Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives                 Liberal Democrats
Mr J Mooney  (Chairman)       Mr T East
Mr D Blake  (Vice-Chairman)   Dr M Gray
Mrs Y Bendle
Mrs F Ellis
Mr C Gould
Mr L Hornby
Dr C Kemp
Dr N Legg
Mrs L Neal

Pool of Substitutes
Mr L Dale               Mrs V Bell
Mr C Foulger
Mr B Riches
Mr R Savage
Mr G Walden
Miss L Webster

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am                      Blomefield Room

Date
Wednesday 30 April 2014

Time
10.00 am

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

Contact
Caroline Heasley  tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman.

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
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 7)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 2 April 2014;  
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 17)
   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>2013/1568/O</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>8 Bridge Street (Old Police Station) Loddon</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/0341/CU</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Rookery Farm Grays Lane Pulham Market</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014/0234/F</td>
<td>WINFARTHING</td>
<td>Swiss Cottage High London Lane Winfarthing</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014/0368/CU</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

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

7. Planning Appeals (for information)  
   (attached – page 46)

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 28 May 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>Activity</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire alarm</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</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>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</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>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGF</td>
<td>Agricultural Determination – approval of details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment – Scoping Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Proposal by Government Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>Tree Preservation Order application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNDP</td>
<td>Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<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>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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

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

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

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

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

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

NO

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

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

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

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

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

NO

YES

YES

NO

YES

NO

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
Application Referred back to Committee

1. **Appl. No**: 2013/1568/O  
   **Parish**: Loddon  

   **Applicants Name**: Orangetree Ltd  
   **Site Address**: 8 Bridge Street (Old Police Station) Loddon Norfolk NR14 6EZ  
   **Proposal**: Proposed demolition of police station and formation of residential with highways improvement  

   **Recommendation**: Refusal  
   1. Insufficient information regarding impacts on historical assets, residential amenity and ecology.  
   2. Highway safety and functionality.  
   3. The proposed scheme does not justify the demolition of a building in the Loddon Conservation Area.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
      NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
      NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
      NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
      NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
      NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
      NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
      NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
      NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

   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

   1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan (2003)**  
      ENV 15: Species protection  
      IMP 2: Landscaping  
      IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
      IMP 9: Residential amenity  
      IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas  
      IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas  
      HOU 5: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns (Part Consistent)

   1.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**  
      South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

   1.5 **South Norfolk local Plan Development Management Policies (submission version)**  
      4.10 Incorporating landscaping into design  
      3.12 Road safety and free flow of traffic
2. Planning History

2.1 2010/2222/F Demolition of existing building and re-development for 5 flats/houses. Approved

2.2 2010/0438/F Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of 5 no. flats. Approved

2.3 2008/1928/CAC Proposed demolition of existing building. Approved

2.4 2007/2563/CAC Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site for 1no retail unit and 4no flats. Refused

2.5 2007/2562/F Redevelopment of site for 1no retail unit and 4no flats. Refused

3. Consultations on amended proposal

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
- Although Parish Council had recommended the previous application for houses and flats for approval, it would prefer not to see a wider road as this could lead to possible future large scale development, as per Parish Council policy 9 - to oppose large scale development in the newly published Loddon Parish Plan 2013

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee if recommended for refusal.
- This application has been before planning committee where the highway issues were contested.
- I welcome the redevelopment of the site which has become an eyesore in the area.
- The proposed dwellings are more in keeping with the vernacular would be a vast improvement on the old police station and concrete office used as an electrical appliance shop.
- There are major parking issues in the access road to the Boatyard which does cause congestion and access problems. I fell that the realignment of the junction from a staggered one to a cross roads would be an improvement and would help to improve the problematic parking in the area and also make it easier for traffic to enter and leave the Princess Cruisers site with improved visibility. The application is for 5 houses and has to be determined on this issue not might be applied for in the future.

3.3 NCC Highways Objection:
- The proposed development, if permitted, would lead to an access and right hand turning movements across the opposing traffic streams of a busy traffic route at a point where vehicle conflict is already high and would interfere with safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users

3.4 Broads Authority No response
3.5 Representations

One letter of objection

- The Boatyard road was made wider in 2006. Sadly this has encouraged more unauthorised parking.
- See no reason to make it wider again.

4 Assessment

4.1 This members of Development Management Committee resolved to defer the application from Development Management Committee on 9th October 2013 so the applicant could provide additional information regarding the proposed highway junction. Members also requested that the Highways Officer attend Committee. This report updates the 9th October report which is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 The applicant has amended the application which still proposes a cross road junction with St Georges Lane but has increased the width of the proposed access into the Boat yard so a pedestrian footpath is provided either side. The application is still outline with all matters reserved but now indicates that 5 dwellings would be provided with no retail. No details have submitted as part of the application regarding appearance of the building, affordable housing, landscaping or biodiversity of the site. There is no clear indication or master plan for the future development of the boat yard site which is within the Broads Area. At this stage the applicant wishes to gain support for the principle of repositioning the access prior to developing the scheme further.

4.3 The principle of residential development has already been agreed with previous applications. The Boat yard which is within the Broads Area is not within a development limit and is subject to a number of constraints. Any future development on this site would be subject to an application by the Broads Authority.

4.4 The applicant has had discussions with the Highway Authority regarding the access, which has resulted in the widening of the access. However the Highway Authority is fundamentally opposed to the creation of a cross road junction. Their view is that T-junctions such as the High Street/George Lane junction are places of vehicular conflict. Moving the access to the boat yard closer to this junction will only increase vehicular conflict at this junction. Crossroads junctions are acknowledged to have the highest levels of vehicular conflict of all non-traffic light controlled junctions and reduced levels of highway safety. It is therefore considered that such a junction would be detrimental to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

4.5 Members will also note the views of the Parish Council and local resident.

5 Conclusion and reason for refusal

5.1 It would not be standard practice for the Council to accept an outline application of this scale in a conservation area. However, the applicant felt it was necessary to obtain a formal highway authority view on the proposed access arrangements before committing more resources to developing the proposal. The Highway Authority has advised that they do not support the proposed arrangement and have explained there reasons for the objection. Unfortunately because the Highway Authority have a fundamental objection to the access it has not been possible to negotiate a solution which both parties are happy with.

5.2 The application now proposes an entirely residential scheme which in principle may be acceptable. The application however does not provide any detail with regard to the potential impacts on the conservation area and surrounding listed buildings which is not considered acceptable in an area of such a high concentration of historical assets. The development provides for no ecological mitigation or survey data, when there may be opportunities to protect and enhance the green infrastructure/biodiversity of the locality and does not provide for any type of design or landscape principles.
5.3 The outline application does not provide for a full examination of the design and scale of the development and its potential impacts on the surrounding historical assets and conservation area and is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of NPPF Sections 7 and 12, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Polices IMP16 and IMP18.

5.4 The proposal provides no detail regarding the potential impacts of the development upon residential amenity in a location which has rear gardens and habitable rooms close to the boundary and therefore cannot be fully examined in relation to Saved Policy IMP9.

5.5 The application proposes the demolition of the former police station but has provided no ecological survey data to identify any protected species and is therefore not in accordance with the requirements of NPPF Section 11 and Saved Policy ENV15.

5.6 The integration of this site from town to the Broads in terms of landscape is considered to be an important design element and no landscape strategy or evaluation has been proposed and the application is therefore not considered to meet with the objectives of Saved Policy IMP2.

5.7 Saved Policy IMP16 only allows for demolition in conservation areas when an approval for redevelopment has been accepted, in this instance the proposed development does not accord with the requirements of Saved Policy IMP16.

5.8 The development proposal details within its indicative site layout the formation of an access which would create a cross roads with Bridge Street and George Lane. This would create right hand turning movements across the opposing traffic streams of a busy traffic route at a point where vehicle conflict is already high and would interfere with safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users. The application is therefore considered to conflict with the continued functionality and safety of the highway in this location and is contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Policy IMP8.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
- ENV 15: Species protection
- IMP 2: Landscaping
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas
- IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas
- SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (Part Consistent)
- SHO 4: Town centres
- HOU 5: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns (Part Consistent)

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
- South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2010/2222/F Demolition of existing building and re-development for 5 flats/houses. Approved

2.2 2010/0438/F Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of 5 no. flats Approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Application Details</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 2008/1928/CAC</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of existing building.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 2007/2563/CAC</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site for 1 no retail unit and 4 no flats</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 2007/2562/F</td>
<td>Redevelopment of site for 1 no retail unit and 4 no flats</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Appeal History**

3.1 None relevant

4. **Consultations**

4.1 Loddon Parish Council

4.2 District Member

4.3 NCC Highways

4.4 Broads Authority

4.5 Representations

One letter of support has been received from the occupier of 10 Bridge Street which advises that the applicant is aware of the right of way which is applicable to both their sites.

5. **Assessment**

5.1 The application site is located within Loddon Town Centre as defined through the South Norfolk Local Plan. The site is located to the east of Bridge Street and partially opposite the Bridge Street/George Lane junction.

5.2 The site comprises of a former police station, which fronts onto the Bridge Street footpath, with a car park to the rear of the building. The former police station and car park occupy the southern section of the site, the northern section of the site provides vehicular and pedestrian access to the car park and the land to the east of the site.

5.3 The former police station and car park abut a residential property on its eastern boundary and a public right of way on its southern. Further to the south are retail and residential units.

5.4 The northern boundary of the site abuts a public house car park and also contains a small workshop/retail unit. The internal site road way provides for access to land associated with the Boat Yard and which is within the boundaries of the Broads Authority.

5.5 The police station building is single storey with a pitched roof and flat roof extension to the rear car park. The access track to the Boat Yard is unmade and has no formal road markings/layout.
5.6 This is an outline application with all matters reserved. There is an extant permission on the same site which establishes the principle of demolishing the former police station and developing the land for residential purposes.

5.7 This application also proposes the demolition of the former police station with the provision on the site of residential and retail units. The site is proposed to be accessed via a new arrangement which would create a cross road style junction with the George Lane/Bridge Street junction. The access would still provide a link through to the Boatyard land.

5.8 The application form accompanying the proposal provides no detail with regards to the amount of dwellings or retail units.

5.9 The indicative site layout plan details a building on the northern side of the Bridge Street boundary, this two/three storey building would provide for a ground floor retail unit and flat above. The land to the rear would have a two storey building on the northern boundary containing four flats and two buildings on the southern element accommodating three town houses and two flats over two and three storeys. This totals ten dwelling units.

5.10 There are no details provided with regard to the appearance of the buildings or affordable housing.

5.11 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development, the impacts of the development upon the locality in relation to heritage assets, biodiversity and highway safety and functionality.

Principle of development

5.12 The site is located within the development limits and central business area of Loddon and also within the conservation area. The development could result in the creation of one retail unit and ten dwellings.

5.13 JCS Policy 14 identifies Loddon as a Key Service Centre and a range of job opportunities would be encouraged to meet with the growth of the locality. The proposal details that a retail unit would form part of the redevelopment and as such this job provision would be in accordance with the direction of JCS Policy 14 and the advice contained in the NPPF which encourages competitive town centres with a diverse retail offer.

5.14 Subject to impact assessments Saved Policy SHO4 encourages the principle of retail development within central business areas and Saved Policy SHO2 requires that a new retail unit should complement the existing business area.

5.15 Although no specific floorspace detail has been provided it would not be anticipated that the unit shown on the indicative site plan would be of a size to be detrimental to the vitality and viability of the Loddon Business Area.

5.16 The provision of dwellings on site is in principle considered to be an acceptable outcome. Although Loddon is outside of the Norwich Policy Area and the rural area is considered to have a 5 year land supply, the site is in a sustainable location and the redevelopment of the site for a limited number of dwellings in the town centre would be considered to be an acceptable alternative to the site potentially becoming a blight on the locality. The site is also considered to be deliverable within 5 years and would help to maintain the rural policy area 5 year land supply. The provision of dwellings would be consistent with NPPF Section 6.

5.17 Furthermore JCS Policy 14 requires for 100-200 dwellings to be provided within Loddon/Chedgrave. Although this site is not identified as a preferred site within the Council's draft Local Plan documents it should also be noted that previous applications
Development Management Committee

have established the suitability for the police station to be demolished and for residential development to take place on the site.

5.18 In accordance with Saved Policy IMP16 the removal of the police station is considered to be acceptable on the provision that a suitable scheme has been granted to replace the demolished building.

5.19 Therefore the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable subject to consideration being given to the other material issues.

Design and Heritage Assets

5.20 The application site is located in a key position within the town centre and conservation area and has several listed buildings surrounding. The busy junction of George Lane and Bridge Street provides for a concentration of built historical assets and therefore the redevelopment of the application site would require to be of a high quality design and to ensure that it was a positive addition to the conservation area whilst not being detrimental to the surrounding listed buildings. These are the requirements of NPPF Sections 7 and 12, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Polices IMP16, IMP18 and SHO4.

5.21 The application has an indicative site layout with parameters for building heights annotated. The indicative layout may be appropriate and the scale of the buildings may also be acceptable. However, without the detail of how these would appear on site and interact with the streetscape and surrounding buildings it would not be possible to approve the scheme in its outline form. The application provides no detail on the potential impacts on historical assets and does not contain any documentation to indicate that these issues have been fully considered.

5.22 By virtue of the lack of detail and assessment impacts contained within the application the proposal is considered to be contrary to the relevant design and historical asset protection policies detailed above.

Highways

5.23 The application is in outline form and reserves all matters. The Highway Authority do not raise any objection to the principle of the site being redeveloped, however they have raised an objection based on the indicative plan which has been submitted.

5.24 The indicative site layout plan details the access to form a cross roads with George Lane and Bridge Street, access to the rear of the site would be maintained.

5.25 The applicant has made it clear that the realignment of the access to the site would be beneficial to the potential to develop the land to the rear. Although there is no clear plan for what the applicant would intend to develop on this land, which is in the Broads Authority, their intention is to allow for a redevelopment of the police station site to take place and to provide for the ability to bring the larger rear site forward at a later date.

5.26 The Highway Authority have advised that this outcome would lead to right hand turning movements across the opposing traffic streams of a busy traffic route at a point where vehicle conflict is already high and would interfere with the safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users. The advice from the Highway Authority would clearly indicate that the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Policy IMP8.
5.27 It is also considered that the proposal to introduce a retail unit on the street frontage requires further consideration by the applicant. Saved Policy SHO 4 advises that new retail development should include satisfactory servicing and access arrangements. The application fails to consider these aspects in a location which does experience high volumes of traffic.

Ecology and Landscape

5.28 The application does not provide any detail with regard to ecological impacts and mitigation. The demolition of the former police station may raise issues with regard to the protection of bats and a survey of this nature should have been undertaken prior to the application being submitted with mitigation methods. The application does not comply with the requirements of NPPF Section 11 and Saved Policy ENV15.

5.29 The internal layout of the site may provide some opportunity to provide a landscape form which would allow for successful integration of the town centre into an area of the Broads, which is characterised by mature vegetation. The application does not provide for a landscape strategy and is contrary Saved Policy IMP2.

Residential Amenity

5.30 The application proposes to create dwellings on the northern and southern boundaries which dependant on the final design may cause issues associated with overlooking of neighbouring properties. The non-uniform layout, orientation and design of the surrounding established properties does require for a level of design detail to be examined before outline approval could be considered appropriate. The application does not provide any of the required detail and is therefore considered contrary to objectives Saved Policy IMP9 as it may lead to a loss of residential amenity.

6. Conclusion and Reason for Refusal

6.1 It would not be standard practice for the Council to accept an outline application of this scale in a conservation area. However, the applicant felt it was necessary to obtain a formal highway authority view on the proposed access arrangements before committing more resources to developing the proposal. The Highway Authority has advised that they don’t agree with the proposed arrangement and have offered their reasons for objection.

6.2 The application proposes a modest mixed use residential and retail scheme which in principle may be acceptable. The application however does not provide any detail with regard to the potential impacts on the conservation area and surrounding listed buildings which is not considered acceptable in an area of such a high concentration of historical assets. The development provides for no ecological mitigation or survey data, when there may be opportunities to protect and enhance the green infrastructure/biodiversity of the locality and does not provide for any type of design or landscape principles.

6.3 The outline application does not provide for a full examination of the design and scale of the development and its potential impacts on the surrounding historical assets and conservation area and is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of NPPF Sections 7 and 12, JCS Policy 2 and Saved Polices IMP16 and IMP18.

6.4 The proposal provides no detail regarding the potential impacts of the development upon residential amenity in a location which has rear gardens and habitable rooms close to the boundary and therefore cannot be fully examined in relation to Saved Policy IMP9.

6.5 The application proposes the demolition of the former police station but has provided no ecological survey data to identify any protected species and is therefore not in accordance with the requirements of NPPF Section 11 and Saved Policy ENV15.
6.6 The integration of this site from town to the Broads in terms of landscape is considered to be an important design element and no landscape strategy or evaluation has been proposed and the application is therefore not considered to meet with the objectives of Saved Policy IMP2.

6.7 Saved Policy IMP16 only allows for demolition in conservation areas when an approval for redevelopment has been accepted, in this instance the proposed development does not accord with the requirements of Saved Policy IMP16.

6.8 The application fails to provide sufficient detail regarding the servicing and access arrangements required for the retail unit to successfully function in the town centre location and therefore does not meet with the requirements of Saved Policy SHO4.

6.9 The development proposal details within its indicative site layout the formation of an access which would create a cross roads with Bridge Street and George Lane. This would create right hand turning movements across the opposing traffic streams of a busy traffic route at a point where vehicle conflict is already high and would interfere with safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users. The application is therefore considered to conflict with the continued functionality and safety of the highway in this location and is contrary to the aims and objectives of Saved Policy IMP8.

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

2. **Appl. No**: 2011/0341/CU  
   **Parish**: PULHAM MARKET

   **Applicants Name**: TMO Traffic  
   **Site Address**: Rookery Farm Grays Lane Pulham Market IP21 4XQ  
   **Proposal**: Change of use from agriculture storage to a depot for a traffic management business (cones, traffic lights, signs, barriers) includes portacabins for mess room and sign printing, use of agricultural building for traffic light and battery store, associated car parking and passing bays (partially retrospective)

   **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions
   1. In accordance with amendments
   2. Specific Use
   3. Vehicle parking and turning
   4. 7.5 t weight limit
   5. Off site highway works passing bays
   6. No parking in front of listed building
   7. Vehicles and people operating from site 7
   8. No administration staff to operate from site
   9. Painting of gates and fences
   10. Farmhouse linked to dwelling
   11. Retention of trees and hedges

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 5: The Economy

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   Development Management Policies (submission version)
   2.1 Employment and business development
   2.10 Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural purposes
   3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
   4.11 Heritage Assets

1.4 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**
   EMP 2: Distribution, nature and scale of employment development on unidentified sites (Non Consistent)
   EMP 3: Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment (Part Consistent)
   EMP 4: Employment development outside the development limits and villages boundaries of identified town and villages (Non consistent)
   EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (Part Consistent)
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1083 Installation of a three micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades) Approved

2.2 2009/1885 Internal and external alterations including repair & replacement windows. Approved

2.3 2008/0603 Demolition of small brick outbuilding Approved

2.4 2007/2169 Proposed barn conversion to residential use Approved

2.5 2007/2168 Proposed barn conversion to residential use Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Current proposal

Refuse
- Concerns above planning guidance regarding the curtilage of the listed building have been breached by TMO
- Increased number of vehicles passing over the farmhouse drive way and front of the barn buildings is cause for concern
- Need for transparency as to what exactly is appropriate should be clarified
- Concern that the revised plan is not labelled correctly.
- Want to see comments of Conservation Officer
- Parish Council would like reassurance from county Highways that the satisfied that the increasing number of TMO vans and trailers travelling along Grays Lane and emerging onto Tivetshall Road do not present a safety hazard.
- If assurance is forth coming may wish to suggest a limit be put on future movements to limit unacceptable growth of the site.
- If permission is forthcoming wish SNC to monitor vehicle movements and further development of the site.
- TMO has expanded rapidly during the planning application and although the Parish wish to support local businesses and economic growth in the Parish feel that TMO have outgrown this site.

Passing bays, offices larger number of vehicles

Refuse
- Concerned about commercial activity around the listed building
- Shocked at number of vehicles manoeuvring around the curtilage
- Concerns hazard of vehicles pulling out onto Tivetshall Road
- Requested unannounced visit

Passing bays, offices and parking area

Refuse
- Application has changed from storage of surplus stock and vans to fully fledged business with multiply movements and staff on site during the day
- Whilst the Council wishes to support the development of local businesses, particularly where they bring employment it is concerned they should be sustainable and not to the detriment of the local environment
- Number of parked vehicles and equipment on close to the farmhouse and barn detrimental to a listed building
- Other listed building owners have restrictions imposed on any developments and would wish to see consistency overall
- Concern over number of vehicles using narrow lane and the hazard of vans with trailers onto Tivetshall Road where there is restricted visibility
- Health and safety concerns over batteries being stored on site.

Initial passing bays and offices
- Approve
  - Concerned the applicant may not have been as open about their intentions
  - Concern over number of vehicles
  - Hazard of vehicles using junction
  - Whilst issues of traffic movement do need to be addressed the Council is inclined to support application on economic development grounds as long as it doesn’t cause significant problems for neighbouring parishioners and highways deals with concerns over traffic

3.2 District Member

Current proposal
To be determined by committee
- Issues regarding vehicle movements and whether site is suitable for the volume of business are of critical importance

Initial passing bays and offices
- Seem business will be a total traffic management business more than a storage site.
- Excessive amount of traffic will cause problems
- Highways have an integral part to play in this application.

Original proposal
- Can be delegated decision

3.3 NCC Highways

Current proposal
Support with conditions
- Understand the application is now for the service side of the business and the admin staff have left the site.
- Highway access along Grays Lane is restricted.
- There is no objection to the principle of the change of use, subject to the highway improvements being undertaken.
- This will need to go hand in hand with controls of persons/vehicles using the site.
- Consider the junction with Grays Lane with Julian Road is adequate for the development. There are no accidents listed at this junction.
- Two passing bays proposed are acceptable and required for the development to be acceptable
- Number of occupants seems to be a continual change depending on whether other depots are available.
- Prudent to restrict the number of persons that can work from the site. Currently 7 vans operating from the site necessary to control this number
- Needs to be 7.5 tonne weight limit.
- Yard is small and can hold one or two vehicles at a time and then only when the yard is clear of trailers. Needs to be sufficient space so that vehicles can manoeuvre and leave the site in forward gear. This matter will improve with reduced number of vehicles and removal of portacabin.

Initial passing bay proposal
Amended plans required
- Happy with the provision of 3 passing places but needs to be a passing place at the entrance to Grays Lane as verge has been eroded there
- Guidance notes are provided for the applicant on passing bays

Original proposal
- Grays Lane single vehicle width without the benefit of passing places or pedestrian footway
- Access arrangement that has already been constructed is acceptable
- Proposal will result in increased traffic
- Recommended that there are highway improvements in the form of new passing bays
- Without improvement proposal would not be supported
- Maximum of 7.5 t weight limit

3.4 Conservation Officer
Current proposal
Support with conditions
- Have looked at the revised parking arrangements and the applicant information regarding moving to Diss
- This resolves earlier concerns about parking in front of the listed building affecting of the setting of the listed house
- Agree to a condition preventing parking in this area.

Passing bays, offices, additional vehicles
- No further comments to make

Passing bays offices and parking area
Support with conditions
- Painting of fence would ease the impact fencing
- Planting would soften impact
- Parking bays should avoid kerbing and tarmac finish to keep rural feel
- The proposed car parking area would ease concerns about parking in front of house, not harm, the setting of listed building in the position shown
- Portacabins are not as intrusive
- Encouraged by potential conversion of barn

Passing bays and offices
- Inserting passing bays may have impact on the rural character of the area
- Concern about stark nature of fences and the parking of vehicles
- Expansion could result in problems between the house and future expansion
- Some adverse impact on the house
- Need further details of surfacing and impact on hedge of passing bays near Julian house and Little Owl Barn need to ensure the rural character is not eroded
- Welcome economic use of farm building as part of the diversification of agriculture, potential business is in wrong place

3.5 Environmental Services
No Objection

3.6 Representations
Current proposal
One letter of objection
- Concerns remain the same
- Like confirmation of road widening rather than passing bays outside Julian House and Little Owl Barn

Passing bays, offices
Two letters of objectors
- Traffic exceeds what I would expect as acceptable on this lane.
- Oppose passing place outside the drive of Little Owl Barn and Julian House people park vehicles this area to park and eat food or park up, restricting access to driveway and affecting setting of listed buildings, problems with litter being dropped
- Even with the relocation of vehicles from the site the volume of traffic is in unacceptable

Initial passing bays and offices
Two letters of objection
- Increased traffic and increased use of junction
- Oppose car parking spaces opposite little owl barn and Julian House
- People parking to see food, dropping litter or used as parking area, unsightly and inconvenient to access drives
- Security risk
- No further traffic however small an increase would be supported as businesses grow over time creating laybys is no answer
- Current industrial fencing and appearance of the site conflicts strongly with rural setting of listed building

7 letters from a competing business
- Traffic management is not farm diversification
- Site is being used for administration
- Question how the site is being operated does not match submitted information
- Questions proposed hours of use
- Unfair competition not complying with regulations
- Vehicles will not be out all day
- Access via Grays Lane is not adequate unless upgraded
- Information given as part of the application is incorrect and is misleading
- More vehicles operating from site than submitted information
- Parked vehicles resulting in reserving onto highway and waiting on highway to enter the site.
Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Rookery Farm on Grays Lane Pulham Market. The main farmhouse is a listed building. One of the barns was given consent as an independent dwelling but this has since expired. The site is still an operational farm and is located outside any existing or proposed development limits.

4.2 This application has been amended several times because the operation proposed on site has changed due to the success and rapid expansion of the business. This is a retrospective application apart from the offsite highway works. The site is now proposed to be a depot for a traffic management business, known as TMO. The company plans and supplies traffic signs, cones, barriers etc. for road works. The site is used as a storage facility for these signs etc. with transit vans including trailers collecting and distributing these. The vans are kept at the employee’s homes overnight. An existing agricultural building is used for the storage of batteries and traffic lights. The rest of the equipment is stored externally in the yard. The application is currently for two portacabins located to the east of the site one is a mess room and other is used to print signs. There is also a small portable building which houses toilet facilities. The administrative staff were until recently operating from two portacabins on site. These staff have now been relocated to an office in Diss and the two portacabins that they previously occupied are in the process of being removed from site which will result in the reorganisation of yard and the creation of a circulation system for vehicles. A parking area for vehicles to the side of the portacabins is also proposed. The company also have depots in Romford (Essex), Hadleigh (Suffolk) and Setchley (Kings Lynn). There are currently 7 vehicles operating from the site, 6 transit vans including a spare vehicle and small van used by sign printer operative. Vehicles operating from other depots do visit the site to collect equipment if and when required. The number of vehicles operating from the site has been higher in the past.

4.3 When the application was originally made it was just for the storage of equipment associated with the business based at Downham Market. The use of the site then changed to a depot and provision of office staff on site. The number of vehicles have also altered as new depots have opened. We have worked with the business as far as possible to try and accommodate their changing operations, whilst trying to control the impact of the development.

4.4 There are four key issues; the principle of the development, the highway implications of the development, the impact on the setting of the listed building and residential amenity

4.5 Firstly the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the development of rural business and promotes the diversification of agriculture. Policy 5 in the JCS supports the development of new or expanding businesses in rural areas.

4.6 Policy EMP3 is the South Norfolk Local Plan supports the conversion of rural building for employment uses subject to a number of criteria. This policy is partially consistent with the NPPF as the NPPF “supports sustainable economic growth…through the conversion of existing buildings”, the list of specific criteria in policy EMP3 is however not consistent with the NPPF. Policies EMP2 and EMP4 in the South Norfolk Local Plan which restrict employment development outside the development limits are not consistent with the NPPF, so can be given no weight.

4.7 Policies DM2.1, DM2.10, DM3.12, DM3.14 and DM4.11 are emerging Development Management policies which have now been submitted for examination, they have minimal weight at this stage.

4.8 Although the site is located outside the development for Pulham Market it is located close to the A140 and does involve the conversion of an existing rural building. Material weight has been given to the diversification of a small farm business which continues to operate
4.9 The Grays Lane itself is a narrow single track road which does not benefit from any passing bays and a number of concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and residents regarding the suitability of the highway access. The Highway Authority note that the highway access along Grays Lane is restricted but they have no objection to the principle of development subject to the proposed installation of two passing bays on Grays Lane. The development would however not be acceptable without these passing bays. They also consider that this will need to go hand in hand with controls on the number of persons/vehicles using the site. They do consider that the junction of Grays Lane with Julian Road is adequate for the development. There are no accidents listed at this junction.

4.10 Discussion has occurred with the owners of Little Owl Barn and Julian House regarding the informal passing place which has been eroded adjacent to their properties. From a highway perspective, due to the alignment of the road, a passing place is required in this location. At present vehicles unrelated to this development park up in this area and stop for breaks and to eat food which has raised concern about the impact on the listed buildings, security and dropping of litter. It has been agreed with the applicant that rather than a formal passing bay in this location, the road will be widened by a sufficient amount to allow two vehicles to pass, but not to be able to park up. The verge will be made good where it has been eroded.

4.11 Concerns have also been raised with regard to the amount of traffic generated from the site. The development until recently included the administrative base for the business, this was causing a number of issues with cars being parked in front of the listed building and resulting in vans reversing onto the highway. The office staff have now relocated to a separate office in Diss which has substantially reduced the number of vehicles on the site. The proposal will result in two portacabins being removed from the site which will free up the space in the yard and allow a one way system to be created which will aid the manoeuvring of vehicles in the site and prevent vehicle reversing on the highway. A parking area is also proposed where vehicles can park up if they need to wait or the van is not being used. The number of vehicles operating from the site has also reduced due the opening of a new depot.

4.12 A record of the number of vehicles movement from the site which has been created by a tracking system has been submitted for between 1st January and 31 March 2014. The average charts show that the number of vehicle movements from the vans operating from the site is around 8-9 per day with additional movements from other vans visiting the Pulham site being slightly higher at 10-12. Given the restrictive nature of the highway and the size of the site, the highway officer considers that although he does not raise an objection to the number of vehicles currently using the site, there is a need to restrict the number of vehicle operating from the site which is currently 7 which includes a spare van. It would be very difficult to enforce a condition which restricted movements from the site. There should also a 7.5 tonne weight limit on vehicles conditioned, which all vehicles currently comply with.

4.13 The removal of the administrative portacabins and vehicles from the administrative staff will increase the space in the yard and facilitate a circulatory system which will enable vehicles in enter and leave the site in forward gear.

4.14 On balance, the development as currently proposed is acceptable in highway safety terms. The site is however not suitable for further expansion and is only acceptable with the provision of the passing bays and subject to the restrictive conditions detailed above. With these restrictions, the proposal complies with policies IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 which is consistent with the NPPF.

4.15 The main farmhouse is a grade II listed building and is located set back from the road. The yard is mainly shielded from the main house by the existing building which is used to store batteries and traffic lights, the portacabins are located to the east so do not affect and benefit to the local economy by the provision of new jobs.
significant views of the listed building. The parking which was occurring on the drive in front of the principle elevation of the listed building was having a significant adverse effect on the listed building, which was not acceptable. The removal of the cars owned by the administrative staff has substantially reduced this problem. Car parking bays adjacent to the portacabins will also provide a parking area if vehicles have to wait to be loaded. The proposed one way circulation will involve driving past the front of the listed building but if this is limited to passing rather than parking the impact on the setting of the listed building is considered acceptable. A condition is also proposed to restrict parking within the drive way and in front of the house. The painting of the security gates and fences a dark colour will also soften their impact. On balance the Conservation Officer considers the impact on the setting of the listed building is acceptable, as long as there is no parking of cars in front of the property. The harm to the setting of the listed building is limited and considered less than substantial and as a result in accordance with the NPPF consideration has been given to the public benefit including the provision of jobs in this instance. The site is screened with existing trees and hedges in the wider landscape and a condition is proposed to retain these.

4.16 Although the main operation of the business is during the day, due to the nature of contracts which involve emergency work, it may be necessary to access the site at any time. The main farmhouse is located close to the development and will suffer from some noise and disturbance from the development. The Managing Director of the business currently occupies the farmhouse so retains control over the any noise and disturbance from the development. The occupation of the farmhouse completely independently from the business, however may result in amenity concerns and as a result a condition is proposed which will require the occupation of the farmhouse to be linked to the business whilst the business is on site. Julian House and Little Owl Barn are located some distance from the site and disturbance is therefore limited to additional traffic movements. The highway improvements will help to discourage vehicles parking near these properties. The level of disturbance created by the traffic movements is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal in this instance.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The business has undergone a rapid expansion and has been more successful than initially predicted. This has resulted in the business needing to change its operations and directions considerably and has resulted in the planning application being amended in the course of its assessment. Although the site is located outside the development limit for Pulham Market, it is located close to the A140 and does involve the conversion of an existing rural building. Material weight has been given to the benefits of diversification to a small farm business which continues to operate and to the local economy by the provision of new jobs. It is considered on balance that the development of the site as currently proposed with the recommended highway works and restrictive conditions has an acceptable impact on highway safety, the setting of the listed building and amenity of nearby properties.

Helen Bowman 01508 533833
hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **App. No**: 2014/0234/F  
**Parish**: WINFARTHING

Applicants Name: Mrs Linda Bettinson  
Site Address: Swiss Cottage High London Lane Winfarthing Norfolk IP22 2EF  
Proposal: Demolish existing bungalow and erect new house and garage

Recommendation: Refuse  
1. Contrary to policy  
2. Adverse impact on character of landscape

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

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 (2003)  
HOU 11: Replacement dwellings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies (submission version)  
DM3.7 – House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide Adopted September 2012.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/1426  
Application for Lawful Development  
Certificate for existing use - retention of dwelling and occupation in breach of personal occupancy condition 1 of planning permission 1976/2319  
Approved

2.2 2013/0021  
Retrospective application for cartlodge  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Object: too large for the plot and would affect the landscape as it stands too high and was not in keeping with the surrounding area.

3.2 District Member  
Delegate if officers are minded to approve. To be referred to Committee if not supported. A highly energy efficient property replacing a structure of timber boarding without any historic importance.

3.3 NCC Highways  
To be reported

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Support conditionally -
4.1 The proposal is for the replacement of an existing single storey dwelling with a two storey property, revision of the existing access to improved highways standards with the removal and replanting of the front highway boundary hedge. The site is surrounded on three boundaries by existing hedging beyond which is open farmland. The site stands alone on the north east side of High London Lane with the nearest neighbouring properties (High London Farm) and an associated range of barns which have been converted to the north west. This small cluster of buildings is remote from the main village centre some way to the north of the site the only other development in the locality is to the south east of the site which comprises a poultry unit and associated dwellings.

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

4.3 The main issue resulting from the proposal is the scale and design of the proposed replacement dwelling.

4.4 The principle for the replacement of the dwelling is accepted by policy HOU11 of South Norfolk Local Plan 2013, and the emerging policy Development Management Policy DM3.7 (although the latter cannot yet be given substantial weight). Both policies require the original dwelling to have a lawful permanent residential use and be capable of residential occupation without major or complete reconstruction.

4.5 The original dwelling is currently occupied, is of a brick built structure linked to a pre-fabricated unit forming the remainder of the dwelling. A timber frame garage occupies the front of the site. The emerging policies make it clear in the reasoned justification that replacement dwellings will be unlikely to duplicate the design of the building replaced but should enhance the character of the street scene. The replacement of the existing dwelling is an opportunity to upgrade and enhance the site which would accord with the principle of the above policies, however, it is the scale and form of the proposed scheme which raises concern.

4.6 Having regard to the South-Norfolk Place Making Guide (Adopted Supplementary Planning Document) Section 4.3 developing a Design Concept states that "development should positively contribute to and not detract from their surrounding environment. If the surrounding area has no distinctive character of identity, it will be preferable to establish a new character and pattern of development that physically integrates into its surroundings, based on the wider setting of South Norfolk and the design principles set out in this guidance".

4.7 The character of the immediate area is that of open farmland. To the south east of the site is a poultry unit with two existing bungalows to the front of the units, however these are well screened in the locality by existing hedging retaining the open landscape perception. To the north west of the site is a restored and extended farmhouse with barn conversions approved in 2007. The character of the complex has been retained as a traditional farmstead. Although the works appear raw at present because much of the work is recent and has not as yet had the opportunity to weather reducing its visual impact, the development has been achieved by working with, and restoring the existing buildings.
4.8 Although few in numbers, other properties along High London Road are of traditional
cottage style properties with low eaves and small dormer windows, or of traditional farm
houses usually with a range of single storey outbuildings. Other properties in the village
centre are also a mix of cottage style dwellings although there are some new dwelling
which are of modern two storey design, however, these are within a built up area of the
existing village centre and do not detract from the overall character of the village.

4.9 The proposed replacement dwelling has a depth of 13.5 metres plus an additional front two
storey gable section with a depth of 1.5 metres giving an overall depth of 15 metres. The
two storey frontage element of the dwelling measures 11 metres with an additional lean-to
section of 3.5 metres providing an overall frontage of 14.5 metres. The elevation to the
rear results in a double gable roof which is set lower than the ridge of the main dwelling.
The side elevations result in a large expanse of building which will be extremely prominent
on either approach along High London Road. The scheme as proposed results in a
dwelling which is bulky in form and with a ridge height of approximately 8.5 metres will be
prominent in the wider landscape context consequently out of character with the traditional
properties of the area. For this reason while I accept the need and principle of a
replacement dwelling the scheme as submitted is out of character with other dwellings in
the immediate vicinity and the main village which will be detrimental to the overall character
of the rural landscape of the area.

4.10 The position of the proposed replacement dwelling within the plot is not an issue and would
allow an improvement for vehicle access, turning and parking space to the front of the
property. At the time of the report no comments have been received from the Highways
Authority, these will be reported at Committee, however, the revised access is proposed to
meet the required standard of the Highways Authority.

4.11 Due to the isolated location of the property, although the current design is not considered
acceptable in terms of bulk and height, there are no neighbours in close proximity to the
site, therefore with regard to the loss of residential amenities or privacy, there are no
issues.

5 Reasons for Refusal

5.1 Contrary to HOU11 of SNLP and DM3.6 of the emerging Development Management Policies.

5.2 The principle of replacing the dwelling is accepted, however the scheme as submitted does not
reflect the character of other properties in the village of Shelfanger or those in the immediate
vicinity of High London Road and will as a result of the overall height and scale of the proposed
dwelling have an adverse impact on the rural open character of the area. For this reason the
scheme as submitted is in conflict with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2014/0368/CU  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH

Applicants Name: Mr B Kemp  
Site Address: Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ  
Proposal: Proposed change of use of barn to car repairs and MOT testing station

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. No generators, air handling plant  
4. Limited Hours of Use  
5. Full details of external lighting  
6. Specific Use  
7. Visibility splay dimension  
8. Access Gates - Configuration  
9. Provision of parking, service areas

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
Development Management Policies (submission version)  
DM 2.1: Employment and business development  
DM 2.10: Conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside for non-agricultural use

1.4 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
EMP 3: Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/1043 Change of use to a concrete hard-standing and grassed area to allow storage for potential occupiers of the already approved employment units. Refused

2.2 2012/0229 Concrete hard standing to allow external storage for potential occupiers of adjacent approved employment units Refused
2.3 2009/0910 Change of use of piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to B1 (a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements. 

2.4 1997/0700 Erection of two agricultural cattle & storage buildings 

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
- Adverse impact on landscape protection zone and open countryside
- Increase in traffic movements on and off busy road (B1108)
- Adverse impact on other similar businesses in surrounding villages
- Fewer employment opportunities if this scheme is approved when compared with previous permitted application.
- Noise disturbance and impact on neighbouring properties
- Visual impact
- Risk that proposed business could increase industrial functions on the site.

3.2 District Member Request for the application be determined by development Management Committee for the following reasons;

When the original application 2009/0910 was approved on appeal, the inspector chose to rely on the number of employees for a B1 development based on floor space in the face of the recommendation for refusal by the Highways Authority. The new application is for vehicle dependent activities, which I believe can only undermine the rationale adopted by the Inspector and reinforces the fears of the Highways Authority.

The employment benefits of the proposal are also dubious, since they would only replace the employment prospects cited for the original application which the inspector regarded as sustainable. The proposals could inflict damage to the viability of similar local businesses close by in Little Melton, Hethersett and Barford.

Development in the open countryside was also an important issue with the original application, but the use of the landscape areas of the site for dumping over the past 3 years, and the current works, which bear little relationship to the conditions of the permission, have caused considerable public concern.

3.3 NCC Highways No objection subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of visibility, installation of gates and the provision of onsite parking and turning.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of the installation of generators and restrictions on hours of operation and lighting.

3.5 Representations Six letters of objection has been received from local residents on the following grounds:
These rural buildings are unsuitable for the proposed use which should be located on a suitable industrial estate.

- Scheme conflicts with principle/details of previous approved scheme/no outside storage/removal of trees.
- Unauthorised works already undertaken at the site.
- Works being carried out in excess of those permitted by previous permission,
- Level and type of traffic generated by proposed use (HGV, LGV etc.) and impact on highway safety for users of B1108.
- Impact of bunds on visibility from access.
- Increased noise and disturbance to nearby properties from proposed use.
- Impact on the development on the visual amenities of the area.

One letter of support has also been received from a local resident on the grounds that the mitigation measures proposed will address concerns relating to residential amenity and that scheme will bring redundant buildings back into economic use.

A further letter has been received supporting the use in principle, subject to no car breaking/scrap collection taking place. Reservations have also been raised as to whether this is a suitable location for this use and its possible impacts on highway safety.

Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission to change of use of a former agricultural building to car repairs and an MOT testing station (B2 use). The site currently benefits from an extant planning permission for employment use (B1 and B8) where works including access improvements have commenced. The existing building measures approximately 27 metres in length with a height to the ridgeline of approximately 7 metres. External works are proposed to the facade of the building including the installation of roller shutter doors, brickwork panels and the construction of a hard-standing. Access to the building would be via the previously approved access off the B1108 Watton Road.

4.2 Amended plans have been submitted by the applicant showing the positioning of the site access to accord with the previous permission and the onsite parking arrangements to serve the car repairs workshop.

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

4.4 The main issues for consideration in this case are; the principle of development, landscape/visual impact, highway safety and residential amenity.

Principle of development

4.5 The site lies in an area of open countryside where national and local planning policy seeks to balance safeguarding the character of the area whilst sustaining and supporting the rural economy. Members will note that whilst the site does not have a formal allocation for employment use, planning permission was granted at Appeal in 2010 for the change of use of a piggery building on the site to a dwelling and the change of use of redundant agricultural buildings on the site to B1 (a), (b) and (c) and B8 use with car parking, landscaping and access improvements (ref: 2009/0910/F).
Given that the scheme proposes the economic re-use of a former agricultural building on the site as supported by Section 3 of the NPPF and Policy 5 of the JCS, and given the context of the site on which the building is located, it is considered that the principle of the use accords with current planning policy.

Landscape and visual impact

Section 7 of the NPPF and Policy 2 of the JCS seek to ensure that development is well designed and appropriate to its setting. The building subject of this application is already present on the site, sits in a relatively well screened position close to the south west boundary, benefits from planning permission for employment re-use and does not require significant works to facilitate its conversion. As such, it is not considered that the scheme would cause detriment in the wider landscape and would accord with the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy IMP2 of the SNLP.

Highway safety

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. Concerns have been raised by local residents and the Parish Council to the impact of the scheme on highway safety, particularly in respect of visibility and the level and nature of the traffic generated. Notwithstanding these concerns, the application has been assessed by the Highway Authority, and subject to the imposition of conditions, no objection has been raised on the grounds of highway safety. As such, it is considered that the application would comply with Policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

Impact upon Residential amenity

Saved Policies IMP9 and IMP10 of the SNLP state that development should not be approved if it would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents through noise and disturbance or loss of privacy. Concerns have also been raised by local residents and the Parish Council in respect of the suitability of the site for the use proposed and its potential impacts on the residential amenities of nearby properties, particularly in respect noise and disturbance.

Notwithstanding the concerns raised, the site benefits from planning permission for employment use, and no objection has been raised by the Environmental Health Officer to the scheme subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of controlling the installation of equipment, hours of operation and lighting. As such, it is considered that the scheme would not significantly impact on residential amenity and would comply with the requirements of Policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Conclusion

The proposed change of use of the building to car repairs and MOT testing is considered acceptable in the context of the permitted employment uses of the site, would not result in significant detriment to the residential amenities of nearby properties or the wider landscape and would adequately protect highway safety. As such, subject to the imposition of conditions, the scheme is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Liz Starling 01508 533681
and E-mail: lstarling@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Planning Appeals
### Appeals received from 22 March 2014 to 22 April 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2317</td>
<td>Forncett Fourways Long Stratton Road Forncett St Peter Norfolk NR16 1AJ</td>
<td>Mr Clive Banks</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1615/F - revision of house and garage on Plot 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Planning Appeals
### Appeals decisions from 22 March 2014 to 22 April 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>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>