
14 Ecology Mitigation  
15 Archaeological work to be agreed  
16 Slab level to be agreed  
17 Boundary treatment to be agreed  
18 Implement landscaping scheme  
19 Arboricultural details as part of reserved matters  
20 Landscaping management plan  
21 Tree protection plan  
22 Fire Hydrants  
23 Management/adoptions and Management Plan for surface water drainage  
24 Details of retaining walls  
25 Restrict use to B1 uses only  
26 Provision of pedestrian link to St Andrews Close  
27 10% of dwellings have renewable energy measures

Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, commuted sums for on-site play areas; off-site older children’s play contribution; education and library.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The economy
Policy 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
IMP2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0562 Screening opinion for residential development
EIA Not Required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils
Long Stratton
Would recommend approval but make following comments:
• Concern that the junction of Swan Lane and the A140 would need improving to cope with the extra traffic especially as there is already planning permission for 120 homes in Tharston
• A pedestrian crossing over Swan Lane to assist children walking to school and other residents accessing the doctors etc is a must and has not mentioned in the planning application.
• It is not clear on the plan if there is to be a pedestrian access from St Andrews Close; it is thought this was mentioned in the original plan.
• Are these homes to be counted in the proposed 1800 homes that are going to be built in the village

Tharston and Hapton
• Have concerns over the increase in traffic on Swan Lane and subsequently the increase in traffic at the end of Swan Lane to the A140.
• There is already traffic using the rural roads through the parish as rat runs and the roads are not suitable.
• It was felt that traffic lights at the end of Swan Lane to the A140 should be considered to alleviate this.

3.2 District Members
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
• There are assets close to tor crossing the site. The site layout will need to take account of this.
• Foul drainage from this development is in the catchments of Long Stratton STW that at present has available capacity.
- The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is acceptable.
- We request the agreed strategy is reflected in the planning approval.
- Any discharge of trade effluent will need our consent, recommend that petrol/oil interceptors fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities.

Recommend a condition for surface water disposal

3.4 Design Officer
Supports the outline application
- An analysis of the form, layout and character of Long Stratton has been carried out that helps to create a set of robust design principles as set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.
- The intended appearance of the development combines traditional building forms and materials in a contemporary context. As with all outline applications the success on how the details of house types is achieved will come via the reserved matters stage.
- Pedestrian and vehicle movement across the site is proposed through a network of footpaths and streets that allow connections to Swan Lane and the existing residential areas of Long Stratton to the east.
- Building for Life 12 assessment carried out – 9 Green and 3 Ambers

3.5 Ecologist
Note the findings of the Ecological report and consider fit for propose.
Recommend the following conditions:
- Timing of works for breeding birds as per 5.3.1 of Ecology report
- Reptile surveys before reserved matters stage as per section 5.1.1. of Ecology report
- Details of planting and enhancement scheme

3.6 NCC Highways
No objections, suggest the following conditions:
- No works to commence on site until details of roads, footways and surface water agreed
- Works to be carried out in accordance with specifications agreed
- No occupation of dwellings/commercial unit until roads/footways constructed to binder course
- Commercial units to provide for at least 26 cars and provide Light goods delivery vehicle parking and turning
- Details for the parking of cycles

3.7 Housing Enabling and Strategy Manager
The applicant proposes 50 dwellings, under JCS Policy 4 this produces a target of 33% affordable homes (16.5 rounded up to 17).

The Design and Access Statement says that ‘the scheme proposes to make provision for 10% comprised of affordable housing’. The applicants have submitted on a confidential basis a full financial appraisal of the scheme. This evidence has been investigated by an expert consultant (District Valuer) for the Council, and it is concluded that the evidence provided justifies 10% affordable
housing. Consequently I accept this application will deliver only 5 affordable homes on site. Size, type and tenure will need to be agreed.

On this basis I have no objections to the application.

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection in principle. Anglian Water's advice is that there is sufficient flow capacity along the public sewer. Note source heat pumps are proposed to be potentially used and advise conditions to agree locations. Lighting details should be agreed to ensure compliance with 'secured by design'

Suggest the following conditions:
- Contamination land
- Details of source heat pumps
- Details of any external lighting
- Details of protecting dwellings from noise during construction

3.9 Environment Agency

Object to the application due to the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), as it does not comply with the requirements set out in paragraph 9 of the Technical Guide to the NPPF

Comments on additional information
The revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) addresses our previous objection.

Suggest the following conditions:
- Details of surface water on sustainable drainage principles

3.10 Landscape Officer

Further information required to show a preliminary plan to show the trees' positions along with their constraints, preferably in relation to the indicative proposed layout. The plans should be reference to the tree survey data.

Comments on updated information
- Still concerns that insufficient regard has been given to the anticipated growth of the existing trees on the site.
- I accept that this is only an outline application but on arboricultural grounds alone the current indicative layout appears to be unsatisfactory. In order for the stated aspiration for the tree retention to be achieved there will need to be revisions and a bespoke condition will be required for a reserved matters application.

3.11 Historic Environment Service

The submitted desk based assessment is insufficient to describe the impact of this development on the impact of this development on the significance of any heritage assets at present, and a field evaluation is necessary, in accordance with paragraph 128 of the NPPF.

Recommend application is withdrawn and the applicant be requested to withdraw their application and resubmit with the results of field evaluation.
Comments on additional survey and information

The proposed development area has been studied via a desk based assessment, and the south east of the site has been subject to an archaeological field evaluation. Whilst no significant archaeological deposits were found in the field evaluation, it did not study the area of highest archaeological potential - to the north west of the site. Adjacent to the northwest boundary, quarrying and later works uncovered a Roman hearth, several Roman urns and a horse skull in association with Roman pottery - this potential has not been explored.

Archaeological condition and brief will required.

3.12 NCC- Planning Obligations

Contributions will be required for, library provision, education.
Condition for fire hydrants

3.13 Flood Defence Officer

No objections
Suggest the following conditions
• Details of sustainable surface water proposal
• Details of management/adoption proposals of drainage features
• Details of effective Management Plan for drainage features

Foul Drainage Advisory - Anglian Water has advised that the foul drainage from the site is in the catchment of the Long Stratton Sewage Treatment Works that has available capacity for flows from this site.

3.14 Internal Drainage Board

The site lies outside of the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board district but surface water run-off may drain into the IDB – may need a financial contribution

3.15 Representations

9 letters of objection received raising the following concerns:
• Access will be on to Swan Lane, together with site at Chequers Road with outline planning permission for 120 dwellings will generate a lot more traffic using this road, children have to access Swan Lane to get to schools and feel that a pelican crossing is vital, should be included in the plans
• Was assured bungalows would be built adjacent to boundary
• Concerned will be overlooked, loss of views
• Increase noise levels
• Increased use of Swan Lane and congestion
• Dangerous for children/parents that use route for walking to schools
• Impact on Doctors Surgery
• When purchased property not made aware of any proposed planning development
• Would like site to remain as is with trees and greenery and wildlife undisturbed, peaceful and quiet ambience remain
• If landscaped will need to be of significant height to avoid overlooking
• Access a problem and will be dangerous for pedestrians
• Noise from demolition
• Concerned about eastern boundary, plot 1 is too close, no landscaping, propose moving Plot 1 house to side of Plot 5
• Landscape should be continued down the boundary up to the pond
• Loss of daylight in the garden
• Not enough effort to find a new use for Cygnet House
Assessment

4.1 The application has been submitted by South Norfolk Council and the majority of the site is owned by South Norfolk Council and extends to approximately 2.46 hectares and is situated within the development boundary for Long Stratton.

4.2 The site is situated between Swan Lane to the south, South Norfolk House to the west, an area of open land used for agricultural purposes to the north, and residential development situated off St Andrews, St James’ and St David’s Way, to the east. The site is roughly triangular in shape. There are two buildings located within the site – Cygnet House a former Care Home, which is currently vacant and The Lodge, which is occupied by South Norfolk Council. The majority of the site, which is located to the north of Cygnet House, comprises open over grown scrub land, together with a number of trees of various ages. An area of managed open space, which incorporates a tree circle, is situated toward the south of the site and to the west of Cygnet House.

4.3 Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is gained via a link road connecting South Norfolk House with Swan Lane. A T-junction from the link road provides access to the site and Cygnet House.

4.4 It is important to note that the topography of the site varies significantly between its southern and northern boundaries. In particular, there is a steep increase in levels to the north of Cygnet House.

4.5 The application seeks outline planning permission for the entire area encompassed by the red line site boundary. Details of the layout, scale, landscaping and appearance of the site are reserved for future determination. Details of the means of vehicular access into the site from the surrounding access network are submitted in detail at this stage. However, details of access within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes are reserved for future determination.

4.6 The application seeks outline planning permission for the redevelopment of Cygnet House and surrounding land to provide up to 50 residential units (Class C3) and up to 800 square metres of business floor space (Class B1), two storey, together with associated highway works. This includes the demolition of Cygnet House but the retention of The Lodge.

4.7 The application has been submitted with the following information:

- Planning Statement
- Design & Access Statement
- Transport Statement prepared by
- Ecology Survey
- Arboricultural Implications
- Assessment prepared
- Archaeological Desk
- Utilities Review
- Energy Efficiency Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)
4.8 As a result of the comments received by statutory consultees further information was submitted to overcome these concerns, and the following additional information has also been submitted, as follows:

- Revised Flood Risk Assessment
- Archaeology Evaluation Report
- Financial Viability Assessment
- Tree Constraints Plan in context of the indicative layout

4.9 As the site is located within the defined development limits for Long Stratton a key service centre, there is a presumption in favour of redeveloping the site, in accordance with policy HOU4 of the SNLP which is still consistent with the NPPF together with Policy 14 of the JCS. Policy 14 allocates 'at least' 1,800 new dwellings to Long Stratton. 1,800 new dwellings are still required in order to deliver a by-pass for the village, so the dwellings proposed in this application would be additional to the minimum 1,800 allocation. The only part of the red line site that is not within the development limits for Long Stratton is a 'triangular' area of trees to the top north-west part of the site, where the trees are to be retained and this part of the site will not be developed and will form a landscape back drop to the proposed gardens. The proposed new B1 commercial space, to be located in one building, replaces the loss of the former Care Home (Cygnet House) and therefore does not result in a loss of commercial use on the site, which is to be welcomed. The proposal for new employment uses is consistent with section 1 of the NPPF and Policy 5 of the JCS. Given the principle of development is supported, the main areas for consideration are highway and access; layout, form and character of the development; affordable housing; ecology and landscape; archaeology and residential amenity.

Highway and Access

4.10 The principal vehicular access to the site is proposed to be taken from the existing junction between the site and the link road connecting Swan Lane and South Norfolk House – utilising the existing access to the site and Cygnet House. This will also provide a pedestrian route to the site. All other highway works are reserved for future determination.

4.11 The indicative Site Plan shows the potential layout of internal roads within the development site. The roads will be constructed to appropriate standards and include footpaths where necessary. Pedestrian access to the site is proposed to be enhanced through the creation of a link to St Andrew’s Close. The creation of the link will require the demolition of a garage associated with 4 St Andrews Close. The route and material of the link is reserved for future determination and it is important this link is secured via a planning condition. Pedestrian access improvements are also include a new footpath from the site to Swan Lane.

4.12 The views of both Parish Council’s and a number of residents is noted including the request for a Pelican Crossing on Swan Lane but in highway terms this is not required for the proposed scale of development. The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the proposed access arrangements and the indicative layout, but they have suggested that the proposed B1 use should have at least 26 car parking spaces and this requirement will be conditioned accordingly. I am therefore satisfied that with appropriate conditions the proposal is acceptable in highway safety terms and satisfies the requirements of policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP).
Layout, form and character of development

4.13 Although this is an outline application with appearance, landscape and layout being reserved it is important that there is sufficient indicative information submitted with the application to assess whether the development will enhance the form and character of the area in accordance with Policy 2 of the JCS and meets the relevant design principles of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The site is currently defined by a variety of attractive assets, for example mature trees, high quality landscaping and varied topography.

4.14 The application has been submitted with a Design and Access Statement and the supporting information successfully demonstrates that the indicative layout capitalises on the key aspects mentioned above by creating a well structured building layout that builds on the quality of the surroundings and the sites features.

4.15 The relationship of the new commercial space and the housing works well. The submitted analysis of the form, layout and character of Long Stratton has been carried out and helps create robust design principles as set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making guide. The intended appearance of the development combines traditional building forms and materials in a contemporary context. The success of this will depend on how the detailed design of houses is achieved in the reserved matters stage.

4.16 Pedestrian and vehicle movement across the site is proposed through a network of footpaths and streets that allows connections to Swan Lane and the existing residential area to the east, to St Andrews Close. The latter would need to be secured by way of the reserved matters application.

4.17 Overall, the application and provides sufficient certainty and demonstrates that there is capacity to achieve a high quality design when assessed under the Building for Life 12 criteria, scoring 9 Greens and 3 Ambers at the outline stage. The proposal therefore accords with policy 2 of the JCS and South Norfolk Place-making Guide.

Affordable housing

4.18 The applicants propose up to 50 dwellings. Under JCS Policy 4 this produces a target of 33% affordable homes (16.5 rounded up to 17).

4.19 Within the submitted Design and Access Statement the applicant states that ‘the scheme proposes to make provision for 10% of residential units to be comprised of affordable housing’. At the time of submission the applicant did not submit any evidence to back up this statement. A confidential viability assessment was subsequently received and as the Council is the applicant this was referred to the District Valuation Office (DVO) to assess. The DVO has concluded that the evidence provided justifies 10% affordable housing. Consequently, the Council’s Housing Strategy Manager, Keith Mitchell, accepts that this application will deliver only 5 affordable homes on-site and Policy 4 of the JCS recognises that affordable housing provision is dependent on the overall viability of development.

4.20 In the Design and Access Statement the applicants state that they wish to determine the tenure of the affordable housing at the reserved matters stage, however it is recommended and is already being discussed in the preparation of the S106 agreement that the details of the affordable housing (size, type & tenure) be agreed at the outline stage so that there will be certainty about what is to be provided. A ‘claw back’ provision in the S106 should also be secured.

Ecology and landscape

4.21 An Ecology report has been submitted with the application and is considered to be fit for purpose by the County Ecologist who recommends that the proposed mitigation outlined in the report are considered and should be attached as conditions to any permission. With
these conditions I am satisfied the proposal accords with policies ENV14 and 15 of the SNLP which remain part consistent/consistent with the NPPF and will ensure that the ecology and bio-diversity of the site will be protected and enhanced.

4.22 As already mentioned the site has a variety of attractive assets, for example mature trees, high quality landscaping and varied topography. The Council’s Landscape Officer does not raise any overall objections to the proposed indicative layout but raises potential concern over the final layout as part of any reserved matters and the need to take into account the future growth of trees being retained. He however satisfied this can be secured by way of a condition.

4.23 In order to achieve the indicative layout shown some young and maturing trees will have to be removed and this not of concern in the bigger picture and layout given many of these are self-seeded. I am satisfied that the layout shown together with conditions to ensure further aboricultural information is submitted, at the reserved matters stage, together with a landscape management plan, the proposed development of the site will result in building on the landscape value identified and accords with Policy IMP2 of the SNLP which remains part consistent/consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

Archaeology

4.24 The application as submitted raised an objection from the Historic Environmental Services (HES) as the submitted desk based assessment was insufficient to describe the impact of this development on the significance of any heritage assets and a field evaluation was necessary, in accordance with paragraph 128 of the NPPF an policy ENV9 of the SNLP.

4.25 Rather than withdraw the application the applicant requested that they the application was put on hold whilst they carry out further works on site and given an opportunity to submit the results of the field evaluation.

4.26 This was submitted and the HES confirm that the proposed development area has been studied via a desk based assessment, and the south east of the site has been subject to an archaeological field evaluation. Whilst no significant archaeological deposits were found in the field evaluation, it did not study the area of highest archaeological potential - to the north west of the site. Adjacent to the northwest boundary, quarrying and later works uncovered a Roman hearth, several Roman urns and a horse skull in association with Roman pottery - this potential has not been explored. They therefore require that an archaeological condition and brief is still needed, but this can be conditioned to any approval.

4.27 I am satisfied that sufficient evidence has now been submitted to ensure that with an appropriate condition the proposal meets the requirements of the above mentioned policies.

Residential amenity

4.28 A number of residents have raised concerns about the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy as result of the proposed housing development and layout. These concerns are fully appreciated and as this is an outline application the final layout and appearance of the development will be subject to a reserved matter application. I am satisfied that the indicative layout for 50 dwellings on the site can be accommodated on the site, whilst respecting the topography of the site and protecting residential amenity to accord with policy IMP9 of the SNLP which remains consistent with the NPPF. The consideration and appropriateness of single storey buildings can be considered at the reserved matters stage.
Other considerations and S106 requirements

4.29 The application has not resulted in outstanding objections from statutory consultees. The initial objection from the Environment Agency has been addressed with the submission of a revised Flood Risk Assessment and is supported with conditions for final design of surface water. Likewise the application is supported by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer. Anglian Water have also confirmed there is foul drainage capacity for this scale of development at the Long Stratton STW and that the surface water/strategy/flood risk assessment meets their requirements. The proposals for surface water and foul water drainage accords with Policy 3 of the JCS and the aims of the NPPF. In accordance with Policy 3 a condition should also be attached to any permission to require at least 10% renewable energy and all dwellings meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water efficiency.

4.30 The application will be subject to a S106 agreement to agree secure contributions for education, library provision and on-site maintenance for play areas and an off-site contribution (amount subject to viability) for older children together with the affordable housing provision and related claw back.

5 Conclusion

5.1 This proposed mixed-use development, which is located within the current and proposed development limits for Long Stratton, can be supported in accordance with policy 14 of the JCS and policy HOU4 of the SNLP which remains consistent with the NPPF.

5.2 The site is within a sustainable location and the mix of housing and employment uses have been shown to work in layout and scale terms on the site. The indicative layout positively responds to the topography of the site and retains key landscape features and is accordance with the key design principles set out in the Design and Access Statement and policy 2 of the JCS

5.3 The submitted and amended technical reports address any potential issues and proposed mitigation and with the proposed conditions outlined in the recommendation, ensures the development will protect and enhance the ecology of the site, will protect archaeology, and not cause any flood risk, is acceptable in highway impact terms and will not cause any undue harm on the residential amenity of nearby residential properties. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of the NPPF, and relevant polices in the development plan as outlined in my assessment above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors 01508 533789
and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

**Parish** : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Hallam Land Management  
Site Address : Land Between London Road And Suton Lane London Road Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline application for up to 385 dwellings, including affordable housing; a site for a two form entry primary school and a reserve site to provide for its future expansion; green infrastructure accommodating landscaping, public open space, a multi-use games area and children's play space; new roads, car parking, cycleways and footways; associated infrastructure, including a sustainable drainage system; vehicular access to be secured from London Road and land for a new cemetery with separate access from London Road (amended title)

Recommendation : Refuse  
1. Absence of secondary school places and consequent impact on sustainability  
2. Impact on setting of listed buildings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 05: Supporting high quality communications infrastructure  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities  
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 13 : Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
ENV 15: Species protection  
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
UTL 15: Contaminated land
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 17: Off site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards
WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey Towers

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.5 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.

1.6 Other material considerations
Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (2011)
The Localism Act 2011 – s1423 Local Finance Considerations

1.7 Emerging Policies
The Wymondham Area Action Plan (Regulation 19 Pre-submission 2013) and Emerging Development Management Policies document (Regulation 19 Pre-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, but they are due to be considered by Full Council and Cabinet on 31st March with a recommendation for these plans to be submitted for examination. If the recommendation to submit is agreed at these meetings the policies will have some more weight. A verbal update will be given at the committee meeting to advise on this issue.

DM1.1: Sustainable development
DM1.2: Infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3: Sustainable location of development
DM1.4: Environmental quality and local distinctiveness
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
DM4.9: Protection of trees and hedgerows
DM4.10: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11: Heritage assets
WAAP Environment Objective
WYM 8: General Green Infrastructure requirements for new developments within the WAAP are
WYM 13: New recreation provision in Wymondham
WYM 15: Land for a new burial ground in Wymondham
WYM 21: Wymondham Development Boundary

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/1171 Screening Opinion for proposed mixed use development comprising housing, new primary school and new cemetery EIA required

2.2 2013/1399 Scoping Opinion for proposed mixed use development comprising housing, new primary school and new cemetery Withdrawn

2.3 2012/1201 FULL planning permission for B1, B2, B8 category office industrial units on Wymondham Business Park with OUTLINE approvals sought for residential development of approx. 20 dwellings on land adjacent to London Road and additional B1, B2, B8 category industrial use for land adjacent to Chestnut Drive to further extend Wymondham Business Park. Approved

Appeal History

2.4 2013/1171 Screening Opinion – Council advised that the Allowed development proposal was considered to trigger the need for an Environmental Statement. The applicant appealed the advice and the Secretary of State upheld the appeal. The associated scoping opinion (2013/1399) was withdrawn by the applicant.

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council Recommend approval as the application provides for:
- Good transport links with a range of access options
- A new primary school and open amenity land
- A new cemetery a key element of the WAAP
- For the Town Council’s view that smaller sites should be developed rather than a large development in South Wymondham
- Balance to the town
- Access to an employment area for the residents.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Planning Policy Despite the lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the fact that the JCS refers to a minimum of 2,200 new houses, the Council asserts strongly that 2,200 new homes is the maximum that can be accommodated in Wymondham due to secondary education constraints at Wymondham High School Academy, the need to retain a strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett and the
need to protect the historic landscape setting of the town and Grade I-listed Wymondham Abbey (which, including its grounds, is also a scheduled monument). The applicant does not appear to have put forward any proposals to address the issue of lack of secondary education capacity.

Planning permissions already exist for just over 2,200 new houses and these are the sites that are identified for development in the Pre-Submission Wymondham Area Action Plan.

I am unable to support this application from a policy perspective, principally because it would lead to the 2,200 limit for housing in Wymondham being exceeded without an appropriate solution to the secondary education capacity issue being forthcoming.

3.4 Conservation and Design Officer

Objection on grounds of harm to the significance of heritage assets of the Grade II listed Gonville Hall and the Grade I listed Wymondham Abbey. The development would also be contrary to the design principles identified in South Norfolk Place-Making Guide for the Tiffey Tributary Farmland Landscape character area, which requires the protection of views to landmarks and their settings, particularly Wymondham Abbey to ensure they are not adversely affected by new development.

3.5 English Heritage

First consultation response:

The development would result in a high level of harm to the significance of Gonville Hall. It would also adversely impact on the wider setting of the Wymondham Abbey, contrary to the JCS. The harm would need to be weighed against the benefits of the development, but the level of harm is high and would require correspondingly high level of benefit to outweigh that harm. The WAAP identifies sufficient sites to meet with the JCS objectives without tis site being developed, we therefore do not believe there to be a clear or convincing justification for the harm that would ensue.

The development is likely to impact on the water table in the vicinity of the moats and if this resulted in significant lowering of the water level in the moat then that would amount to substantial harm.

In the event that the local planning authority wishes to determine the application without seeking further information concerning the water table, then in light of the status of the heritage assets affected by this proposal and the high level of harm that would ensue, English Heritage does not believe this proposal meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for sustainable development and recommends that the application is refused.

Second consultation response:

Still of the view the development would result in a high level of harm, requiring a correspondingly high level of public benefit to outweigh it.

They also noted that recent case law (North Norfolk District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and David Mack) indicated paragraph 134 of the NPPF was consistent with the Statutory obligation to consider the setting of listed buildings under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (as amended).
3.6 Historic Environment Service  
First consultation response:
The proposed development site lies adjacent to Gonville Hall, a medieval moated site which has an associated settlement known from previously recorded earthworks and cropmarks. Further information is required to establish the presence, form, date and significance of any heritage assets with archaeological interest (buried archaeological remains) at the site before an informed planning recommendation can be made. We therefore request that the results of an archaeological evaluation are submitted prior to the determination of the planning application in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework para. 128.

Second consultation response:
Reiterate above comments, with the addition that the geophysical survey has highlighted possible archaeological features including ring ditches likely to relate to Bronze Age funerary monuments. Request further field evaluation prior to permission being granted.

3.7 NCC- Planning Obligations  
Significant concerns over secondary school capacity. Require contributions for schools, fire hydrants, library provision,

3.8 NCC Highways  
First response:
Objection on grounds of lack of guaranteed further secondary school places and consequent impact on sustainability of proposed development. Also objection on the grounds of highway functioning and safety.

Second response:
Objection on grounds of highway functioning and safety resolved through further discussion.

3.9 Environment Agency  
Recommend that a condition can be used for Flood Risk issues.

Require further information on several matters, including the impact of the cemetery over an aquifer, before recommending conditions regarding water resources.

3.10 Landscape Officer  
No comments received

3.11 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
No objections. Capacity exists for the proposed development. Condition recommended regarding foul water strategy recommended.

3.12 NCC Ecologist  
Concern over impact of development on breeding birds.

3.13 Environmental Protection - Flood Defence Officer  
Recommends water conservation methods be introduced at the design stage. Advice provided on the developers responsibility regarding drainage of the site and infilling of watercourses.

A condition is recommended to ensure that future drainage features are managed and concurs with the EA advice provided.

3.14 Housing Strategy Manager  
No comments received

3.15 Waste & Environmental SNC  
Concern over noise, further information required through condition to ensure adequate living conditions. Also a full desktop study for contamination and remediation would be required through
condition, along with condition for unidentified contamination. Foul drainage should be considered with Anglian Water and details of any lighting scheme to be agreed.

3.16 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No objections raised. Some advice issued regarding the future design and layout of the site and aspirations to achieve Secured by Design status.

3.17 Norfolk Police Authority

Holding objection - request for contributions under planning obligations to enable the policing of new development.

3.18 Representations

There have been 19 letters of representation received. 1 was in support and 18 objecting. The issues raised by the objectors are the following:

- Capacity of area to accommodate more development in addition to Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP)
- Democratic process to agree WAAP undermined by additional growth
- Highway safety and capacity
- School capacity
- Air quality
- Doctor surgery capacity
- Impact on setting of listed building
- Impact on heritage assets - archaeology
- Impact on landscape character
- Impact on trees
- Impact on existing local residents i.e. through noise
- Car parking, in particular from school
- Positioning of school
- Distance to nearest local services
- No provision of community facilities on site
- Poor pedestrian and cycle links to town centre and rail station, need for new bus stop
- How benefits/contributions will be secured and provided to benefit residents
- Water drainage and sewerage
- Loss of agricultural land
- Disturbance from construction
- Prejudice development of adjacent Johnson’s Farm
- Light pollution
- Allotments suggested instead of community orchard

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located approximately 1 mile south west of the town centre and covers approximately 27 ha of grade 3 agricultural land positioned between London Road and Suton Lane. The site is of an irregular shape and is largely flat.

4.2 The Suton Lane eastern boundary has no hedgerow but does contain several mature trees, the road sits at a lower level than the field boundary. The London Road boundary contains sections of hedgerow and trees along the boundary. London Road and Suton road meet at the roundabout adjacent the modern Abbey Road development. The north eastern boundary of the site is adjacent a small triangular parcel of land which has outline approval for the development of up to 20 dwellings (2012/1201).
4.3 The southern boundary of the site contains a substantial tree belt and is shared with the curtilage of Grade II listed Gonville Hall. Gonville Hall is accessed from a lane way onto Suton Lane and has on its southern aspect a series of barns converted into dwellings (Gonville Hall Farm). On the eastern side of Suton Road is an employment site which has approval to expand through approval 2012/1201 and also on a separate area of land a County Wildlife Site (CWS). Other surrounding land is largely in agricultural use.

4.4 Wymondham Abbey is located to the north east of the site beyond the Abbey Road development and views of the Abbey can be obtained from the site and from further south.

4.5 The site is located outside of both the current and emerging development boundaries of Wymondham and falls wholly within Flood Zone 1. It is subject to no other specific planning designations.

4.6 The application is in outline with all matters reserved apart from access. The application proposes up to 385 dwellings which would include a provision for 33% of the housing stock to be for affordable housing. The application also proposes to create a site for a primary school with provision for its future expansion.

4.7 The proposal also details public open space including a multi-use games area and children's playspace and land for a new cemetery with separate access from London Road.

4.8 The two vehicular access points proposed for the residential development would also both be on London Road with a roundabout being provided on one.

4.9 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development (including infrastructure capacity), the historic environment impacts, highways, design and landscape, water and drainage, ecology and open space, residential amenity, land contamination and sustainability.

**Principle of development and highways**

4.10 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.

4.11 Paragraphs 14 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework make it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that housing supply 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 (JCS) 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. Therefore in this instance the direction of Saved Policy ENV8 for residential development holds less weight and the site should be assessed on all other material issues.

4.12 Wymondham is identified in JCS Policies 9 and 10 as an area within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) which can accommodate a major expansion of at least 2,200 dwellings over the plan period (2008 – 2026). JCS Policy 10 sets out a number of requirements for delivery of 2,200 houses, including expansion of capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction and identifies the requirements for expansion of the town centre, extensive green infrastructure strengthening the importance of the Tiffey valley, an enhanced bus service, safe and direct cycling and pedestrian routes to link key locations around the town centre.
and surrounding area, a new pre-school and primary school and secondary education provision, and expanded household waste recycling facility.

4.13 The land allocated for a primary school would provide additional education provision for children aged 4-11, including those from the new development. The current primary school strategy is to develop four 4-11 primary schools across Wymondham to cater for the JCS numbers. The new school to be provided through the South Wymondham application will be expandable up to 420 places. The County Council may find it impossible to fund the construction of a fifth primary school, as proposed in this application. Any consent could ensure the delivery of the land for the school through an appropriate S106 agreement as required.

4.14 In relation to growth at Wymondham, JCS Policy 10 notes that: “Secondary education provision remains to be resolved but may require the relocation of the existing secondary school to another site”. This has been superseded by further investigation into school provision, with making maximum use of the Wymondham High Academy site the chosen course of action. Some expansion of Wymondham High Academy is possible, but due to its land-locked position, this cannot go beyond the pupils expected to arise from 2,200 additional dwellings in Wymondham. An expansion masterplan to grow the school to accommodate this level of growth has been agreed by Norfolk County Council Children’s Services with Wymondham High Academy, and the initial phase of the masterplan has been implemented.

4.15 In addition, new allocations totalling about 80 dwellings in parishes which feed into Wymondham High Academy are included in the Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations & Policies Document. Whilst only limited weight can be afforded to the specific allocations at the current time, the Joint Core Strategy does allocate dwellings to settlements relative to their position in the settlement hierarchy, so there is reasonable certainty that a number close to the 80 will be finally allocated.

4.16 The Pre-Submission Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) concludes that about 2,270 dwellings are allocated to Wymondham (a slight over-allocation for flexibility reasons). About 2,250 dwellings identified in the AAP now have planning permission (and some are already under construction or built out), so these are ‘allowed for’ by Norfolk County Council in secondary school terms (i.e. they are classed as commitments).

4.17 It has therefore been advised by both SNC Planning Policy and NCC Children’s Services that Wymondham does not have sufficient secondary school places for more than 2,200 dwellings to be provided in Wymondham and as such the 2,200 should be viewed as a maximum at least until longer-term (i.e. for the period beyond 2026) consideration of secondary schooling has been undertaken. This would be most appropriately undertaken through a review of the Joint Core Strategy/Local Plan, so that more comprehensive consideration of the most appropriate future secondary school ‘solution’ can be made in the context of the potential need for new housing and employment land, covering not just Wymondham but the wider area (encompassing locations like Hethersett and Cringleford).

4.18 Paragraph 72 of the NPPF directs that local authorities should work proactively to provide for school places within growth areas. However, the local secondary school is now an academy and outside the control of NCC Children’s Services. Wymondham High Academy has advised the Council through the Local Plan process that, due to site constraints, it cannot expand further (beyond the agreed masterplan to accommodate 2,200 new dwellings in Wymondham). Nor does it wish to re-locate either its Sixth Form element or its playing fields off-site; either outcome would be “highly undesirable educationally and would not be in the best interests of our students and staff”. The secondary school capacity issue is one which is clearly highlighted within JCS Policy 10 and the applicant has been aware of for a considerable period of time, yet they have not provided any detail on how this could be addressed. Therefore, although NCC Children’s Services and SNC are willing to work
proactively to resolve the issue, neither authority has been approached by this applicant (or, indeed, any others promoting non-WAAP compliant sites) with a workable solution or suggestion for satisfactorily resolving the matter. An appropriate solution would require both land and funding, neither of which Norfolk County Council or SNC can provide in this instance. It would not be educationally or socially acceptable for a solution to be left to the admissions processes of schools and the County Council – i.e. where a local place is not available to an applicant for a school place, the next nearest school would be offered. The County Council reasonably expects there to be sufficient capacity within each secondary school catchment area as defined in admissions documentation. It would not accept a solution which laid a significant transport burden on the Council as a result of this or any other proposal. It is considered that, given limited (and falling) budgets for local authorities, decisions on future schooling (particularly secondary schooling) cannot and must not be divorced from wider sustainability, infrastructure and financial considerations as to how and where future housing and employment growth should take place in South Norfolk.

4.19 It would therefore have to be assumed that should the application be approved the children associated with this development which would require secondary school places would have to be transported from the town to the nearest available places, which would be in Hethersett or Attleborough. This is also not considered to be of benefit to the children’s integration into the community or promote social interaction and inclusive communities as promoted within paragraph 69 of the NPPF.

4.20 The applicant has contested that due to the five-year land supply shortage, the development should be approved regardless of the secondary education place shortfall. To accept this argument would result in unsustainable pressure being placed on the education resources of the town and unsustainable transport practices being introduced (which would also add to pressure on limited and declining County Council budgets for educational travel). It should also be noted (as outlined in paragraph 4.16 above) that the Council has approved an appropriate level of development to provide for 2,200 dwellings within Wymondham and it is understood that these are deliverable and viable. These sites are those which now form the bulk of the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan and provide for a sustainable plan led system for the town to be established.

4.21 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. As identified above, 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’. The development would lead to an unsustainable development in terms of community cohesion, education provision and transport movements.

4.22 It is acknowledged that there is a 5 year land supply shortage in the NPA and that in geographical terms the site is close to the town centre and services are available and that the land is under one ownership with no known factors which would render it undeliverable or unviable. Also the benefits of providing 127 affordable units (33%), land for a two form entry primary school and a cemetery for the town are noted, although the County Council has noted that the pupil generation from 358 dwellings will not be sufficient to permit construction of the new school, and that a fifth primary school in the town could possibly not be funded by the County Council.
4.23 However, when viewed against the definition of sustainable development within the NPPF, the proposal does not meet the necessary criteria due to the lack of secondary school education places and the consequent transport implications (in terms of cost and emissions) which would be implemented to overcome this issue and social cohesion of children to their surrounding community. It would also lead to a development which would not be in accordance with the emerging growth plan for the town (notwithstanding that only limited weight can be afforded to the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan as a number of its policies are under challenge). The displacement of children from other parts of the catchment area in order to allow children from this development to secure places does not align with the sustainable transport and community cohesion aims which are detailed respectively in policies 6 and 7 of the JCS and paragraphs 34, 50 and 69 of the NPPF.

Transport and highways

4.24 Saved Local Plan policy TRA 1 (provision of pedestrian links) seeks to promote safe and convenient pedestrian access. Policy TRA 3 (provision of cycling facilities) seeks to promote cycle infrastructure to cater for demand created by new development. Policy IMP 8 (safe and free flow of traffic) seeks to ensure that new development does not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic. Furthermore the need to promote sustainable transport is encouraged through Section 4 of the NPPF.

Following negotiations with the developer, the exact design of junctions and highway improvements have been resolved to be acceptable. There was discussion over the signal timing and precise design of some aspects of the junction between Norfolk County Council and the applicant. These issues have been largely resolved to a point that would not merit refusal of the application on this ground. The site is at some distance to the town centre and rail station, with limited pedestrian and cycle links (such as road crossings) to enable safe and convenient movement into the town. Whilst other smaller residential developments have been permitted in the area, the amount of journeys this development would create would lead to a much more significant effect in terms of car reliance and increased car journeys. Aside from the more strategic school issue raised above, there are limited facilities for the residents of the proposed development, leading to significant journeys to facilities such as convenience stores. Access to the proposed cemetery would also lead to further journeys to this location. This would lead to a reliance of car usage which would not minimise the need to travel or promote sustainable forms of transport identified in Saved Policies TRA1 and TRA3 of the local plan or paragraph 34 of the NPPF.

4.26 For the reasons detailed above the principle of the development cannot be accepted and the application is considered to be contrary to the sustainability principles of policies 6 and 7 of the JCS and paragraphs 34, 50 and 69 of the NPPF.

Air quality

4.27 The impact of additional car journeys has been considered in terms of air quality. The issue of increased reliance on private car use aside, the additional development would not lead to a significant loss of air quality or air pollution. Supporting information has been submitted to demonstrate the increase in air pollutant would not exceed objectives (or tolerances) as set out in the Environment Act 1995.

Parking provision

4.28 The parking provision would need to be in accordance with Saved Policy TRA19 of the local plan. Parking has been raised as a concern, both for future housing and proposed primary school. The parking provision and layout would be determined at a reserved matters stage. The design of new development can ensure appropriate parking. Also the layout of the school and appropriate travel planning could ensure that there is no adverse impact on the surrounding road networks from parking at the primary school. These would not be sufficient reason to refuse the application on these grounds.
Historic Environment, Design and Landscape

4.29 Grade II listed Gonville Hall is considered by English Heritage, the applicant’s historic environment advisor and the Council’s Senior Conservation & Design Architect to be of high significance in terms of architectural, historic, archaeological and artistic interest. Gonville Hall is an important moated site, with the Grade II listed hall being of brick construction with a C16th timber framed core. The proposed development has the potential to impact upon the setting of Gonville Hall and as such an understanding of the significance of the setting must be fully examined.

4.30 The proposed development also has the potential to impact upon the Grade I listed Wymondham Abbey, which is arguably the most important listed building within South Norfolk. The towers of the abbey are visible from the development site as a distinctive landmark feature, giving a strong sense of place.

4.31 A major element of the experience of Gonville Hall is through its agricultural setting/environment, and the tranquility that comes with that isolated rural setting. This setting contributes significantly to the experience of the Hall, as a building of significance and substance that visually, economically and politically would have commanded the immediate locality. Extensive planting by the adjoining land owner has been carried out on the northern side of Gonville Hall in a rectangular block. This planting is an alien feature within the landscape setting and does not make a positive contribution to the significance of the Hall, as historically the Hall would have had a more open aspect. There are still glimpses of the two storey built form of Gonville Hall through these trees, particularly in winter months both from the east and from the west.

4.32 Gonville Hall has a double moat with a relatively rare combination of circular and rectangular moats. The double moat at Gonville Hall has been reviewed by English Heritage archaeologists and assessed as being of national importance, and of equivalent status to other scheduled moats in the East of England. The impact of all new development within the settings of listed buildings must be considered under Saved Policy IMP15 of the local plan. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF also identifies non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets. The double moat therefore requires consideration as if it were scheduled.

4.33 Policy 2 of the JCS and paragraphs 57, 58 and 61 of the NPPF seek to ensure that development proposals respect local distinctiveness, including landscape setting and character, townscape and use of sustainable materials. Saved Policy IMP2 of the local plan also requires new development to incorporate a high standard of landscape so that proposals are well integrated within the surrounding landscape setting. Additionally design guidance is also provided through the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD. This document identifies the site as being within the Tiffey Tributary Farmland Landscape character area, which has been identified to be agricultural in character with long range views towards important landmarks such as Wymondham Abbey. The key design principles identify that the rural character should be retained, along with protecting the views of landmarks and their settings, such as the Abbey. The Landscape Character Assessment reviewed by Chris Blandford Associates in 2012 also identified the rural setting of this landscape area and the need to protect important historic buildings from disturbance or visual intrusion.

4.34 An assessment of the contribution to the significance of the heritage assets is required. As defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, the setting of a heritage asset is defined as "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral." It is therefore important to note that the experience of setting is dynamic when moving around and experiencing an asset.
Guidance by English Heritage titled ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ identifies attributes that make a contribution to the significance of the asset. The relevant attributes to this case include the asset’s physical surroundings, including re topography, other surrounding heritage assets, definition of scale and surrounding landscape and spaces, land use, green space, trees and vegetation, openness, enclosure and boundaries and degree of change over time. Attributes affecting the experience of the asset also include the surrounding landscape or townscape character, views from, towards, through, across and including the asset, visual dominance, prominence or role as a focal point, tranquillity or remoteness and sense of enclosure.

The rural and agricultural setting of Gonville Hall has remained relatively unchanged over time. To the south of Gonville Hall the landscape is relatively open, with views of the rooftopscape of Gonville Hall and the single storey range of outbuildings are clearly visible in the wider landscape. Furthermore it is at this point where there is an important appreciation of the wider rural context and the inter-visibility and relationship between the ground of buildings at Gonville Hall and the towers of Wymondham Abbey which form an important landmark feature on the horizon to the east of the hall. It is recognised that the landscape has changed over time with more recent residential development, but the towers still remain an important and dominant visual feature in the landscape. The approach to Gonville Hall is also an important part of its setting. This takes the form of a tree lined driveway from the east which has a relatively open and rural aspect with views of the Abbey towers forming the backdrop to the north. This would change with the proposed development to the north of the hall.

To assess the effect of the proposed development, the above English Heritage Guidance identifies the following attributes that could affect setting and the significance of a heritage asset: proximity to asset, extent, degree to which location will physically or visually isolate the asset, position in relation to key views, prominence, competition with or distraction from the asset, dimensions, scale and massing, changes to the built surrounding, space, skyline, general character or land use.

A key aspect of the significance of Gonville Hall is its relationship with its rural setting and immediate agricultural context. The proposed development would surround the hall from the south west, north and east of the site and will result in a significant change to a more urban character. The proposals to include planting to the north of the hall to protect the privacy of its residents from the new development would also further detach the hall from its surroundings. The ability to appreciate the hall in its historic rural context, particularly from the south, will be lost. Similarly, it will no longer be able experience the hall and its associated outbuildings together with the Abbey towers in the wider rural landscape which will become an urban rooftopscape. Views of the Abbey from the approach to the Hall will also no longer be possible.

English Heritage has raised concerns regarding the historical landscape context. They have advised that retaining the application site in agricultural usage would best help preserve the wider setting of Wymondham Abbey and the historic town, while enhancement of the entrance to the town, as the applicant has suggested would be achieved, might be better delivered through high quality design of the small triangle site already consented at the junction of London Road and Sutton Lane (2012/1201).

The setting of Gonville Hall would be irreversibly and significantly damaged if the development were to be approved. The open, tranquil environment afforded to the building would be lost with intense screen planting on the majority of the northern edge and an urban landscape form developed on the south by virtue of the burial ground. Whilst the cemetery would not require substantial built forms, it would fundamentally change this part of the landscaped setting to Gonville Hall, creating a formal landscape more typical of an urban environment and at odds with the current agrarian landscape. The Landscape and Visual Assessment prepared by CSa fails to acknowledge the impact of such a change on
the setting of Gonville Hall, suggesting only in paragraph 5.21 that ‘will contribute in due course to the well vegetated setting of the Hall’.

4.41 The heritage assets have a high degree of sensitivity to change and based on the assessment set out above the proposed development will cause harm to their significance. The adverse impacts identified will be indirect as a result of harm to their settings. In assessing the level of harm caused, taking account of the above considerations, it is considered to be less than substantial. English Heritage is of the opinion that the degree of harm set out in the applicants Heritage Statement is a significant underestimation and the level of harm would be of a very high order. However, after considering the relevant guidance in detail the council is of the opinion the harm would be less than substantial. In this instance paragraph 134 of the NPPF is relevant, where the harm must be balanced against the wider public benefits. This is considered further below.

4.42 A further concern would be that the level of planting proposed adjacent to the moated areas would result in an impact on the water table in the vicinity of the moat. If changes to the water table were to result in a significant lowering of the water level in the moat then, in the opinion of English Heritage, this would amount to substantial harm. The applicant has provided further information on the water table of the surrounding area, identifying the water level to be 8m below ground and the moat filled with surface water run-off from surrounding land. The origin of the water aside, the planting of additional trees would still result in the lowering of water levels in the surrounding vicinity as biomass grows and holds the water. Whilst this issue has been considered in light of paragraph 132 of the NPPF, on balance the lowering of the water levels is not considered sufficient enough to merit significant harm. The level of water is not something that could be fully controlled due to variable rainfall and groundwater levels through natural changes.

4.43 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF directs that a balance between harm to a designated heritage asset and public benefit needs to be made by the determining authority. The public benefits of this scheme are summarised below:

- affordable housing
- green infrastructure accommodating landscaping,
- public open space,
- a multi-use games area and children’s playspace;
- land for a new cemetery

4.44 It is considered that these public benefits are not of a significant enough nature to warrant the level of harm which would be experienced upon the setting of Gonville Hall and the moated areas. A recent High Court decision, the importance of considering paragraph 134 of the NPPF was reiterated when it was considered to be consistent with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended. This balance of the harm the proposals would have on the heritage assets and landscape setting are therefore not considered to be outweighed by the above public benefits. The application is considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Policies IMP2, IMP15 and WYM12 of the local plan, policy 2 of the JCS and paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

Building for Life

4.45 As the proposals are at an outline stage the key design assessment would be undertaken through any reserved matters application. The overall layout of the site responds to the requirement to create mature landscaping to protect the amenity of residents at Gonville Hall. The overall layout of the proposed development is acceptable in principle, although the detail over the precise acceptability would come down to the details submitted in subsequent reserved matter applications. A Building for Life Assessment is being carried out and will be verbally presented at committee.
4.46 Saved Policy IMP 2 of the local plan specifically seeks to ensure that new development incorporates a high standard of landscape so that proposals are well integrated within the surrounding landscape setting. It is also noted that proposals should reflect the character and distinctiveness and make use of native species, include new tree planting and maximise nature conservation and environmental value of the new landscape. This policy is consistent with Section 7 of the NPPF which recognises landscape as one of the key facets of good design. Notwithstanding the above issues raised in the wider context of landscape setting, the landscaping within the proposed development would be a matter to be agreed through subsequent reserved matters to any consent granted. A good amount of open space is given within the development, the provision and management of this would be set through any Section 106 agreement and conditions if consent was granted.

Archaeology

4.47 Saved Policy ENV9 (nationally and locally important archaeological remains) states that where a proposal would cause significant alteration, damage, or have a significant impact on the setting of archaeological remains there will be a presumption against development. The policy goes on to state that development affecting sites of local importance will only be permitted if the need for development outweighs the local value of the remains. The policy concludes that if preservation in-situ is not merited planning permission can be subject to appropriate archaeological conditions. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF also states that an archaeological desk study should be submitted, and where necessary field evaluation.

4.48 More information has been requested by the Heritage Environment Services to determine the importance of any archaeological remains prior to the application being determined. This information has not been submitted. However neither Saved Policy ENV9 nor paragraph 128 of the NPPF however requires this information to be submitted prior to determining an application. Whilst this would be preferable, it would not be a sufficient enough reason to merit refusal of the application when this detail could be dealt with through condition.

Water and drainage

4.49 Policy 3 of the JCS seeks to ensure there is sufficient water resource for new development. Although this site is not within planned growth within South Norfolk, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is sufficient potable water supply and sewerage capacity to accommodate the new development. Water conservation measures are considered below in the section on sustainability.

4.50 The site is in Flood Zone 1 and so is not in an area of significant flood risk, but due to the scale of the site flood water drainage requires consideration. Land has been set aside for surface water runoff in the form of balancing ponds and swales. The details and management of this would be determined through subsequent reserved matters and condition detail applications.

Ecology and open space

4.51 Protection of local habitats and encouragement of biodiversity is required through Saved Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the Local Plan and policy 1 of the JCS, which are both consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF which sets out the government’s approach to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide enhancement measures. The additional development would also lead to increased transport movements and increased built form leading to impacts of traffic and surface water on the local environment.

4.52 There are no statutory designated sites i.e. RAMSAR, SAC within the immediate locality of the application site. There is one Site of Special Scientific Interest within 4km and several County Wildlife Sites within 1km of the site. However, there is potential for protected species on the site.
4.53 The ecology report accompanying the application identifies some impact on protected habitats and species. It is anticipated that the additional dwellings will have some increased pressure on surrounding habitats and species, but suggested mitigation or enhancement measures, including appropriate lighting, would ensure there is no adverse impact on protected species.

4.54 The proposed site layout includes some area of open space. Within these equipped play areas and routes for public access are proposed. The provision and management would be secured through a Section 106 agreement as required for any consent issued. In a letter of representation it was suggested that allotments could be proposed instead of a community orchard. The planting of trees has been suggested to ensure there is a visual break in between this site and Gonville Hall. Whilst the allotments would be another good community use the current proposals of a community orchard would still be an acceptable community use of the open space.

4.55 Additional tree and shrub planting has been proposed, which would assist in the breeding habitat for some birds. This additional planting raises concerns over the setting of Gonville Hall, as it would further screen the listing building from the surrounding area. The approval of the proposed development would give an opportunity for additional landscaping to improve the habitat for these species. However, the addition of significant housing would lead to more disturbance to surrounding wildlife. The proposed development would therefore not necessarily improve the habitat for protected species. This matter has been considered, but is not considered to be significant enough to merit a reason for refusal on this ground. Whilst the residential development may increase disturbance to the turtle doves it would not remove their habitat entirely. The additional planting would further detach Gonville Hall from the surrounding landscape, this has been considered in the above section of the report.

4.56 The proposed trees on site are of significant interest both for the setting of Gonville Hall and the wider rural landscape. Some tree loss is proposed to enable the two new accesses into the site. The trees to be removed are of interest but are not of enough significance to be a reason to refuse the scheme. In addition to this a scheme of replacement tree planting would compensate for the loss of biomass from the tree removals. The recommended tree protection measures and replacement planting identified in supporting information to the application could be conditioned to any consent issued.

Residential amenity

4.57 Saved policy IMP9 of the SNLP states that planning permission will only be granted for new development where there is no significant adverse impact on the amenity of residents through overlooking, overshadowing, setting of adjacent buildings or other impact on the privacy and amenity of nearby dwellings. The proposed development would be on a location formerly undeveloped which would lead to some impact. However, the proposed development is on the south side of the B1172 giving some separation from the proposed development. Whilst it is acknowledged there would be some loss of privacy and increased disturbance from lighting, traffic and noise of additional residents, these are not considered significant enough to merit refusal of the application, and could be reduced through the final design at reserved matters stage and appropriate conditions.

4.58 As required by Saved Policy UTL14, appropriate refuse collection storage and collection facilities would be agreed through any subsequent reserved matters applications.

4.59 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors. The key sources of additional noise would be additional traffic and noise from the school. Both of these have been considered but again are not considered to be significant enough disturbance to existing residents to merit refusal of the application on this ground. Noise and disturbance from the construction
A condition could be recommended to any consent issued for a construction management plan to limit the disturbance to an acceptable level.

The site is close to the A11, a key corridor of movement within the area, and the train line between Norwich and Cambridge. The noise from this road would impact on the future residents of the proposed dwellings. Information submitted with the application has identified that appropriate noise mitigation could be taken to bring the noise levels down to acceptable levels within the dwellings. This could be secured through condition to any consent granted.

The new development would lead to the potential for more light pollution. A lighting scheme could be conditioned to any approval to bring the lighting levels to acceptable levels, minimising light overspill to a degree that could be acceptable.

Land contamination

Saved policy UTL15 seeks to ensure contamination is identified before any planning permission is granted. Initial desk-top investigations have not identified any potential sources of contamination. However, to ensure full investigation further field-based surveys and potential remediation would be required. This could be ensured through condition to any consent granted, along with a condition to consider unidentified contamination through the course of the development.

The issue of contamination from the cemetery has been raised. The cemetery would be located over a principal aquifer, and concerns have subsequently been raised by the Environment Agency over the potential for burial leachate to enter the chalk aquifer. The Environment Agency identified three potential sensitive receptors including the water supplies to some surrounding properties, the moat at Gonville Hall and the proposed balancing pond to the north of the cemetery. The dwellings have been confirmed to not operate a site-based water pump for water supply, the moat has been confirmed to be fed by surface water and not groundwater, and the balancing pond would be more than 30m from the boundary of the cemetery site. Therefore the concerns over the cemetery are considered to be met.

Sustainability

JCS policies 1 (addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets) and 3 (energy and water) both require a high level of sustainability to be achieved. Policy 3 of the JCS places a specific requirement for all major development proposals to include sources of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy providing at least 10% of the scheme’s expected energy requirements. This detail could be conditioned to ensure compliance with these requirements.

Other matters raised in consultations

Norfolk Police Authority raised a holding objection until contributions were made to assist with policing and crime reduction for the additional development. Unfortunately there is no basis in policy terms for justifying such a contribution. The design of any subsequent reserved matters will ensure good design principles are used to reduce the potential for crime where possible.

The capacity of doctor’s surgeries has been raised in letters of representation. The provision of doctor’s surgeries was considered in the Joint Core Strategy for all planned growth. Although this proposal is outside of the planned growth for Wymondham there is no evidence to suggest that the doctor’s surgeries are at capacity. In the absence of this information it is difficult to support this as a reason for refusal to the proposed development.
Concern has also been raised over how the benefits from the development would be secured. As the recommendation in this report is for refusal this is not outlined in detail, but an accompanying Section 106 agreement would secure the community benefits to different degrees including provision of open space, land for the cemetery and financial contributions to libraries for example. If a decision were made on this case once Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was implemented by the council these benefits would be delivered both through a S106 agreement for onsite provision of land and financial contributions through the CIL tariff of £75 per square metre for new dwellings.

In a letter of representation the development of Johnson’s Farm has also been raised. An outline masterplan has been referred to, but these proposals have no weight in planning terms. The proposals were put forward in an early stage of the Wymondham Area Action Plan. Only a small part of the site was taken forward into the preferred sites for this document and was subsequently removed at the Pre-Submission stage (due to lack of secondary school capacity). Therefore the proposals have no weight and the concerns raised over the positioning of the roundabout cannot reasonably be used to justify any reason for refusal over access for this application.

The proposal of providing allotments has been suggested rather than a community orchard. This has been taken into consideration but as a community open space is provided it is not considered sufficient enough an issue to refuse the application on this ground.

The proposed development raises the key issues of secondary school place availability, sustainable transport and the impact on the setting of both a Grade I and Grade II listed buildings. The site is not allocated in the Pre-Submission iteration of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (notwithstanding that only limited weight can be afforded to this factor, as various policies of the Wymondham Area Action Plan are under challenge), but in the absence of a five year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area and the less than substantial harm the development would have on the above listed buildings, the adverse impacts of permitting the development must be weighed against the benefits the development would bring.

Whilst it is noted that the development would deliver 127 affordable homes and a cemetery for the town, the absence of secondary school place provision in the surrounding area is of significant concern. The council has worked with the developer to actively resolve this issue but the provision of a commuted sum is not enough to actually deliver school places for the children who will potentially live at this site. Land is not available to deliver a secondary school, and so there is no opportunity for the commuted sum to be spent to address this issue. Efforts have been made to increase capacity at existing schools but it has not been possible to reach agreement on this. It should also be noted that there are concerns over delivery of the proposed primary school which would reduce the benefits this would bring.

Although it is noted that it is not the responsibility of the developer to provide education facilities, a decision cannot be made in line with the NPPF that would lead to children needing to travel over 12 miles to school. This would not be in line with promoting social inclusion and cohesion, or sustainable transport for new development.

The proposed development would also lead to a significant impact on the Grade II listed building of Gonville Hall and its moats, which are considered to be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument, and the Grade I listed Wymondham Abbey. The open and rural nature of the Tiffey Tributary Farmland landscape character area land surrounding the hall would be significantly changed to an extension of the urban townscape of Wymondham.

To protect the amenity of the existing residents of Gonville Hall, should the development be permitted, further tree planting is likely to be required leading to further division of Gonville Hall from it surrounding open countryside.
5.6 The significance of Gonville Hall is considered to be harmed through development within its rural setting. Although the harm is considered to be less than substantial, the harm is not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits.

5.7 The development is therefore recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

1) The development of 385 dwellings in this location would lead to an unsustainable development with poor social inclusion and cohesion, and promote unsustainable transportation methods by virtue of the absence of available or planned secondary school pupil places within the surrounding area, leading to children needing to travel a significant distance from their homes for education, potentially at significant cost to Norfolk County Council for needing to provide transportation free of charge for pupils to the nearest available secondary school with capacity, increased reliance on private car use through parental drop-offs and poor social cohesion and inclusion with the existing community in Wymondham. In the absence of a five year land supply, these adverse impacts of the development are still considered to outweigh the benefits of affordable housing, a cemetery and land for a primary school and is considered to be contrary to policies 6 and 7 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments 2014) and paragraphs 34, 50 and 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). In the planning balance in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

2) The development would lead to a detrimental impact to the setting of the Grade II listed building of Gonville Hall, and its moats which are of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument, and the Grade I listed building of Wymondham Abbey by virtue of the loss of the open and rural character of the land surrounding the heritage assets and wider Tiffey Tributary Farmland Landscape character, through the proposed urban form to the north of Gonville Hall eroding the open, rural character of the surrounding area and limiting views of the identified landmark of Wymondham Abbey towers. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Saved Policies IMP2, IMP15 and WYM12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (adopted 2003), policy 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendment 2014) and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). The harm identified is considered to be less than substantial, however in the planning balance in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm caused to the significance of designated heritage assets.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jo Hobbs 01508 533674 and E-mail: jhobbs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2013/2201/F  
**Parish**: BROOKE

Applicants Name : F W Properties  
Site Address : Land North Of 30 Norwich Road Brooke Norfolk NR15 1AB  
Proposal : Residential development of 12 dwellings and garages, plus associated services. Maintained field access, New speed limit and village entrance signs.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Materials  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
6. Landscaping  
7. New Water Efficiency  
8. Surface Water  
9. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
10. Implement of approved remediation  
11. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
12. Visibility splay, approved plan  
13. Provision of parking, service  
14. Construction Traffic (Parking)  
15. Highway Improvements - Offsite  
16. Traffic Regulation Orders  
17. Ecology Mitigation  
18. No additional windows at first floor  
19. Tree protection  
20. The bathroom window at first floor on plot 12 shall be obscure glazed.

Subject to a section S106 Agreement in respect of Affordable housing (33%).

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 15: Service 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  
IMP 2: Landscaping
2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Refuse:
- 4 trees will be lost which is unacceptable. No reason why the design could not be amended so the trees can be retained.
- Garages should not be to the front of the houses, should be level with or behind the building line of the houses.
- 4 new accesses onto B1332 is excessive, there should be one new access point on each side of the road.
- No natural screening indicated for the north side, there should be natural hedging of a similar nature to the hedge to north of existing houses.
- Plots 9/10/11/12 have no garages most have two each but not all. Should be a minimum of two off road parking spaces.
- Needs to be confirmed that the existing foul water system can cope.
- Clarification required that the windows will be constructed from sustainable materials.
- Surface water drainage - would like additional drainage on site. Soakaways do not work on heavy clay soils.
- The road should be widened to accommodate the island in the road. Whole road will need resurfacing to make sure no problems caused by water main in road.

3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Flood Defence Officer

Support with conditions

3.4 Planning Policy

Support: identified as a preferred option site

3.5 Landscape Officer

Support with conditions

3.6 Environment Agency

No objections

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objections – the foul and waste water systems have capacity for the proposed development

3.8 Design Officer

Support

3.9 NCC Ecologist

To be reported

3.10 Environmental Services

Support with conditions

3.11 Housing Strategy Manager

No objections - Affordable housing provision has been agreed with applicants

3.12 Representations

No comments received
Assessment

This full application seeks consent for erection of dwellings and garages, located on either side of the Norwich Road to the north of the village of Brooke. The site is outside the existing Development Boundary and the conservation area.

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

Principle of development

The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocations document identifies this 1.4 hectare area of land as a preferred site (BKE 1) for residential development, and although not yet adopted, this emerging policy is a material consideration.

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 Brooke is defined as a Service Village makes provision for small scale housing growth for between 10-20 houses subject to form and character considerations.

- The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocation document allocates this 1.4 hectare site as suitable for 12 dwellings with 6 on either side of the road. The Regulation 19 representation period on the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document consultation that concluded on 13th December 2013 has not raised any soundness objections to this proposed allocation.

- 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. Brooke is situated within the Rural Policy Area which has a confirmed 5 year land supply of sites. Therefore the 5 year land supply is not an issue for consideration within the determination of this planning application.

In the above circumstances, the principle of new residential development of the scale proposed is considered acceptable in this instance.

Design, layout and impact on the character of the area

Both JCS Policy 2 Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The new development will be an extension to the existing street scene and will provide a new entrance into the village when travelling from the Poringland direction. The house types are based on a number of simple variations in elevational treatments and slight changes in the orientation of the buildings which will give visual interest in the street-scape. Plots 5 and 6 will act as focal points at the entrance to Brooke and help to create a 'sense of arrival' by combining strong building forms and attractive architectural detailing. The appearance of the dwellings has been designed to reflect the vernacular style of buildings in the area and are based on traditional Norfolk design principles; steep pitched roofs, traditional detailing and a traditional palette of materials. Together these elements help to create a development with a locally inspired character that relates well to this part of Brooke. The applicant has provided additional information in their...
'Supplementary Design Statement' that demonstrates how the scheme has been developed in accordance the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide by developing a scheme that has been designed to have a positive character based on an understanding of the local area. The scheme has been well thought out and accords with policy and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. When the assessed against Building For Life 12, the scheme scored 12 Greens out of 12, which meets Policy 2 of the JCS.

4.5 The Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the provision of a number of garages being located to the front of dwellings, however these form part of the overall design concept, giving visual interest and in respect of plots 5 and 6 act as a focal point at the entrance to the village. They are acceptable in design terms and would not represent a reason to refuse the application. The Parish Council have also raised concerns regarding the loss 4 trees. Tthe proposal does require the loss of unprotected trees, however the implications of this has been assessed by the landscape officer and he has raised no objections. The scheme also proposes hedge planting to the northern, eastern and western boundaries with the addition of new trees.

Affordable housing

4.6 Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy states that sites for 16 dwellings or over 0.6ha are required to provide 33% affordable housing. The applicant has proposed 2 two bedroom houses and 2 one bedroom houses which would comply with the affordable housing requirements. As such, the Housing Strategy Team has raised no objection to the scheme on the grounds that it would meet the requirements of Policy 4 subject to this provision being secured through a condition or S106 agreement.

Highway safety

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

4.8 The application proposes four new accesses off Norwich Road. Concerns have been raised by Parish Council that there should only be one new access on either side of the Norwich Road. However, notwithstanding these concerns, the Highways Authority has assessed the proposal, and subject to the imposition of conditions, particularly in respect of on-site and off-site highway improvement works, have raised no objection to the proposed development.

4.9 The Parish Council has raised concerns regarding the parking for plots 9/10/11/12, the applicant has responded to this by providing two spaces per dwelling (1 and 2 bedroom units).

Residential amenity

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

4.11 No objections have been raised in respect of the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenities of adjacent residential properties. The scheme has been designed not to cause significant loss of privacy, outlook or light to nearby properties and as such would comply with Policy IMP9.
5 Conclusion

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

5.2 The design, scale and layout of the scheme are considered appropriate for its context and are of a high standard of design. The development will not adversely affect the character of the area and will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, drainage or highway safety. In these respects the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788 and E-mail: cc Curtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

5. **Appl. No**: 2014/0039/F  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Vincent Somers  
Site Address: Hingham Congregational Church Chapel Street Hingham Norfolk NR9 4JH

Proposal: Change of Use from Church (D1) to residential (C3). Demolition of later rear extension to form garden space

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Details of visibility splay  
4. Details of car parking  
5. Removal of PD Rights  
6. Front boundary details  
7. Ground surface materials  
8. Contaminated Land  
9. Drainage  
10. Window details to be agreed  
11. Windows to be obscure glazed  
12. Details of repairs and coping for rear boundary wall

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of listed buildings  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas  
ENV 15: Species protection

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Parish Council  
Refuse due to the impact of the proposed new first floor windows on the privacy of neighbours. Recommended roof lights used as an alternative. Also, recommended rear boundary wall retained and would like the recently removed railings reinstated. Had concerns about the loss of parking spaces along Chapel Street.

Comments following re-consultation - reiterated the above

2.2 District Member  
Application to be determined by Committee in view of the considerable amount of local public concern.
2.3 NCC Highways Requested further information highlighting the achievable visibility splays from a single vehicular access and the position & number of proposed parking spaces associated with the proposal.

Comments following re-consultation - no objection but recommended conditions.

2.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection but with approval specified conditions for any contaminated land.

2.5 Ecology No ecological information required.

2.6 Representations Neighbour objections

- Proposed demolition of rear boundary wall which forms part of existing rear gable to Chapel.
- Overlooking from proposed new first floor windows
- Design of first floor windows
- New openings in the building
- Loss of historic front railings
- Impact on parking in Chapel Street
- Increase in traffic
- Impact of gravel from front of site spreading on to the road
- Works already completed to remove internal fabric and front grassland area
- Inappropriate methods that have been used to clean the building
- Likely level of noise of ongoing works following approval of the scheme
- Lack of information in the application - further elevation details required

Neighbour objections following re-consultation on amended details:

- Blocking of rear neighbours right of way
- Overlooking from first floor windows
- New openings in the building
- Impact on parking and increase in traffic
- Impact of gravel from front of site spreading on to the road
- Accidental demolition of historic rear boundary wall

3 Assessment

3.1 The application seeks planning permission for conversion of a former Congregational Church in Chapel Street, Hingham to residential use. The Church is set back from the road and is situated in the Hingham Conservation Area. Immediately adjacent to the north side are two grade II listed buildings, 7-9 Chapel Street and an outbuilding directly east of 21 Bond Street. Adjacent to the rear boundary of the Congregational Church are numbers 13, 15 and 17-21 Bond Street which are all grade II listed buildings.

3.2 The proposed conversion scheme involves the demolition of a later rear extension which has also been built onto the rear boundary garden wall of 15 Bond Street, a grade II listed building. New window openings are proposed in the exposed main rear gable of the church from which the rear gardens of neighbouring properties in Bond Street could potentially be overlooked. No other changes are proposed to the front and side elevations of the building. There is provision for two parking spaces at the front of the site in the courtyard area.
3.3 The proposal is assessed against policies IMP 17 and IMP 18 as it is development involving alterations to a building within a conservation area. The impact on existing use of the highway and on neighbouring amenities also needs to be assessed under policies IMP 08 and IMP 09. Potential impact on protected species also needs to be considered under policy ENV 15. The policies in the Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that the proposal is of a good design and does not adversely affect the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The assessment of these applications gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

3.4 As required under the NPPF assessment of the application needs to take into account the impact the proposal will have on the significance of both the church (as a non-designated heritage asset) and conservation area (designated heritage asset).

3.5 There is no objection in principle to the conversion of the church to residential use. The building is situated inside the development boundary within a residential area and has not been in use for some time. The proposed change of use will not result in any loss of employment.

Impact on Residential Amenity

3.6 The amended fenestration scheme for the rear elevation clearly shows the first floor windows to be obscure glazing with bottom hinged casements which have restricted opening to prevent direct overlooking onto neighbouring garden areas. Under current policies, taking into account the existing arrangement of buildings around the site, which form part of an urban area within the development boundary, the proposed new window openings at the first floor are acceptable provided they have obscure glazing and open in such a way so as to avoid direct overlooking into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties immediately west of the site. There is no requirement for means of escape through these windows as a sprinkler system is proposed inside the building which satisfies building regulation requirements. The full details of proposed windows would need to be agreed under conditions with any approval. Their retention in perpetuity would also be a requirement under conditions.

Design and impact on the conservation area

3.7 Although not listed, the Congregational Church is a fine example of a Gothic Revival Nonconformist Chapel and is prominent in the street scene making a considerable contribution to the historic character and appearance of the immediate area. As well as being a non-designated heritage asset the church is identified as being of Townscape significance in the current Hingham Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

3.8 With this proposal the appearance of the front and side elevations of the church will remain unchanged the only external changes being new openings in the rear gable end. The proposed amended scheme of fenestration at the rear gable end has been designed to be sympathetic to the architectural style of the church and will sit comfortably with the building.

3.9 The front railings are to be only partly reinstated in order to allow for a new vehicle access from Chapel Street. This partial reinstatement will help to retain some of the original character of the front boundary. As the church is not listed and the original railings were no higher than 1m no formal permission is required for their removal.

3.10 The historic wall which forms part of the later rear extension on the church is to be retained rather than being replaced with a 2m high close boarded fence as was originally proposed in the application. This will provide some enhancement in views of the site from the west side as the wall will appear freestanding as originally built.
3.11 As the church is not listed, no formal permission is required to remove parts of the internal fabric and some of this work has already commenced. In view of this, it is not considered necessary to condition photographic recording of the building as recommended by the Historic Environment Service should the application be approved.

Highways

3.12 A number of concerns have been raised regarding the loss of parking along Chapel Street and the increased level in traffic that may result from the proposed scheme. Having given consideration to these issues, the Highways Officer has not objected to the amended scheme, even though the proposed parking arrangements and visibility splays do not meet current standards. Parking arrangements and vehicle access to the site required by the proposal will have less impact on the surrounding area compared with the potential impact of its current lawful uses under Use Class D1 (which includes church halls, health centres, nurseries, education, public halls and similar institutional use).

3.13 Taking into consideration other objections raised I do not consider it necessary for any further amendments to be made to the proposal before the application is approved.

4 Conclusion

4.1 The amended scheme addresses overlooking issues and its design is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing building and will not result in any adverse impact on views of the conservation area or on the setting of listed buildings to the rear of the site. Whilst there will be some loss of parking on the road at the front of the site, the impact of this and any increase in traffic that may result from the development is considered acceptable, as it will generate less traffic and need for parking compared with its current potential use. The proposal complies with the above policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy guidance in the NPPF regarding non-designated and designated heritage assets and therefore is acceptable.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Philip Whitehead 01508 533948 and E-mail: pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk
ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS – PROGRESS REPORT 24th March 2014
Report of the Director of Growth & Localism

This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TIVETSHALL ST MARY     | Unauthorised Building                  | 07.12.04                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 04.02.06  
New building now erected and awaiting removal of unauthorised building  
To revisit in eight weeks to check on demolition |
| Mardle Hall            |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| Rectory Road           |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| 2004/0238              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| WORTWELL               | Standing of a caravan                  | 15.06.11                    | Enforcement Notices served  
Compliance date extended one year to 14/09/15 |
| Station Farm           |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| High Road              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| 2004/0254              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| DICKLEBURGH            | Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development | 24.04.07                    | Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with  
But new breach under investigation |
| Beeches Farm           |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| Norwich Road           |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| 2007/8036              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| HARLESTON              | Breach of condition – provision of footpath | Not required            | Norfolk County Council now owners and outstanding issues are being addressed by them  
NFA |
| Hopkins Homes          |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| Wharton’s Nurseries    |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| Station Road           |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| 2008/8109              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| ASLACHTON              | Standing of residential caravans       | 24.02.09                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 31/07/15 |
<p>| Grays Lane             |                                       |                             |                                                                             |
| 2008/8368              |                                       |                             |                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEETING</td>
<td>Use of land as a travellers site</td>
<td>24.06.09</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harveys Lane 2006/0014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELVERTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Temporary Stop Notice served Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddon Road 2010/8097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 24.07.11 Appeal dismissed – Enforcement Notice partially complied with Further enquiries ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Appeal submitted and allowed for four year temporary permission Compliance date 11/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilderswood Lane 2010/8027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 29.12.11 Ongoing negotiations to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj. to Fen Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELDESTON</td>
<td>Breach of Planning condition</td>
<td>25.10.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 The Street 2009/8178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House 2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House 2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DENTON            | Change of use of barn and Building works to barn    | 16.02.11                    | 2 Enforcement Notices served  
Appeal decided, one notice upheld with compliance date of 20/06/12  
One notice dismissed.  
Ongoing prosecution |
| Grove Farm        |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Middle Road       |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2008/8155         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| CROWNTHORPE       | Formation of Access                                 | 16/11/11                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 27/10/13  
Owner unable to comply at present due to personal circumstances  
Ongoing monitoring |
| Land adjacent to   |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| The Drift         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Crownthorpe Road  |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2011/8025         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| ASLACTON          | Erection of buildings not connected to agricultural use | 21/12/11                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 31/07/15 |
| Land off          |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Grays Lane        |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2008/8368         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| LODDON            | Erection of fence adjacent to a highway             | 09/06/11                    | Enforcement Notice complied with NFA                                                                                                         |
| Land at           |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 3 Norton Road     |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2011/8057         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| BARFORD           | Change of use of land for the standing and occupation of residential caravans | 01/02/12                    | Enforcement Notice complied with NFA                                                                                                         |
| Mud Walls Farm    |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Watton Road       |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2011/8175         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| HEYWOOD           | Erection of ancillary building                      | 06/06/12                    | Enforcement Notice complied with NFA                                                                                                         |
| Woolsey Bridge    |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Barns             |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| Burston Road      |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2012/8141         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| WYMONDHAM         | Unauthorised works to Listed Building (Insertion of UPVC windows) | 02/05/12                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Notice upheld on appeal and varied, new compliance date 30/05/14 |
<p>| 70 Damgate Street |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |
| 2011/8281         |                                                     |                             |                                                                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAXLINGHAM THORPE</td>
<td>Change of use of land to mixed use as agricultural land and land for the storage of a caravan</td>
<td>20/06/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on the North side of Windy Lane, Foxhole 2010/8302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Unauthorised standing of mobile home for residential purposes</td>
<td>18/07/12</td>
<td>Planning application allowed on appeal Personal consent to current occupiers until they no longer have a need for the accommodation NFA is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow View The Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane 2012/8018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPCROFT</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the stationing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>27/03/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 30/08/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South side of Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street 2012/8299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of woodland</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served and appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Covert Cavick Road 2011/8033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSHALL</td>
<td>Breach of Condition</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 16/02/14 Complied with but ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of South View Harleston Road 2013/8147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULBARTON</td>
<td>Untidy land</td>
<td>05/02/14</td>
<td>Notice served Compliance date 14/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevannon The Common 2013/8217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAXTON</td>
<td>Change of use of stable to</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Barn</td>
<td>residential dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 19/03/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lane 2013/8087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Erection of Fencing</td>
<td>06/11/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Oaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 19/04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton Road 2013/8099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlingham Thorpe</td>
<td>Storage of a caravan</td>
<td>27/02/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served and appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on the North side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Windy Lane 2013/8069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enforcement Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 22 February 2014 to 21 March 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/0811</td>
<td>Thurlton Land South Of Manor Farm Low Road Thurlton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr William Morgan</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1488</td>
<td>Costessey Land Rear Of 38 Crown Road Gurney Road Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Richard Wymer</td>
<td>Sub-division of garden &amp; erection of new dwelling and ancillary works on land to rear of 38, Crown Road, Costessey, Norwich, Norfolk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 22 February 2014 to 21 March 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>2013/0524</td>
<td>Bergh Apton Land East Of Millers Cottage Mill Road Bergh Apton Norfolk</td>
<td>Ms Vivien Castleton</td>
<td>Outline permission with all matters reserved for one detached, two storey, four bedroom dwelling.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1620</td>
<td>Long Stratton 12 St. Marys Road Long Stratton Norwich NR15 2TT</td>
<td>Miss Amy Eletheriades</td>
<td>Erection of fencing to replace existing wall</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>