Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives: Mr J Mooney (Chairman), Mr D Blake (Vice-Chairman)
Liberal Democrats: Dr M Gray
South Norfolk Independent Grp: Mr J Herbert
Mrs Y Bendle
Mrs F Ellis
Mr C Gould
Mr L Hornby
Dr C Kemp
Dr N Legg
Mrs L Neal

Please note that planning application Item Nos 1 - 8 will be heard from 10.00 am onwards.

Planning application Item Nos 9 – 22 will be heard from 1.30 pm onwards.

Pool of Substitutes: Mr L Dale, Mrs V Bell, Mr K Weeks
Mr C Foulger
Mr B Riches
Mr R Savage
Mr G Walden

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am Blomefield Room

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 8, and arrive at 1.30 pm if you intend to speak on items 9 to 22.

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

South Norfolk COUNCIL

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 23 July 2014

Time
10.00 am

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

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

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

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 8, and arrive at 1.30 pm if you intend to speak on items 9 to 22.

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 8)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 24 June 2014;
   (attached – page 11)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 19)
   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>2013/2039/RVC</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Unit C Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2013/2044/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Unit C Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2013/2041/RVC</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Unit A2 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/2043/RVC</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Units E1 And E2 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013/1494/O</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land East of A47, West of Round House Way and North of A11; and Land to the South of A11, East of A47 and West of Cringleford</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014/0319</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land North of Shotsesham Road (Area D), Poringland</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2014/0732/D</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land West of Norwich Road and South of Caistor Lane Poringland</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2014/0823/D</td>
<td>THARSTON AND HAPTON</td>
<td>Land At Chequers Road Tharston</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Planning Ref No.</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2014/0840/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Poundstretcher Farrier Close Wymondham</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2014/1064/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land West of Station Road Wymondham</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2014/0204/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Brooke House Brooke Gardens Brooke</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2014/0342/H</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2014/0343/LB</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2014/0820/DC</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2014/0923/RVC</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2014/0345/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Barn Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2014/0346/LB</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Barn Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2014/0824/DC</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2014/0825/DC</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2014/0430/F</td>
<td>THARSTON AND HAPTON</td>
<td>Blyth Green Park Stratton Road Wacton</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2014/0917/RVC</td>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Romany Meadow The Turnpike Carleton Rode</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2014/1138/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>46 - 60 Ayton Road Wymondham</td>
<td>227</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 230)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)

(attached – page 235)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 20 August 2014
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related pecuniary interest

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

Other Interest

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

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

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

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

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?
1. **App. No**: 2013/2039/RVC  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd  
Site Address: Unit C Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk NR5 0JT  
Proposal: Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 2003/1127/F- Goods condition

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Prohibit retail of products ranges as for 2003/1127 but omit food and drink from prohibited list.  
2. Maximum net retail floorspace 663sqm (excluding café).  
3. No sub-division to unit less than 1000sqm (gross)

2. **App. No**: 2013/2044/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd  
Site Address: Unit C Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk NR5 0JT  
Proposal: Installation of mezzanine floor

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Ancillary use only, not to be used for retail floorspace.

3. **App. No**: 2013/2041/RVC  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd  
Site Address: Unit A2 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk NR5 0JT  
Proposal: Variation of Conditions 2 and Removal of Condition 4 of planning permission 2008/1738/F- Goods Condition and condition relating to half of Unit A

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. No food and drink sales.  
2. Maximum net retail floorspace 1,343sqm.  
3. No sub-division to unit less than 1000sqm (gross)
4. **Appl. No**: 2013/2043/RVC  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd  
Site Address: Units E1 And E2 Alex Moorhouse Way Costessey Norfolk NR5 0JT  
Proposal: Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 2003/1127/F- Goods condition

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. No food and drink sales.  
3. No sub-division to unit less than 1000sqm (gross)

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 11 : Norwich City Centre  
Policy 19 : The hierarchy of centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (Part Consistent)  
SHO 3: Retail development at the Longwater retail park

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

DM 2.1 : Employment and Business Development  
DM 2.4 : Location of the Main Town Centre Uses

2. **Planning History**

2.1 The original planning permission for the Longwater Retail Park was granted in 1994 (93/0818) and contained a condition restricting the range of retailing that could occur. This condition was amended in 2003 (2003/1127) to contain a list of product ranges that are not permitted to be sold. Those ranges prohibited are as follows:

- food and drink;
- clothing and footwear, fashion accessories including watches and jewellery;
- pharmaceutical and personal care products;
- toys, games and books.

It is this permission (2003/1127) which still applies to Unit C and to which the current application to relax the retail restriction condition applies (2013/2039).
2.2 Further permissions have since been granted to vary the permission on individual units within the Retail Park. These include the following:

- 2008/1738 – Further widening of permitted retailing in A1 and/or A2.
- 2010/1420 – Subdivision to form separate units E1 and E2 (not implemented).
- 2012/1018 - Unit D – Permitted occupation by Boots

2.3 The 2008 permission (2008/1738) prohibits the following:

- Food and Drink
- Newspapers and Tobacco
- Clothing and Footwear (except where ancillary to permitted goods)

2.4 The 2008/1738 permission applies to units A1 and A2 but condition 4 only permits the extended range of goods to be sold from one of the two units at any time. Because Argos are currently exercising this permission from unit A1, unit A2 is still bound by the restriction as applied by the earlier permission 2003/1127 as set out above.

2.5 The current application 2013/2041 in respect of unit A2 seeks relaxation of the condition on 2008/1738 to both extend the range of goods permitted to be sold and to allow the relaxation to apply to unit A2 (as well as that from 2008/1738 applying to unit A1).

2.6 Members may be aware that the Retail Park also includes a Sainsbury supermarket approved in 1994 (93/0812) which has since been extended (2009/0779). More recently permission has been granted for a Next store on land on the opposite side of William Frost Way (2013/1259).

2.7 The current application 2013/2043 for Unit E1/E2 also relates back to permission 2003/1127 which still applies to this unit.

3. The Proposals

3.1 2014/2039 – To relax condition 1 attached to permission 2003/1127 to allow the sale of food and drink.

3.2 2014/2039 – Insert Mezzanine floor of 465sqm.

3.3 2014/2041 – Unit A2 - To relax conditions 2 and 4 of permission 2008/1738 to permit the sale of all non-food goods including clothing and footwear.

3.4 These two applications are described as a response to the economic climate, but also to the approval of the new store for ‘Next’ who will consequently be vacating unit A2 and unit E1/E2 which is described as “likely to be oversized for Staples”, who currently occupy it.
3.5 The applications are supported by Planning and Retail Reports; a letter from Savills commenting on the likelihood of finding new tenants for the units as currently restricted; and a letter from transport consultants Mayer Brown.

4. Consultations

4.1 Costessey Parish Council
- 2013/2044: Approve
- 2013/2039, 2041 and 2043: Approve but impose condition requiring HGVs not to park on Alex Moorhouse Way

4.2 Highways Agency
- All applications - No objection

4.3 NCC Highways
- 2013/2039 and 2044 (Unit C) – No objection
- 2013/2041 and 2043 (Units A2 and E1/E2) – No objection subject to Travel Plan.

4.4 Environmental Services (Protection)
- No adverse comments to make

4.5 District Member
- Can be delegated

4.6 Norwich City Council
Norwich City council have commented extensively on the applications raising objections both directly and via their own retail consultants MWA. Their representations are available on the file (and web site) but I have sought to distil the key points below. Comments were made on the original submissions and again following the submission of supplementary retail reports by the applicant’s agent.

Comments on original submissions:
- Strong objection to changing role of Longwater towards a destination out-of-town shopping centre, in conflict with the hierarchy of centres as set out in JCS Policy 19 in which Longwater is not identified as a centre in its own right.
- Proposal draws investment away from Norwich City Centre and other centres including Riverside and Anglia Square. Suggest £27m trade draw from City Centre; 11-20% trade draw from Riverside; delays or postponement of investments in City Centre and Anglia Square.
- Proposals are not ‘in keeping’ with the form and function of the location and are therefore contrary to SNLP policy SHO2 and JCS policies 11 and 19.

Via consultant MWA:
- Queens Hills is a sequentially preferable location for the additional convenience retailing.
- Question the likely cumulative impact of food sales on the Bowthorpe and Larkman centres.
- Should assess further the availability of smaller units on the edge of the City, Anglia Square and Riverside eg. for clothing retail.
- Likely adverse impact on the viability of Riverside.
- Should look at specific draw of clothing retail which is key to higher order centres so could impact more than suggested.
- Cumulative effects likely to delay investment in the City Centre, increase out-of-centre competition and reduce the potential occupiers for new and existing City Centre units.
- Likely to result in postponement and delay of investment in Anglia Square.
• Question details of turnover figures used.
• Create precedent with further adverse impact.

Further comments on supplementary information:
• Query sales density figures used.
• Predicted 12.69% trade diversion from Riverside is unacceptable.
• The sequential assessment should include the whole of the City and the District Centres.
• There are units of more than 1000sqm available in the City.
• Anglia Square remains a sequentially preferable retail location.
• Barn Road and Chantry car park sites are available and suitable within the City.
• Hall Road site is sequentially preferable.

4.7 Representations
None received

5 Assessment

5.1 These applications raise a number of issues which I would categorise and address under the headings of; the principle of the proposed retail activity and additional mezzanine in this location; application of the sequential test; application of the retail impact test; and highway/traffic issues.

5.2 Applying the sequential test and retail impact assessment to proposals of this scale and complexity has required specialist advice. The Council have employed consultants (WYG Planning and Environment) to advise on these areas taking account of not only the applicant’s submissions, but also objections from third parties, most notably Norwich City Council.

5.3 WYG provided a report on the applicant’s original submissions which made a number of serious criticisms. The applicant’s agents have responded with supplementary reports which have also been assessed by WYG in a further report. WYG’s last report is attached as Appendix 2. All these reports and submissions are available on the file via the Council’s website. I do not seek to report on all of the detailed deliberations, but the comments below highlight the key findings and conclusions in respect of the sequential and retail tests.

Principle of Development

5.4 The applications obviously relate to retail units that already exist on the established Longwater Retail Park. However, it is still appropriate to consider whether the additional range of retailing that would be permitted by the proposed changes to planning conditions is acceptable in principle in this location (as well as the additional Mezzanine floor proposed to unit C).

5.5 It is important to note that Longwater is not identified in the hierarchy of centres as defined in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policy 19. The site is consequently regarded as an ‘out of centre’ location. Although the identified centres or edge of centre locations are favoured in national and local policy, this does not altogether exclude Longwater from additional retail use or development, provided that such proposals can satisfy the sequential and retail impact tests (SNLP policy SHO 3 and NPPF section 2).
5.6 SNLP policy SHO 2 also requires that out-of-centre retail development should only be approved if it would be “in keeping with the size and function of the settlement it is intended to serve”. The City Council suggest that in view of the JCS hierarchy and SNLP policy SHO 2, the proposals are not in keeping with this location. However, the established Longwater Retail Park clearly serves a wide area and not just an individual settlement. Therefore, I consider that the proposals could not be described as being out of keeping with the size and function of the ‘settlement’ (area in this case) it serves.

5.7 Although I find no objection in principle to the proposals, it is clearly critical to assess them in the light of policies addressing more detailed issues such as the sequential approach, retail impact and other material considerations.

Sequential Test

5.8 In requiring a sequential approach to assessing retail development, paragraph 24 of the NPPF states:

“Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date local plan. They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.”

The NPPF goes on to indicate that applications failing to satisfy the sequential test should be refused. National Planning Practice Guidance explains that alternative sites should be assessed with regard to their suitability, availability and viability.

5.9 The Council’s consultants (WYG) have conducted an assessment of alternative locations that could be sequentially preferable to the Longwater site. The NPPF indicates that both the retailer/developer and local authority should be flexible in identifying sites which are suitable, available and viable. However, WYG also draw attention to recent appeals and case law which suggests that consideration must be given to the developer’s requirements, so that sites considered should be capable of accommodating the development proposed rather than expecting the proposal to be substantially changed to suit potential sites.

Unit C

5.10 WYG advise that sites of approximately 0.25Ha would be required to accommodate the 1,394sqm (gross) Simply Food operation. Having examined the centres at Bowthorpe, Larkman and Queens Hills, they conclude that no sites of a suitable size are available (see paragraph 2.3 of the appended report).

Unit E1/E2

5.11 WYG have assessed a range of sites in the City, including Anglia Square and other sites suggested by the City Council (paragraphs 2.4 – 2.21). In seeking sites of approximately 0.15Ha (to accommodate a store footprint of approximately 1000sqm) they conclude that none of the sites identified can be said to be suitable, available and viable.

Retail Impact

5.12 The NPPF seeks to protect the vitality and viability of established town centres by requiring an assessment of the impact of larger retail development proposals on such centres. WYG have assessed the retail impact information submitted by the applicant’s agent. As noted above, the initial submission was not acceptable, but further information was supplied. Consideration has also been given to the objections and submissions from and on behalf of Norwich City Council.
Assessment of retail impact is complex and requires a degree of judgement in what figures to apply and how to interpret the results. Because of this, there remains a degree of disagreement between the applicant, objectors and our own consultant. However, as an independent and disinterested party, I am inclined to follow the advice of our consultants. WYG’s assessment of retail impact is given in section 3 of the attached report. The impact of the Unit C proposal for food sales and the non-food sales from units A2 and E1/E2 are considered separately, and then as a cumulative impact together with other proposals. WYG’s conclusions are that the impact from the Unit C proposal would not unacceptably harm existing centres or potential development elsewhere (paragraphs 3.29 – 3.33). They recommend that the net sales area is controlled by condition to ensure the impact is not further increased.

They similarly conclude that the impact from the proposed non-food sales from units A2 and E1/E2 would not have an unacceptable impact on existing or proposed development in established centres (paragraphs 3.42 – 3.45). It is again recommended that the net sales areas are restricted by condition to ensure impact does not increase further. A summary of the cumulative impact and predicted trade diversion is given in a table at paragraph 3.46. The report concludes that the application proposals pass the sequential and retail impact tests.

Highways/Traffic

Members will be well aware of the concerns regarding traffic congestion at the Longwater junction. The applications under consideration have the potential to increase traffic, but it is difficult to prove or quantify this given the wide range of factors that can affect traffic flows and the fact that no increase in net retail floorspace is involved. Following discussions with the applicant’s agent, NCC highways have raised no objection to the applications and The Highways Agency similarly does not object.

Conditions

The applications have been assessed for impact and sequential testing purposes on the basis of the particular information submitted with the applications. As recommended by WYG, any permissions should therefore restrict net retail sales areas to those specified in the applications. A restriction on sub-division of the units is also retained and revised from the original 1993 permission (1993/0818) which prevents sub-division of the units to less than 1000sqm (gross floor area). This reflects the basis on which the sequential test has been conducted and also the large unit retailing character and function of the Park.

Only application 2013/2044 for additional mezzanine floorspace is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy

Conclusion

Although the Longwater Retail Park is an out-of-centre location, no sequentially preferable site has been identified that is suitable, available and viable. Assessment of the impact of the proposals on existing and planned developments in established centres has shown that they pass the impact test required by the NPPF and relevant local plan policies. In these circumstances and in the absence of any sustainable highway object, the applications should be approved with appropriate conditions.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 South Norfolk District Council (hereafter referred to as ‘the Council’) has instructed WYG to provide advice in respect of four planning applications (Refs: 2013/2039; 2013/2044; 2013/2041; and 2013/2043), submitted by Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Limited (‘the applicant’). The proposed developments are identified as follows:

- 2013/2039 | Unit C | Relax condition 1 of 2003/1127 to permit food sales (for M&S Food);
- 2013/2044 | Unit C | Insert 465 sq m mezzanine floor for storage (to facilitate the M&S operation);
- 2013/2041 | Unit A2 | Relax conditions 2 and 4 of 2008/1738 to permit unrestricted non-food sales; and
- 2013/2043 | Unit E1/E2 | Relax condition 1 of 2003/1127 to permit unrestricted non-food sales.

1.2 Two Planning and Retail Reports were submitted, the first in support of applications 2013/2039 and 2013/2044 (concerning Unit C), and the second in support of applications 2013/2041 and 2013/2043 (concerning Units A2 and E1/E2). These were undertaken by RPS Planning and Development, and comprise a summary of retail policy context, a sequential assessment and an impact assessment.

1.3 Further to the submission of each of these applications, received on the 12th November 2013, an exchange of correspondence and consultation responses have been received from Costessey Parish Council, Norwich City Council and RPS as follows:

- Costessey Parish Council response, dated 18th December 2013;
- Norwich City Council interim response, dated 20th December 2013;
- RPS letters, dated 7th February 2014;
- Norwich City Council letter, dated 25th February 2014, enclosing an assessment of Retail Applications in South Norfolk and Cumulative Impact Considerations prepared by MWA;
- RPS letters, dated 18th March 2014;
- WYG interim appraisal of Retail Planning Issues, dated 4th April 2014;
- RPS letter, dated 24th April, enclosing a draft schedule of sequential sites;
- Norwich City Council letter, dated 30th April 2014, enclosing the Norwich Central Area Shopping Survey schedule of vacant units for the period July/Aug 2013;
- RPS Supplementary Retail Reports, dated 14th May 2014, enclosing a revised Retail Impact Assessment for all applications and a revised Sequential test Assessment in relation to the applications concerning Units A2, E1/E2;
Norwich City Council letter, dated 3rd June 2014, enclosing the Norwich Central Area Shopping Survey schedule of vacant units as of April 2014;

• RPS letter, dated 24th June 2014.

1.4 This Further Appraisal of Retail Planning Issues should be read in conjunction with the interim appraisal of Retail Planning Issues, produced in April 2014 and the correspondence referenced above.
2.0 The Sequential Approach

Introduction

2.1 Following our initial Appraisal of Retail Planning Issues, issued 4th April 2014, responses received from both the applicant and Norwich City Council have provided additional information and assessments of further sequential sites, particularly within Norwich City Centre.

Unit C (Proposed M&S Simply Food operation)

2.2 Unit C of the Longwater Retail Park extends to 929 sq m net sales area at ground floor level and is currently restricted to a range of goods which does not include food and drink. The applications concerning Unit C (2013/2039 and 2013/2044) propose to relax the condition restricting food and drink sales on the ground floor in order to accommodate an 800 sq m net sales area, an approximate 100 sq m cafe and approximately 20 sq m of comparison goods sales for a M&S Simply Food Store, as well as a new build mezzanine at first floor level. The first floor mezzanine will be 465 sq m and will accommodate storage and back of house operation.

2.3 We had previously found that the application proposal for Unit C passes the sequential test and have not been provided with any further information that would cause us to revise this conclusion (see Paragraph’s 2.21-2.22 of our earlier assessment, included below).

2.21 “We are satisfied that there are no sequentially preferable sites to the application site at either the Bowthorpe or Larkman District Centres. Also, whilst we are of the view that the Queens Hill Local Centre could potentially accommodate a Simply Food store of the size proposed, such an opportunity is unlikely to come forward within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that this Centre can be dismissed by reason of unavailability.”

2.22 “We are therefore content that the proposals for Unit C pass the sequential test.”

Units A2, E1 & E2 (Proposed Goods Relaxation)

2.4 The current sales area of Unit A2 is 929 sq m on the ground floor, with an additional 750 sq m at first floor and the application proposal (2013/2041) is to relax the condition restricting comparison goods sales at Unit A2 so that clothing, footwear, fashion accessories and toys, games and books might be sold from the unit. Unit A2 is currently occupied by Next Home who are expected to vacate the property should they receive planning permission for a new store currently benefitting from a resolution to grant at Longwater.

2.5 Units E1 and E2 are currently occupied by Staples, and the application proposal (2013/2043) is to relax the restrictive condition governing these Units so that they too may sell clothing, footwear, fashion accessories and toys, games and books. The current sales area is 1,880 sq m net, with an extant Lawful Development Certificate for a mezzanine floor of 1,651 sq m net.

2.6 As stated in our earlier assessment, the Tesco Stores Ltd vs. Dundee City Council case [2012] UKSC 13 has established that the test of suitability should consider whether sites are capable of accommodating the development proposed, rather than whether the
development proposed could be redressed to be accommodated on sequentially preferable sites.

2.7 In Paragraph’s 2.31 and 2.32 of the earlier assessment it was recommended that the sequential test is undertaken on the following basis:

2.31 “We note that existing Unit A2 operates from a ground floor area of 929 sq m with a mezzanine at first floor level. Therefore, we would expect the applicants to search for sites capable of supporting a footprint of approximately 1,000 sq m.”

2.32 “We suggest that sites of 0.15 hectares and above should be considered where there is a well connected car park within a reasonable distance, and 0.25 hectares in all other cases.”

2.8 For simplicity, RPS has considered all potential sites of 0.15 ha and above identified in the Norwich Local Plan Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies DPD (submitted to the Secretary of State April 2013), the Norwich Central Area Shopping Survey schedule of vacant units as of April 2014, and a site survey conducted in April 2014.

2.9 Norwich City Council (NCC) contend that all vacant units and potential development sites should be considered, referencing paragraph 4.15 of the MWA assessment and that in the absence of named operators, a degree of flexibility should be exercised. As stated in paragraph 2.30 of our earlier assessment “we disagree with the MWA assessment, as the principles of the Dundee supreme court case dictate that an applicant should not have to fit their proposal to small but more central sites.”

2.10 The applicants raise a number of additional sites in their Supplementary Retail Reports, dated 14th May 2014. Aside from asserting that additional smaller sites should be considered, NCC only offer further site specific comments in relation to the sites listed below. Having reviewed the Norwich City Centre - Sequential Test Assessment enclosed within the applicants Supplementary Retail Reports, dated 14th May 2014, we do not offer any further site specific comments, other than related to the sites listed below.

2.11 Below, we have summarised the information submitted by both RPS and NCC in the order in which it was received before coming to our own independent conclusions. Dates are noted below indicating correspondence from RPS in green and NCC in blue.

2.12 **Anglia Square**

**7th Feb/ 18th Mar** RPS identifies that Anglia Square is allocated within the Norwich City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) and Policy AS2 dictates that the redevelopment requires a major foodstore. Since the application proposal is not for a foodstore, and the floorspace of proposal is too small to anchor such a development, the site is dismissed.

**1st May** NCC states that the Anglia Square planning application is for an anchor 7,792 sq m foodstore, but does not preclude other retail development. NCC goes on to identify surface parking sites and land to the south of the new link road, Edward Street, as potential sites within Anglia Square.

**14th May** RPS states that Anglia Square is currently mostly occupied, with the exception of office space. The site has been marketed by CBRE for redevelopment “in the medium to long term” and as such is not considered to be available. The AAP identifies the proposal as for a comprehensive redevelopment, and this would seemingly preclude development on a piecemeal basis. Additionally, Policy AS3 (incorrectly referred to as AS4 in the report) dictates that any loss of car parking will need to be replaced, and that the development of sites currently used for car parking would not be desirable unless replacement car parking is also provided.
3rd June NCC notes that the extant policy within the AAP was produced in a “very different economic climate” and that it is currently unlikely that the comprehensive development originally envisioned would be viable.

24th June RPS state that at the current time, the AAP and the associated policies are extant, as such there is no current policy basis on which to reject the application proposals.

NCC identify two areas within Anglia Square for potential non-food retail development. The first suggestion, sites currently used for surface car parking, would require the provision of replacement parking in accordance with Policy AS3. This would reduce the size of the plot available for retail floorspace and as such would be unviable. The second site for further consideration was land to the south of the new link road, Edward Street: the majority of the area allocated for Retail/Residential development to the south of Edward Street appears to be in use for surface and multi-storey car parking with the exception of the vacant office unit at the corner of Edward Street and Magdalen Street. This office site measures 0.05 ha and as such would be too small to accommodate the application proposal.

Additionally, regardless of the likelihood and feasibility of “a comprehensive development driven by convenience retail of the scale indicated” and the intention of NCC to review the details of the Norwich City Centre Area Action Plan, the plan and its associated policies are extant at the time of the application, and accordingly we agree that Anglia Square can be dismissed under the sequential test.

2.13 Norwich City Centre
2.14 10-24 Ber Street (CC4)

24th April RPS observed that retail use would be restricted to a street frontage development at ground floor level, which would be unsuitable and unviable for the application proposal, and go on to question the availability of the site as existing users would need to be displaced.

1st May NCC note that the site is suitable as it is located on a well connected, prominent frontage on the fringe of the Primary Shopping Area, opposite a John Lewis and a pay and display car park and as such should be considered as suitable.

14th May RPS state that the site is currently unavailable and that there are no plans to displace Eastern Beds, who occupy the sole retail unit. They identify further constraints to the development of the site including that it is located within the City Centre Conservation Area. The Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document lists the area of the site as 0.42 ha, requiring a minimum of 40 residential units, pedestrian links, public realm improvements and replacement parking. RPS conclude

We agree with the RPS assessment that the site is unavailable as there is no evidence to suggest that the current tenant is planning to vacate the site and as such can be dismissed under the sequential test as being unavailable.

2.15 Barn Road Car Park (CC24)

24th April RPS note that the site is divorced from the Primary Shopping Area and that there would be a requirement to provide integrated replacement parking, which would result in a site that would be too small to accommodate the development.

1st May NCC state that the site is adjacent to a Secondary Shopping Area with wide frontage and the potential for car parking. It is also noted that the site is owned by NCC and as such would be available for development.

14th May RPS identify constraints to the development of the site including that it is within the City Centre Conservation Area. The Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document lists the area of the site as 0.42 ha, requiring a minimum of 40 residential units, pedestrian links, public realm improvements and replacement parking. RPS conclude
that such a scheme would be highly unlikely to be able to deliver a 1,000 sq m retail unit. RPS also note that “the site falls beyond 300m from the Primary Shopping Area, and therefore according to the NPPF is out of centre.”

3rd June

NCC consider the site to be available and suitable, being in a prominent location near to high street retailers.

Whilst the site is available, we agree that the requirements of the Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document suggest that the site would be unable to provide a suitable location for the application proposal.

2.16 Chantry Car Park (CC29)

24th April

RPS state that the requirements of the St Stephen’s Street Outline Masterplan mean that the site will be too small to accommodate the development.

1st May

NCC note that the site is adjacent to the Primary Shopping Area, well connected to leading fashion retailers in the vicinity and well served by nearby pay and display parking facilities. The site is owned by NCC and is available for development.

14th May

RPS identify constraints including that the site is located within the City Centre Conservation Area and adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document requires the provision of public open space with any development. In addition, the existing office on site is occupied and there are currently no plans to relocate, as such site would be too small to accommodate the required level of floorspace and is considered unavailable and unviable.

3rd June

NCC consider the site to be available and suitable, being in a prominent locations near to high street retailers.

We note that there is no evidence to suggest that the occupants of the office plan to relocate and as such we agree that the office remains unavailable. The site is allocated within the Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document and any development would be required to provide public open space as well as boundary treatments taking into account the neighbouring Grade I Listed Buildings. In addition, the site is allocated for a mix of uses and as such would be too small to accommodate the application proposal and therefore can be dismissed under the sequential test as unsuitable.

2.17 Hall Road (R3)

1st May

NCC states that the site is allocated for comprehensive redevelopment as a new District Centre with a policy allowance for both a food store and comparison goods floorspace. Asda have purchased the site and are looking to implement extant planning permission, dated December 2012, (Planning ref: 12/02003/F) for “Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a new district centre to include a food store, customer cafe, retail units (Class A1, A2, A3 or A5), community use, restaurant/public house unit, business units (Classes B1 and B8), gym, car parking, public realm and associated access and servicing”. Once implemented, the adjoining Hall Road Retail Park will also become a sequentially preferable edge of centre site.

14th May

RPS notes that the Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document lists the site as a new district centre, anchored by a large food store with a comparison goods element restricted to 500 sq m, with any other comparison retail goods units limited to 300 sq m and as such the application proposal would be unacceptable on a policy basis. Hall Road Retail Park has no vacancies and as such is unavailable.
3rd June NCC concede that there are currently no vacant units within Hall Road Retail Park and go on to identify that there is the potential to develop the large surface car park.

24th June RPS note that there is no evidence that the surface car park at Hall Road Retail Park is available and that the practical implication of vehicle manoeuvring and servicing would make such an application unviable.

Whilst the site at Hall Road is allocated within the Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document, the restriction on comparison retail units to 300 sq m dictates that, in policy terms, the application proposal would be unacceptable at the site. In addition, the adjacent Hall Road Retail Park would be unavailable and unviable and as such both Hall Road and Hall Road Retail Park can be dismissed under the sequential test.

2.18 Bridewell Alley

14th May RPS note that the unit is only partially in retail use. The retail element of the site is too small to support a retail store of 1,000 sq m. In addition, the unit is not entirely vacant and as such wouldn’t be available.

We agree with this assessment and that the site can be dismissed under the sequential test.

2.19 82 Castle Mall

14th May RPS state that the unit is located on the first floor of the shopping centre with a very narrow shop frontage. Whilst the site is currently vacant, ASDA have a lease until 2020 and as such the site is unavailable.

3rd June NCC note that the unit is subject to a change of use planning application (planning application ref: 14/00527/U) and as such should be considered as available.

24th June RPS indentify that the current planning application includes descriptions of the sites unsuitability for retail use and limited attractiveness. In addition, the application has been given positive pre-application feedback from NCC and should the application be granted the site would be unavailable.

Taking account of the current planning application proposing the change of use of the unit, we agree with this assessment that the unit is soon likely to be considered unavailable and that the site can be dismissed under the sequential test.

2.20 125-129 Kings Street

14th May RPS note that the site is divorced from the city centre, is in non-retail use and is smaller than 1,000 sq m.

24th June RPS go on to identify that the property is Grade II listed with low ceilings unsuitable to a modern retailer.

We agree with this assessment that the unit is unsuitable and that the site can be dismissed under the sequential test.

2.21 1 Prince of Wales Road

14th May RPS note that the site is divorced from the city centre and in non-retail use as offices.

24th June RPS go on to state that the property is let for office use and as such is unavailable.

We agree with this assessment that the unit is unavailable and that the site can be dismissed under the sequential test.
3.0 The Impact Assessment

Policy Context

3.1 Planning applications for retail development located outside defined town centres should include an assessment of impact. The criteria for the assessment are set out at Paragraph 26 of the NPPF (2012). These are as follows:

- the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and

- the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

3.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres (2014) confirms that it is for the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the impact test, and that failure to undertake an impact test could in itself constitute a reason for refusing planning permission. The Guidance also re-emphasises the like-affects-like principle when assessing impact, and draws on the specific example that it would not be appropriate to compare the impact a large out-of-centre store with small-scale town centre stores.

3.3 The NPPG sets out a seven step approach to assessing quantitative impact. This is almost identical to the stepped process set out in the now superseded PPS4 Practice Guidance.

Unit C (Proposed M&S Simply Food operation)

The Previous Appraisal

3.4 The Planning and Retail Report prepared by RPS (November 2013) considered the issue of Impact in Section 9, with relevant statistical tables enclosed at Appendices 1-3. In appraising that document regarding the Unit C proposals, we concluded that the application proposal would be unlikely to have any significant adverse impact upon existing, committed or planned public or private investment. However, we also concluded that the applicant’s assessment of impact upon town centre vitality and viability was flawed.
3.8 Our initial areas of concern were as follows:

1. **WYG comment (March 2014):** The applicant is entirely reliant on turnover and market share data arising from the 2007 Norwich Retail Study. That data is based on household surveys which are now nearly 8 years old. This is clearly unsatisfactory as there have been a significant number of on-the-ground developments in the Norwich urban area, and in its rural hinterland, over the intervening period which would alter market shares. The applicant is requested either to source a new empirical source of information such as a household survey on which to re-assess their findings, or else to use other data sources which might be in the public domain. To that end, we note that in recognition of the elderly nature of the Norwich Retail Study, both Indigo in the case of the Sainsbury’s extension at Longwater, and Peter Brett Roger Tym in the case of the recent Next Home & Garden application at Longwater, conducted their own household surveys.

**WYG Comment on RPS response (May 2014):** In line with our advice, RPS has utilised the much more up-to-date household survey evidence prepared in support of the Next application (NEMS, June 2013). That survey considered both comparison and convenience goods market shares and so can be utilised to inform the impact assessment for both Unit C and Units A2 & E1/E2.

2. **WYG comment (March 2014):** The applicant has relied on Figure D1 of the PPS4 Practice Guidance, but has failed to take account of the requirement for that assessment to “build on steps 1-4 of the needs assessment” (Paragraph D1). Consequently, there is no assessment of population or expenditure per capita from within their defined study area, no examination of expenditure growth rates or special forms of trading and only a tacit examination of existing market shares (figures directly lifted from the 2007 Norwich Retail Study and in effect re-presented as 2014 figures). The extant guidance advised that forecasts of retail need should not be prescriptive (Paragraph B3), and we are not suggesting that the applicant necessarily goes as far as following Step 5 of Figure B1 i.e. assessing future capacity. However, we request that the applicant does follow Steps 1-4 of B1. This is in order to provide for a credible assessment of the “state of existing centres and the nature of current shopping patterns” (Paragraph 17, NPPG, Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres). Without doing so, we are not content to rely upon the base turnover data arrived at in Appendix 1 as that information is unsubstantiated and is not based on latest populations and expenditure estimates.

**WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has now satisfactorily utilised up-to-date population and expenditure data in line with our recommendations.

3. **WYG comment (March 2014):** The applicant has failed to take account of the full range of convenience goods commitments in their assessment. As detailed by MWA on behalf of Norwich City Council, it is relevant to account for the likely impact of the arrival of Morrisons on the former B&Q site at Neatmarket, the
We also offered the following broad comments:

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** The sales density applied in Appendix 2 to the M&S Simply Food unit of £9,677/sq m is considered to be acceptable. Our own data taken from Mintel 2013 shows that convenience floorspace within M&S stores currently trades at around £9,729/sq m (2013 prices) and so is broadly comparable. However, RPS do not state their price base and so we would request that this is corrected in any future submissions.

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has presented their revised assessment using a constant 2011 price base. This is acceptable.

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** RPS confuse trade draw with trade diversion consistently throughout their assessment. The two are distinct, with the former relating to the place of residence of shoppers at a retail destination, and the latter relating to the monetary diversion of trade from different stores and centres. Trade diversion is consistently mislabelled as trade draw. There is in fact no trade draw assessment within the report and the applicant is requested to correct this in any future submissions which are based on an appropriate market share assessment.

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has updated their assessment to account for a range of trade diversions to both the application proposal and the list of commitments. They have omitted a trade draw assessment. In our view this reduces the level of accuracy in any resultant trade diversion assessment, but nevertheless, the assessment is now fit for purpose. We consider the outputs in terms of cumulative impacts in more detail below.

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** The assessment of trade diversion at Appendix 3 is likely to understate impact on Bowthorpe District Centre. Having visited the Roy’s store, it is apparent that it is capable of offering both a main food and to-up shopping experience at a mid-range price point. It is likely therefore to experience a greater level of trade diversion than that currently forecast by RPS.

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS does not agree with WYG that the Roy’s store offers a comparable offer to the proposed M&S store. As a result, RPS has not increased estimated trade diversion from the 0.5% assessed under their
Having established that the updated parameters are broadly acceptable as the basis for assessing impact, we now go on to review RPS’s revised assessment utilising the headings set out in that assessment. At the outset, it is to be noted that whilst RPS has provided separate documents for considering the two planning applications, the text commentary around the impact assessment is common to both. We have therefore focussed on the relevant components to each i.e. the convenience goods assessment for Unit C, and the comparison goods assessment for Units A2 and E1/E2.

**Study Area and Study Period**

3.11 We had previously accepted the Study Area, based on a 15 minute drivetime, suggested for the M&S proposal in RPS’s initial assessment. However, as a product of standardising their revised assessments, RPS has widened the Study Area to match that utilised by Peter Brett’s in their 2013 assessment on behalf of Next. This is an acceptable approach, provided that the trade diversion analysis has been adjusted to suit. We consider this further below.

3.12 RPS assess impact over a two year period to 2016, in keeping with the Peter Brett work. Ordinarily this could be considered a narrow assessment period, but in this instance, where the Unit in question is already built and ready to occupy, we consider that 2016 is an appropriate assessment year.

**Price Base**

3.13 As detailed above, RPS has utilised a 2011 price base in keeping with the Peter Brett work. This is acceptable.

**Sales Densities**

3.14 At Table C in Appendix 1, RPS set out their assessment of the turnover of the proposed M&S unit. We had already agreed the sales density as being acceptable and accept that the proposed store will have a convenience goods sales density of around £9,677/sq m.

3.15 RPS has then incorrectly applied the same sales density to the comparison goods floorspace of the unit. Based on Verdict 2013, we estimate that the correct figure is £4,235/sq m. However, as the proposed amount of proposed comparison goods floorspace is small, this is unlikely to materially affect the results of the analysis. Indeed it will lead to a very small over-exaggeration of the store’s turnover and, therefore, impact.

**Retail Floorspace**

3.16 RPS then correct an error in their previous Retail Report by revising their floorspace from gross to net sales area. The effect is to reduce the scale of proposed ground floor sales area from 800 sq m net in their original assessment, to 663 sq m net in the revised assessment. At Paragraph 2.22, RPS explain that this figure excludes the proposed cafe. We have no cause to question this assessment, but would suggest that in the event that the Planning Authority sought to grant planning permission for the development, that a Condition be added to restrict the total sales area to 663 sq m net (excluding the cafe).

**Turnover of Existing Floorspace**

3.17 RPS conducts an assessment of average sales densities for bulky goods retailers in Table A. That assessment concludes that an average sales density of £2,834/sq m should be applied to existing Unit C. We have reviewed this figure in light of our own assessment of Retail Rankings 2013 and our own estimate is that a bulky goods average is £2,809/sq m at 2011 prices. The figure adopted by RPS is therefore a robust one.

**Turnover Potential of the Application Proposals**

3.18 Table C estimates that the M&S unit will have an annual turnover of £6.42m. As described above, this is likely to be a very small over-estimate owing to the misapplication of the comparison goods sales density. Nevertheless, this makes the resultant turnover a credible one.
**Net Turnover of the Proposals**

3.19 The net convenience goods turnover of the proposal is estimated at £6.22m in Table D. This is accepted.

**Retail Planning Commitments**

3.20 Table E at Appendix 1 lists the commitments suggested under the original correspondence by WYG and NCC. RPS has lifted, where possible, the accepted turnovers levels of committed stores and has considered what percentage of their turnover might derive from the Study Area. We are happy with this analysis, and the resultant turnover of all commitments at 2016 of £100.0m. The convenience goods element of this is £69.9m.

**Population**

3.21 As previously described, RPS has lifted this information from the Peter Brett study and we are therefore content with the figures.

**Expenditure**

3.22 Tables 4 and 5 set out the convenience expenditure per capita and total convenience expenditure figures. The base figures accord with our own Experian data, and appropriate adjustments have been made for annual growth rates in Table 4 and reductions for Special Forms of Trading in Table 5.

**Convenience Goods Trade Diversion and Impact Assessment**

3.23 RPS has utilised the market shares arising from the Peter Brett’s survey to underpin their convenience goods assessment. An assumed spend of 75% on main food and 25% on top-up purchases has been adopted. We can confirm that such figures are typical.

3.24 Table 11 examines the proportions of trade likely to be diverted to the M&S store, as well as the other convenience goods commitments. An exception is made for the proposed foodstore at Taverham. RPS suggest that the Retail Impact Assessment which supported that application concluded that there would be no overlap in terms of trade diversion with either the application proposals or other convenience commitments. We have viewed the document produced by JW Planning (August 2013) in support of that application, and found that in fact the proposed store is forecast to have considerable impacts upon stores within the proposed M&S study area. By way of example, the proposed store was forecast to derive 35% of its trade from the existing Sainsbury’s at Longwater (£9.5m). A further 7% (£2.0m) was forecast to derive from ‘other stores with the Norwich urban area’ which is likely to include the City Centre and District Centres. And there are also impacts forecast on Drayton and Hellesdon, both of which are also assessed under the RPS assessment. We therefore disagree with RPS that the Taverham foodstore proposal should have been excluded from the cumulative impact assessment, and make adjustments for this in our analysis which follows.

3.25 Turning to assess the forecast diversion of trade away from existing retailers to the proposed M&S store, RPS has assumed that the majority of trade will be diverted from the nearby Sainsbury’s (34%), as well as Waitrose in Eaton (18%), M&S in Norwich City Centre (12%), Asda at Hellesdon (10%), Tesco at Harford Bridge (10%) and Others (10%).

3.26 We do not disagree with the broad apportionment of trade diversion to these stores, all of which are within a reasonable drivetime of the application site. A large proportion of trade is forecast to be diverted from the nearby Sainsbury’s, notwithstanding their differing market positions and vastly differing range of offer. This is reasonable.

3.27 However, we feel that RPS has over-stated the likely impact on ‘Other’. No explanation is given as to which stores this might be, and given the lengthy list of stores and centres already considered, we have serious doubt that this trade would derive from the remaining stores; perhaps corner stores and filling stations. As set out above, we also disagree with RPS in their assessment of likely impact on the Roy’s supermarket at Bowthorpe District Centre. That store offers a range of goods at different price points, and is geographically nearby.
3.28 As a result of the concerns we have highlighted with the missing trade diversions to the Taverham store, and the under-estimated impact of the proposed M&S Store on Bowthorpe, we have made adjustments to the resultant impacts shown at Table 11 of the RPS study. We have lifted the forecast trade diversions from the JW Planning assessment at Tavernham, and assessed that only 5% of the M&S stores trade is diverted from ‘other’ with the residual 5% being attributed to Bowthorpe District Centre.

3.29 In light of the foregoing, we suggest that a more realistic assessment of cumulative convenience impact on Norwich City Centre and Bowthorpe District Centre would be as per the table below. Notably, we have combined the assessed impact on the M&S in Norwich City Centre with the rest of the convenience stores in the City Centre. Whilst RPS seek to draw a distinction, in that M&S are pursuing the scheme in full knowledge of the cannibalisation of their own trade, it is equally relevant that there is likely to be a loss of linked trips arising from any reduction in footfall to that unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store/Centre</th>
<th>RPS Forecast Cumulative Convenience Impact</th>
<th>WYG forecast Cumulative Convenience Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwich City Centre (including M&amp;S)</td>
<td>£2.45m (5.0%)</td>
<td>£3.45m (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowthorpe District Centre</td>
<td>£0.03 (1.4%)</td>
<td>£0.34m (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions on Impact

3.29 Overall, we find that even notwithstanding our increased trade diversion forecast, there will be no unacceptable impact on Norwich City Centre as a result of the Unit C (M&S) proposals. The solus impact is relatively minor and our assessment is that the cumulative impact on existing convenience stores is unlikely to result in store closures.

3.30 We have more of a concern with regards to the potential impact on Bowthorpe District Centre. The forecast level of diversion is on the margins of acceptability. However, we are mindful of the role other stores/facilities within the Centre play in bringing footfall to the Roy’s store, and also that there has been no objection to these proposals from retailers within the Centre, which must be a material consideration. On balance, we therefore find that the proposals are unlikely to result in any significant adverse effect on Bowthorpe.

3.31 We recommend that the Council includes though a Condition restricting the sales area of the proposed M&S store to the 663 sq m net suggested by RPS, in order to mitigate any further diversion of trade away from this centre in particular.

3.32 Turning to any potential impact on existing, committed or planner public or private investment, we consider that the nature of the proposals (relatively small in scale) would be unlikely to prevent any food retailer coming forward who had ambitions to open a store in the Norwich urban area. With specific regard to the Anglia Square proposals, a much larger anchor foodstore is envisaged there, which would be substantially different in character and would largely compete for a different type of custom (i.e. main food shopping over top-up shopping).

3.33 We therefore find that the Unit C (M&S) proposals accord with the NPPF retail tests. We turn next to consider the Unit A2, E1 &E2 proposals in isolation, before concluding on the cumulative impact if both applications were to be grated planning permission.

Units A2, E1 & E2 (Proposed Goods Relaxation)

The Previous Appraisal

3.34 The Planning and Retail Report prepared by RPS (November 2013) considered the issue of Impact in Section 9, with relevant statistical tables enclosed at Appendices 1-3. In appraising that document
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regarding the Unit A2, E1 & E2 proposals, we concluded that the impact upon existing, committed or planned public or private investment was unclear, as the assessment of impact upon town centre vitality and viability was flawed in a number of areas. In the section which follows, we track our original comments, before discussing the appropriateness of the response provided by RPS. Some of our comments, for example in relation to the absence of an up-to-date retail survey, mirror our assessment in respect of Unit C above. Therefore we have not repeated that analysis, but this should not be construed as a lessening of any of our original concerns.

Impact of the Proposal on Town Centre Vitality and Viability

3.35 Our initial areas of concern were as follows:

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** Appendix 1 - The sales densities applied to comparison goods floorspace within foodstores are far too low. For example, Verdict 2013 suggests that Sainsbury’s comparison goods sales density is £6,260/sq m, Tesco is £13,196/sq m and Asda is £7,308/sq m (all 2011 prices).

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has abandoned the use of average sales densities and instead utilised the survey results derived from the Peter Brett household survey.

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** Appendix 2 – The existing Sales density of the Next store in Unit A2 is over-estimated. Peter Brett Roger Tym in their Retail Assessment, suggested that the Next Home floorspace would trade at £2,500/sq m.

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has adjusted the sales density accordingly.

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** Appendix 2 – RPS consistently apply sales density discounts to mezzanine floorspace. In keeping with our advice on the Next proposals, and indeed PBRT’s ultimate conclusions, no such discount should be applied to comparison goods floorspace. To apply such discounts effectively assumes that shoppers will be put off accessing a mezzanine floor by the escalator journey. Whilst this may be true to trolley based shops in some convenience goods stores, it does not ring true to comparison based shopping. Indeed, such units are typified by different floors representing different departments e.g. ladies and children’s clothing downstairs, and men’s clothing upstairs.

- **WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has now removed any previously applied discounts.

- **WYG comment (March 2014):** Appendix 2 – RPS has estimated that the potential re-occupation of Unit A2 would match the existing Next Home Unit. We think that this is
an under-estimation as the current unit is a home store, whereas it is likely to be re-occupied by a fashion retailer. MWA suggest that the applicant should consider much higher potential sales densities, assuming a worst-case scenario that the Unit is occupied by Marks & Spencer or suchlike. We think a more measured approach would be to assume an average sales density for clothing and footwear retailers across both floors. Our assessment of the latest figures from Mintel 2013 suggests that this is £4,347/sq m (2011 Prices). This would result in an annual turnover of £7.3m.

WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014): RPS adopts an average sales density of £3,681/sq m. Whilst this moves towards the WYG figure, we maintain our objection as RPS has omitted a number of clothing retailers, such as River Island and Primark, who have higher sales densities than those retailers they have listed. The revised report also suggests that out-of-centre retailers generally attract lower sales densities given their location and lower footfall. Whilst this might be true in some instances, the figures derived from Retail Rankings are averages and each of these companies hold substantial and expanding out-of-centre portfolios. We therefore disagree with RPS’s use of a discounted sales density for a combination of both these reasons.

• WYG comment (March 2014): Appendix 2 – We consider that RPS has underestimated the potential turnover of a re-occupied Unit E1/E2. In keeping with the above, we would suggest an assumption that both floors trade at £4,357/sq m. This would result in an annual turnover of £15.4m.

WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014): Our comments mirror those above. We feel that RPS continues to under-estimate the sales density of the potential occupiers.

• WYG comment (March 2014): Appendix 2 – MWA has suggested that RPS is wrong to apply a discount for the turnover of existing retailers in each of the Units, suggesting that all new turnover should be assessed for impact. We do not agree with this assessment, as the effect would effectively be to double-count.

WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014): No action required.

• WYG comment (March 2014): Appendix 3 – Forecast trade diversions from Sainsbury’s and other retailers on Longwater Retail Park are significantly over-exaggerated. The likely occupiers of the Units will be fashion retailers, who would compete only to a very limited extent with Sainsbury’s who typically sell clothing items under their own TU range, and where purchases are often incidental to a food based shop. There is also likely to be only a limited overlap of trade with existing retailers on the Retail Park. The Range is the only unit selling clothing and footwear and having examined those items, they are mainly discount clothing and end-of-line items. There
is unlikely to be any significant competition between that store and say a River Island, Primark or H&M. The corollary is that forecast trade diversion from Norwich City Centre and Cathedral and Riverside Retail Parks is likely to be significantly under-estimated. Of note, elsewhere in their assessment, RPS refer to Riverside Retail Park as being edge-of-centre (Paragraph 9.31), but it is to be noted that the Retail Park is an allocated District Centre and impact upon it is therefore of significance.

**WYG comment on RPS response (May 2014):** RPS has significantly re-worked their analysis e.g. forecast trade diversion from Norwich City Centre is increased from 30% to 50% and forecast trade diversion from Sainsbury’s is decreased from 20% to 5%. We consider the resultant impact assessment in more detail below.

3.36 Having established that the updated parameters are mostly acceptable as the basis for assessing impact, we now go on to review RPS’s revised assessment utilising the headings set out in that assessment. As detailed earlier on in our report, it is to be noted that whilst RPS has provided separate documents for considering the two planning applications, the text commentary around the impact assessment is common to both. We have therefore focussed on the comparison goods assessment for Units A2 and E1/E2 below. In order to avoid repetition, we have also sought only to comment on areas of significant difference to the convenience goods assessment already undertaken. For example, we do not comment again on the population forecasting, price base etc.

**Retail Floorspace**

3.37 RPS revise their estimates of net comparison goods sales areas to 1,343 sq m net for Unit A2 and 2,825 sq m net for Unit E1/E2. We have no reason to doubt that these areas are correct, but would again recommend that the Planning Authority seek to condition the Units accordingly in the event that planning permission was granted.

**Turnover Potential of the Application Proposals**

3.38 Based on the adopted sales density of £3,681/sq m, RPS calculate the total comparison goods sales to be £15.34m per annum. For the reasons discussed above, we feel that RPS has under-estimated the potential turnover of these units in the absence of any named retailers. Accordingly, we feel that an average sales density of £4,357/sq m is more appropriate. This would result in annual comparison goods sales of £18.16m, an increase of £2.82m on the figure put forward by RPS.

**Net Turnover of the Proposals**

3.39 RPS utilises a net figure of £7.98m as the uplift in comparison goods turnover between the existing situation and the proposed situation. We support the methodology in doing so. However, for the reasons above, we believe that an uplift of £2.82m should be applied, thereby resulting in a revised net uplift in comparison goods turnover of £10.80m.

**Comparison Goods Trade Diversion and Impact Assessment**

3.40 Table 10 at Appendix 1 sets out RPS’s assessment of trade diversion and resultant impact. We have considered the trade diversions to the proposed Units set out in this table and consider the impact attributed to Norwich City Centre to be realistic (50%). However, we consider there to be two flaws as follows:

1. RPS has sought to attribute 14% of trade diversion to the new Next Home & Garden store. We think that this is likely to be an over-estimate as the Next store would also be likely to benefit from the increase in footfall attracted to the newly converted units. We think it is reasonable to assess that this level of diversion would instead derive from Riverside Retail Park, with diversion from the Next store reverting to 8%.
2. For the reasons set out previously, we think the RPS assessment under-estimates all impacts by a factor of 35.5% (£10.80m/£7.98m). The resultant net turnover of the proposals at 2016 is therefore adjusted by £2.96m (£8.33m x 35.5%) to £11.29m.

3.41 As a result of these two adjustments, we calculate the revised trade diversions to the application proposals as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store/Centre</th>
<th>Trade Diversion to Application Proposals</th>
<th>Cumulative Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich City Centre</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Retail Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Road Retail Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Zone A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Retail Park</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Zone B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asda, Hellesdon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other retail warehouses, Zone C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Zone D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwater Retail Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainsbury’s, Longwater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next, Longwater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowthorpe District Centre</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions on Impact**

3.42 In light of our assessment of the likely impact upon comparison goods trade at centres and stores across the Study Area, we are content that there is unlikely to be any significant adverse impact. The solus impact of the application proposals is unlikely to result in the closure of any stores in Norwich City Centre, and whilst the cumulative impact on Riverside District Centre is of more concern, we consider that Centre to be performing well, with little evidence of long term vacancy or reduced footfall. It performs well as a fashion and retail destination in its own right.

3.43 Turning to consider likely impact on existing, committed or proposed public of private investment, there has been considerable debate between Norwich City Council and RPS over the potential impact on future investment at Anglia Square District Centre. Planning permission was granted to Totem Ltd in 2013 for a number of elements including Phase 1 for a large foodstore and 3,565 sq m net of additional retail facilities.

3.44 It is difficult to forecast whether such an investment would be prejudiced by additional retail development at Longwater Retail Park. Clearly, there is likely to be little impact upon any investment by a large foodstore operator as we have already highlighted, and this would be the anchor to this development. It may be though that the Longwater proposals could influence investment decisions by non-food retailers who might otherwise locate to the city centre. However, on balance, we consider that the two destinations are distinct, and that a significant number of retailers would be prepared to invest in both.
Moreover, we note that there are no objections from Totem Ltd, or from individual retailers in or around Norwich City Centre, to the Longwater proposals.

3.45 Having now been able to complete our sequential and impact assessments, we consider that any non-food proposals at Anglia Square are likely to be some time from fruition, with no site observed to be available, suitable and viable in the near future. In light of our findings, we consider that investment in Longwater Retail Park would be likely to impact upon investment decisions at Anglia Square if any non-food redevelopment proposals were imminent, but we are not convinced that they are. Therefore, we find that the application proposals are unlikely to prejudice any beneficial investment in that centre, and that a general growth in comparison goods retail spend in the Norwich urban area over the coming years is likely to compensate for any short-term diversions (noted by Experian as £142m across the Study Area over the period 2013-2018).

### Cumulative Impact of Both Proposals

3.46 At Appendix 1, Table 12, RPS set out a cumulative impact assessment of both application proposals, as well as commitments. This is important, as it necessary to consider whether both proposals can be permitted alongside each other. As a result of the findings of our report, there have been a number of amendments to the figures suggested by RPS. For completeness, a revised version of their assessment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Trade Diversion to Application Proposals</th>
<th>Cumulative Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich City Centre</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside District Centre</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkman District Centre</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglia Square</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowthorpe District Centre</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Summary and Conclusions

4.1 The NPPF provides guidance at paragraphs 24-27 and explains that applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date development plan should be refused planning permission where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact with regard to the following:

- the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and

- the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

4.2 The applicant has carried out an assessment of each proposal having regard to the tests above. Our critique has highlighted a number of areas of difference, but on the basis of the revised assessment, we are content that both applications pass the prevailing retail tests.

4.3 We recommend that the Council seeks to implement appropriate convenience and comparison goods floorspace restrictions in order to preserve the vitality and viability of existing centres.
5. **Appl. No**: 2013/1494/O  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD

Applicants Name: Land Fund Limited  
Site Address: Land East of A47, West of Round House Way and North of A11; and Land to the South of A11, East of A47 and West of Cringleford  
Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

**Recommendation**: Refusal:
1. Adverse impact on the ability to cater for the planned growth in the Norwich Policy area as set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy by virtue of developing land likely to be necessary for carrying out of future road improvements required to accommodate such growth. It would also similarly be contrary to Policy TRA 2 of the adopted Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.
2. Inadequate provision of open space
3. Insufficient information to ensure the protection of hedges and trees on site

Members should note, there is a potential for this application to be called in the Secretary of State. Once a decision has been made by Members the SoS will advise as to whether he will call-in the application to make the final decision on this application.

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 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  
NPPF 13: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres  
Policy 20: Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area
ENV 3: River valleys
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the southern bypass of the city of Norwich
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
ENV 17: Public access to sites of nature conservation value (Part Consistent)
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
SHO 9: Shop sites in major residential developments
SHO 10: Class A3 uses outside the defined Central Business Areas
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities
LEI 6: Smaller scale leisure facilities (Part Consistent)
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
UTL 15: Contaminated land
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 2: Safeguarding of the cycle network
TRA 3: Provision of cycle facilities
TRA 13: Corridors of movement
TRA 17: Off-site road improvements

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide 2012

1.5 Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies relevant to this application site</th>
<th>Relevant to Outline (O) or Reserved Matters (RM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN1 Co-ordinated approach for delivering overall growth</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN2 Protection of heritage assets</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN3 Protection of significant buildings</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN4 Provision of infrastructure</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1 Provision of landscape corridors</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2 A11 Landscaping</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3 Protection of hedgerows</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4 Yare Valley protected areas</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5 Provision of sustainable drainage</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6 Provision of open space and community woodlands</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU1 Housing Allocation</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU2 Design Standards</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU3 Density of development</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU4 Mix of property types</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU5 Provision of sheltered housing and care home</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU6 Minimizing energy use in dwellings</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU7 Space standards</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOU8 Provision of garages

HOU9 Provision of affordable housing

HOU10 Protection of heritage assets

ECN1 Provision of business accommodation

ECN2 Provision of local shopping facilities

SCC1 Provision of primary school

SCC2 Provision of medical facilities

SCC3 Provision of walking/cycling routes

SCC4 Construction methods for community buildings

SCC5 Provision of playing field and play areas

SCC7 Provision of library facilities

SCC8 Provision of allotments and community orchard

TRA1 Major estate roads

TRA2 Thickthorn interchange improvements

TRA3 Provision of walking / cycling routes

TRA4 Pedestrian and cycle needs


1.8 Circular 02/2013 – Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (2013)

1.9 Ministerial statements

1.10 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.10.1 Emerging Development Management Policies (Submission version (2014)

DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk

DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations

DM1.3 Sustainable location of development

DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness

DM2.4 Location of main town centre uses

DM2.6 Food, drink and hot food takeaways

DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs

DM3.9 Design Principles

DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport

DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic

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

DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management

DM4.5 Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open spaces

DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0552 Screening opinion for residential
development EIA required

3. Other related planning history

The following applications have been permitted near the application site:

3.1 2001/1852/O & 2008/2347/O Erection of 750no dwellings, school, local
shop, community facilities, playing fields,
open space, roads, cycleways and
footpaths | Land North Newmarket Road
Cringleford Norwich
And
Outline application for residential
development (626 units) and associated
infrastructure including open space and
recreational woodland, site for Primary
School, Community facilities and up to
1486sqm mixed use (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5)
Neighbourhood Centre (revised Phase 2
- Round House Park) | Phase 2 Round
House Park Round House Way Cringleford

Total dwellings delivered by these two
overlapping permissions: 1,000

3.2 2012/1477/O & 2012/1880/O NRP North and South Outline masterplans
Approved

Total floorspace proposed: approximately
150,000sq.m. research and development (an
ancillary uses) approved across both
permissions.

3.3 2011/1804/O Residential led mixed use development of
1196 dwellings and associated uses
including Primary School, Local Services (up
to 1,850 sq. m (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5,
D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small
business units, community facilities/doctors'
surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space,
equipped areas of play and informal
recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn
Park and Ride including new dedicated slip
road from A11.

3.4 2013/1793/O Outline planning permission for a
development of 800 dwellings together with a
small local centre, primary school with early
years facility, Two new vehicular accesses
off Colney Lane, associated on-site
highways, pedestrian and cycle routes,
public recreational open space, allotments,
landscape planting and community
woodland.

Pending
consideration at
time of report being
written
4. Consultations

4.1 Cringleford Parish Council (Appendix 1)

First consultation (August 2013):
- Undermines, at this late stage, the 2 years of community work in developing the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Prejudice not only the Neighbourhood Plan but also the Local Plan by predetermining decisions about scale, phasing, location, number and density of housing.
- Prejudicial to the coordinated approach to overall planning for growth in the development boundary stressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Scale will have adverse effects on the character and appearance of the village which the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect.
- Landscape setting of the village adversely affected, while the important landscape zones along the A47 and the A11 will be severely compromised and erode further the strategic gap between the village and the countryside.
- Average density of dwellings, which is given as 25 dwellings per hectare, is deceptive as the actual proposed densities are up to 32-45 dwellings per hectare.
- Does not create a high quality, sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities within the development limit.
- Does not effectively address traffic management and highways infrastructure requirements identified by the Highways Authority during the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Adverse impact on residential amenity and result in the loss of open space, wildlife zones and green infrastructure corridors.

In response to making of Neighbourhood Plan:
- Uncoordinated approach to whole site area through two separate applications
- Total number of dwellings in both this and adjacent application (2013/1793/O) exceed neighbourhood plan required by 250.
- Density too high
- Transport and highways impact

Second consultation (June 2014):
- Inadequate open space proposed – not in one area over both application sites, within landscape buffer, overhead power lines and in close proximity the A11 and A47 which would not be safe.
- Also re-iterate earlier concerns noted above.

Colney Parish Council (Appendix 2)

- Too many dwellings compared to neighbourhood plan
- Inadequate open space and landscape buffers
- Transport and highways impact
- Impact on ecology

4.2 Local Members

County Cllr J Virgo (Humbleyard Division)
- Proposals do not reflect Cringleford resident’s views in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Intensity of development out of keeping with surrounding housing.
- Potential for ‘rat-running’ through existing streets.
- Further strain on the Thickthorn Roundabout before any improvement to the interchange is proposed.
- Initial housing proposals do not seem to reflect the local Norfolk style.
- Potential noise pollution due to proximity of the A11 and southern bypass.

District Cllr C Kemp
- This application ought to be dealt with in public by the Development Management Committee.
- This is a very significant application both for the Parish of Cringleford and for the whole District.
- Its consistency with the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan ought, in the interests of democracy and informed decision-making to be debated in open Committee.

District Members
- To be reported if appropriate.

4.3 Play and Amenities Officer
- Unable to make a full assessment at outline stage.
- Green spaces seem to be located on the edge of the development rather than within it.

Comments on revised open space and playing pitch provision:
- Concern over split provision of playing pitches across two sites and subsequent impact on facilities.

4.4 Conservation and Design Architect
- Suggest a condition requiring that a Design Code is prepared and agreed to which all future developers and development parcels will have to adhere to ensure appropriate character and quality of development is achieved at detailed design stage.

4.5 Landscape Officer
- Disregard for some of the existing boundary hedgerows and mature trees, particularly the hedge with trees parallel to Round House Way, opposite Peregrine Mews, Raven Croft and at the junction of the south boundaries of 14 & 11 Stratford Crescent.
- Concerned that the masterplan appears to propose structures within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees; most apparent to the south of the A11 and gated section of Cantley Lane.
- Hedgerows not surveyed to the procedure in the Hedgerow Regulations.
- Much of the site lies within the Norwich Southern Bypass (A47) Landscape Protection Zone.
- The detailed treatment of open spaces between the proposed residential areas and A47 is unresolved.

4.6 Housing Strategy Officer
- Affordable housing will comprise of 33% units.
- 85% of affordable housing provided as social rent and the remaining 15% as intermediate units.
• Agreement reached on the mix and tenure of the properties and this part of the application is considered acceptable.
• A sheltered housing scheme is also proposed, which could help to meet a specific need.

4.7 Highways Agency (Appendix 3)
• No formal objection to proposals in light of Circular 02/2013 and impact of development on trunk roads in vicinity. But of the view that further measures would be required to ensure the efficient operation of the Thickthorn junction in 2026.

4.8 Norfolk County Council Highways (Appendix 4)
First response (October 2013):
• Premature until such time as a preferred scheme for Thickthorn Roundabout is agreed between the Highways Agency, the Local Planning Authority and the Local Highway Authority
• Adds to a proliferation of accesses on to the public highway and leads to additional interference with free and safe flow of traffic, to the detriment of highway safety.
• Conflicts with future road proposals, which would be prejudiced by the development, as proposed.
• Insufficient highways and transport information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway/highway safety.

Second response (June 2014):
• Progress has been made to agree measures to address highway impacts
• However no agreement over ability of an improved Thickthorn Interchange to accommodate predicted growth under Joint Core Strategy
• The impact indicated the junction would be over capacity by growth at 2026
• The impact of development on B1172 indicates worsening traffic conditions
• The impact on Newmarket Road has not been assessed
• Base model does not take into account the permitted North Hethersett development
• Assessment overestimates capacity of links at the signal stop lines and on give way links
• Assessment overestimates junction efficiency by not reflecting the MOVA operation
• Assessment overestimates the capacity of the junction by assuming approach lanes are longer than they actually are
• Requirements of policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan would therefore not be met and it has not been reasonably demonstrated that the mitigation proposed would accommodate the planned JCS growth, nor has a suitable alternative been shown or land identified for its delivery.
4.9 Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste

Following receipt of further information on how site investigation would be carried out, satisfied that an appropriately worded condition would ensure the safeguarding of minerals under the requirements of Norfolk County Council’s Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

4.10 Norfolk County Council Planning Obligations

Two consultation responses (both before Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented):

- Request land and contribution for primary school
- Request contribution toward secondary school provision in Hethersett
- Request financial contribution and conditions to provide 13 fire hydrants for the residential uses and further hydrants for commercial (depending on final floorspace approved for each use class)
- Allocation of land and contributions to a sub-library on site, or contribution to an additional library.
- Management of biodiversity areas should be considered

4.11 Norfolk County Council Public Rights Of Way Officer

- Original concerns relating to Public Footpath Cringleford FP1 have been addressed.
- Additional comments raised on the connection of walking routes to ensure the provision of circular walks.
- Surfacing and adoption of footpaths requires consideration.

4.12 Environmental Services (flood defence)

- The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) advises that the Environment Agency surface water flood maps indicate that there may be some susceptibility at the northern part of the site to water flood risk.
- The FRA indicates that development will be directed away from any potential surface water flood risk and where this is not possible floor levels will be raised to mitigate the potential flood risk from storm events.
- Future detailed water drainage based on sustainable drainage principles should be agreed as well as the future ownership and management of drainage features, subject to appropriate planning conditions.

4.13 Environmental Services (protection)

- No objection subject to appropriate planning conditions to deal with noise, contaminated land and remediation, and external lighting.

4.14 Natural England

- No confirmed bat roosts found on site.
- Based on information submitted on Great Crested Newts the proposed development would be unlikely to affect this European Protected Species.
- Notes that a likely area of 20.6ha of Landscaping, Open Space and SUDS is indicated in the Land Use and Landscape Parameter Plan that will contribute to Green Infrastructure.

4.15 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

- Welcome the offer of a co-ordinated approach between all parties with regard to public access on the floodplain.
- Potential impacts on Meadow Farm CWS have been identified.
Impacts on other CWS and habitats that lie outside of the development boundary have been assessed.

Response received requesting housing numbers that are proposed to be delivered under Joint Core Strategy to be reduced.

Concerns raised over impact of development on landscape and Yare valley, the potential for more than 1200 dwellings contrary to the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

Proposals have considered the impact on County Wildlife Sites.

Cumulative effects of recreational use from increased housing should be assessed and mitigated for if necessary.

Welcomes the offer to develop a coordinated approach between all interested parties with regard to public access provision on the floodplain, and to prepare and deliver a conservation management plan for the floodplain CWS along this section of the Yare valley.

Satisfied that the great crested newts surveys have been conducted to best practice.

Green infrastructure and habitat corridors should be further developed in detailed design stages.

Loss of mature hedgerow on site regrettable, but if mitigation can be demonstrated it is acceptable.

Agree with opinion expressed by Norfolk County Council Ecologist.

No objection subject to appropriately worded conditions for further archaeological works to those already submitted to date.

No comments received.

Would like to see all the development constructed to Secured by Design accreditation.

Further details should be provided at the detailed stage.

Would also request a financial contribution is made to assist with policing and community safety.

No objection subject to appropriate planning conditions.

No comments received.

No comments received.

No comments received.

Site traversed by power lines of up to 132,000 volts. Any requirement to move these would entail high costs and take significant time to implement. Therefore suggest these structures are taken to be immovable objections.
on the site, and request any design should take account of this.

4.28 Anglian Water Services Limited
- Anglian Water have identified the works that are required to increase foul sewage capacity and produced a strategy to deal with this.
- An appropriate planning condition to delay the development until a suitable scheme is implemented to prevent foul sewage flooding events is to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

4.29 Sport England
- Consulted on the proposed playing pitch provision, to be verbally presented at committee meeting

4.30 Local Residents
- 58 letters of objections covering a range of issues:
  - Development proposals fail to conform to the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.
  - Cumulative impact of development on environment not being considered
  - Density, layout and style of housing fails to respect the existing local character of the area.
  - Density too high, insufficient protection of green corridor along A11 and ignores the landscape protection zones
  - Impact on and safety of existing roads, including possible ‘rat-runs’ will be created through the existing street network, particularly Kettingham Lane via Keswick Road, Low Road, Brettingham Avenue/Cantley Lane and Intwood Road from the A11.
  - Impact on public transport availability and on Thickthorn Roundabout before any highways improvements are proposed.
  - Lack of detail on future improvements to the A11 pedestrian crossing to encourage pedestrians to use it safely, particularly to access schools to the south.
  - Secondary school provision
  - Doctor surgery provision
  - Impact to the landscape and environment, including changes the environment from semi-rural to urban, threatening open green spaces, habitat and farmland.
  - Impact on adjacent County Wildlife Site
  - Commercial premises and shops out of character with the local area and no demand for these.
  - Impact on drainage from developing green fields and pollution from new development.
  - Detrimental to existing southern development and is not clearly linked to other on-going northern development.
  - Houses too close to A47 and A11 roundabout and fear that noise levels and pollution will be too high.
  - Parish Council and Cringleford residents have worked hard to prepare the NDP and this is ignoring all that work.
  - Loss and change of character to the ‘gateway’ into Norwich.
  - Inadequate playing pitch provision under electricity pylons and in land safeguarded for wildlife, increasing the cost of building changing rooms through having two
separate sites which would be paid by the Parish Council.
- Police have raised concerns

5 **Assessment**

**Location and Description of Site**

5.1 The site is located on the western edge of Cringleford village and comprises two irregular parcels of land bisected by the A11 (Newmarket Road) and Cantley Lane. The site has a total area of approximately 47.6 hectares.

5.2 The land to the north is bounded by Round House Way and the Round House Park development to the east, the A11 to the south, the Grade II Listed ‘Round House’ to the south east and agricultural fields to the north and west. The land to the south is bound by the A11 to the north and the A47 to the west, County Wildlife sites to the south and existing residential dwellings at Cantley Lane to the east. There is a public right of way through the south parcel of land.

5.3 The site contains an identified site of archaeological interest within the south parcel of land, and a further pair of Grade II listed buildings to the south east of the site (The Farmhouse and 8 North House). There are also trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders to the south east of the site.

5.4 The site comprises a mixture of grade 3 pasture and arable farmland. The topography is relatively flat, with a gradual slope to the northern and southern edges of the site in association with the nearby Yare River Valley. The river valley forms a County Wildlife Site as well. Site features comprise of hedgerows and trees along some of the site boundaries and an existing hedgerow and trees that follow the approximate alignment of Round House Way to the west edge of the site. A green corridor of mature hedgerows and trees are located along the route of the old Cantley Lane road to the south.

5.5 The site is within the open countryside, within the southern bypass protection zone and identified as a strategic gap under local plan policies. More recently the area has been re-allocated under the neighbourhood plan to have an allocated housing development area and a landscape buffer zone of 145m to the east of the A47. There are also electricity pylons through the site with high voltage cables.

**The Proposal**

5.6 The Planning Application proposes a residential-led development on the land to include the following:
- Up to 650 dwellings;
- Up to 2,500 square metres of commercial floorspace, covering a range of uses;
- Recreational spaces and equipped play areas of play;
- An area of open space to the north of Cantley Lane, which is proposed to function as a village green;
- An area of informal recreation to the east of the A47 of approximately 20 hectares;
- A landscape strip of 50 metres to the south of the A11 and a 35 metre set back to the north of the A11.

5.7 The planning application is in outline form only, which reserves the details of all matters (except access) for determination at a later date. The application includes an illustrative masterplan and supporting information that indicates the broad parameters of land use, landscaping, density, building heights and movement of the proposed development. A revised site layout plan demonstrating open space provision has also been submitted in June 2014.
5.8 A Screening Opinion (reference 2013/0552) on whether the proposal would require an Environmental Impact Assessment was issued to the Local Planning Authority on 2 April 2013. It concluded that the proposed development would require an Environmental Impact Assessment and a Scoping Report was prepared by Land Fund Limited containing a plan to identify the site and a brief description of the nature and purpose of the development and of its possible effects on the environment.

Key Considerations

5.9 The main issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are an assessment of the proposal against the policies of the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), relevant material considerations, and whether the application contributes towards achieving sustainable development.

5.10 The Development Plan for the area comprises the Joint Core Strategy for South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich 2011 (parts remitted and adopted 2014); the saved policies of the South Norfolk District Local Plan; and the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) that sets out the overall strategy for providing 1,200 additional homes until 2026 on sites dispersed across the Housing Allocations Area.

5.11 The CNDP was supported through a referendum early this year. The district council formally made it part of the development plan in February 2014. Through the CNDP the decision was made to allocate one large site rather than a number of smaller sites throughout the CNDP area. Policy HOU1 of the CNDP identifies a site for approximately 1,200 dwellings as shown on the CNDP Proposals Map. The principle of development has therefore been established through the current made neighbourhood plan for the site. It is noted that the land is currently greenfield and grade 3 agricultural land and has several environmental constraints. However the principle of development has already been established, and the impacts of the current proposals are considered further in this report. Therefore the principle of new housing on this site is acceptable, providing there is compliance with the other principles.

5.12 The proposed housing development is largely within the allocated housing development area, but there is a small section of housing within the landscape buffer. This is considered further under the landscape section below.

5.13 Policy 9 of the JCS identifies Cringleford as a focus for major growth and development and states that housing will be addressed by the identification of new allocations to deliver 1,200 dwellings. Policy 10 of this strategy goes on further to detail at least 1,200 homes will be delivered at this site, with provision for pre-school and a primary school on site, expansion of existing services nearby, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the city centre, hospital, research park and Hethel and improved green infrastructure to enable access to the adjacent river Yare valley.

5.14 Alongside this, consideration should be given to the supply of land for housing in the NPA. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

5.15 The current 5-year land supply figures were published in March 2014, demonstrating the council had a 4.8 year supply of housing within the Norwich Policy Area demonstrating that there is not a sufficient land supply within this area within the next five years. This is a consideration in the determination of this application, with paragraph 14 of the NPPF requiring planning permission to be granted unless the harm of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits the scheme would deliver.
5.16 It should also be noted that the above 5-year land supply calculations include some completions for dwellings at this location, as it is an allocated housing site. However as there is a shortfall within the 5-year supply, the inclusion of this site does not change the fact there is no 5-year land supply or the way in which this application is considered under the NPPF.

5.17 The density of the proposed development must be considered against the requirements for the CNDP, for which policy HOU3 requires a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. The density of the area to be developed for housing is approximately 25 dwellings per hectare. This area does not include the open space, as per the requirements of policy HOU3.

5.18 It should be noted at this point that in conjunction with this application and the adjacent 2013/1793 application for 800 dwellings, totalling 1450 dwellings, exceeds the approximate 1200 under the neighbourhood plan. However, given the density of this application of 25 dwellings per hectare it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application based on the number of dwellings in this application individually.

5.19 To consider the merits of this scheme the key planning issues are the principle of the non-residential uses on site, highway and transport impacts, design and heritage impacts, landscape, open space, public rights of way and ecology, water and flood risk, residential amenity, affordable housing, mineral extraction and Community Infrastructure Levy and financial contributions.

5.20 A ministerial statement was released on 11th July 2014 relating to neighbourhood planning. This sought to clarify when the Secretary of State would recover appeals relating to neighbourhood planning. This does therefore not have any bearing on this proposal at its current stage as a planning application.

**Principle of non-residential uses**

5.21 Within the application up to 2,500sq.m. of non-residential uses are proposed including retail (use class A1), professional services (use class A2), restaurants and cafes (use class A3), pubs and wine bars (use class A4), hot food takeaways (use class A5) and non-residential institutions (use class D1). The precise floorspace of each and precise D1 use has not been specified at the outline stage, and would need to be fully considered at reserved matters applications for all planning considerations.

5.22 The principle of these uses would provide additional services to the future residents of the proposed dwellings. The need for a sequential approach to the location of this development has been considered but these would form local services for the new dwellings within the wider allocated housing area, justifying the location of these uses within this area. The quantum of floorspace in this application is high, but this would serve additional housing coming forward on the whole of the housing site allocation area, which would reduce the need to travel to other existing services. The proposals are therefore in accordance with local plan policies SHO2 and SHO9, policy 6 of the JCS and sections 2, 4 and 8 of the NPPF. If the application was recommended for approval suitably worded conditions would be appropriate to ensure the appropriate distribution of local services between the north and south parcels of land, and limits to the maximum floorspace of uses to ensure the scale is appropriate to the settlement hierarchy.

**Highways and transport**

5.23 In taking the sustainability of the sites location into account regard must be given to Policy 10 of the JCS which states that Cringleford being a location for major expanded communities is dependent on expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction. The Government has committed to funding an improvement of the Thickthorn interchange under the recently announced City Deals programme. Further to this, policy IMP8 of the local plan
requires development to not prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network. The South Norfolk growth locations in the adopted JCS require infrastructure to support the impacts of that growth. The infrastructure plan in Appendix 7 of the JCS and subsequent updates on the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) and most recently the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan (GNIP) identify that a major improvement of Thickthorn Interchange is required to be brought forward during the Local Plan period to address the cumulative impacts of traffic from allocated development.

5.24 These requirements are further reiterated in policy TRA2 of the CNDP. This policy requires land to be identified for the improvement of the Thickthorn Interchange as required, and any application coming forward would need to demonstrate it did not prejudice the delivery of the options for improvement of this junction. If the development did prevent delivery of such an option, detailed evidence is required to demonstrate that an alternative junction improvement proposal is deliverable and it meets the requirements of the local authorities and Highways Agency.

5.25 The evidence supporting the application considers the impacts of currently permitted development in the area as well as the application proposals on the function of the existing Thickthorn Interchange junction and mitigation is proposed. However consideration has not been given to the impact of all the proposed growth in the JCS area nor to the delivery of an appropriate improvement.

5.26 During discussions on the application progress had been made to agree measures to address the local highway impacts of the development. However no agreement over the ability of an improved Thickthorn Interchange to accommodate predicted growth under JCS has been found.

5.27 The Highways Agency has considered the application, and has not issued an objection. This response is based on the highway impact of development at the opening year of development, just taking into account the proposed dwellings and some locally permitted development. This approach cannot take into account all the other proposed growth within the area identified under the JCS. This is because the Highways Agency are required to comment in line with Circular 02/2013 – Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, which only requires consideration of highway impact in the opening year. The Highways Agency have however considered the technical information presented to them and issued a letter on 18th June raising concerns that it was likely further measures would be necessary to ensure the efficient operation of the Thickthorn junction with the full growth planned within the area under the JCS.

5.28 Norfolk County Council as Highways Authority have considered the submitted technical information in light of the development plan policies, and have raised an objection based on the ability of Thickthorn Interchange to accommodate all the traffic from planned growth under the JCS up to 2026. The concerns relate to the delivery of the junction improvements on land adjacent to Thickthorn Interchange and the absence of evidence to show alternative junction improvements that do not require additional land being deliverable. The improvement of Thickthorn is one project in a programme of strategic infrastructure improvements to support planned growth across the area that form part of the Greater Norwich City Deal. The City Deal commits the partners including this council to the delivery of housing and jobs targets and currently the evidence presented by the applicant has not shown that development does not hinder infrastructure improvements required to meet those targets. This concern is heightened by the fact that the Government has committed to funding an improvement of the Thickthorn Interchange under the recently announced City Deals programme.

5.29 The detailed technical information submitted demonstrated in the view of the highway Authority that the junction would be over capacity at 2026, that impact on the B1172 indicated a worsening of traffic conditions and that the impact on Newmarket Road had not
been assessed. The base model also did not take into account of the planning permission granted for Hethersett North (reference 2011/1804 above) for 1196 dwellings.

5.30 Detailed analysis of the technical information submitted also identified an overestimation of the capacity of links at the signal stop lines and on give way links at Thickthorn Interchange. An overestimation was also made of the efficiency of the junction by not reflecting the Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) operation of the junction. The assessment also overestimates the capacity of the junction by assuming approach lanes are longer than they are.

5.31 It is considered by the local Highway Authority that the requirements of policy TRA2 of the CNDP have not been met and it has not been reasonably demonstrated that the mitigation proposed would not prejudice the planned JCS growth, nor has a suitable alternative been shown or land identified for its delivery.

5.32 The application in its current form is therefore considered to be contrary to the delivery of the adopted development plan and should be refused. Although the applicant has provided a justification for not including a preferred option within the development proposals, the Highway Authority still considers that the development prejudices the delivery of a suitable improvement to the Thickthorn Interchange required to support planned growth. Whilst a Travel Plan would mitigate the some impacts of this development, secured through a Section 106 agreement, this would not be sufficient to deal with the wider issues relating to the Thickthorn Interchange.

5.33 There are also a number of other issues that have been raised based on the detailed information submitted with the Transport Assessment which relate to the accuracy and robustness of the information submitted with the application. This relates specifically to the:

- Phasing and number of dwellings show on the drawings;
- Access strategy for land south of A11 Cringleford by-pass

Taking all of these issues into account Members should be aware that the Highway Authority has recommended that the application be refused based on the grounds that it has not been reasonably demonstrated that the mitigation proposed will facilitate planned JCS growth, nor has a suitable alternative been shown and that land is available for its delivery (Appendix 4). The development proposals are therefore contrary to saved policies IMP8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), policies 6, 9 and 10 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted in 2014) and policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014).

Design and heritage

Layout and design

5.34 The application is in outline only with all matters reserved except for access. The proposal is supported by a detailed Design & Access Statement along with an indicative layout which has been informed by a strategy for movement, land use and landscape, density and building heights. Consideration has been given to policy issues and other guidance documents including the NPPF, JCS, South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and the CNDP.

5.35 The Council's Conservation and Design Architect has carried out an evaluation of the proposals using the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Building for Life criteria. The main areas of concern are where there is insufficient information at this outline stage to be assured that the development will meet the required quality and the design principles. This issue could be addressed by requiring a Design Code through condition. This will ensure all future developers and development parcels will achieve a good character and quality of
development at the detailed design stage. Subject to this requirement and further detailed design work, the outline proposed would comply with policy 2 of the JCS and provisions within section 7 of the NPPF.

Archaeology and Heritage Assets

5.36 Policy ENV9 of the local plan and policy GEN of the CNDP requires consideration to be given to any potential heritage assets on the site. An initial Archaeological Assessment was undertaken to assess the likely significant effects of the proposed development on archaeological remains. Some concerns were raised by the Historic Environment Service over the reports provided and further work was undertaken. This has now adequately addressed the concerns, but any consent should contain conditions to require further investigatory work to inform the reserved matters applications.

5.37 There are a number of Listed Buildings in the area, mostly Grade II. There are two Listed Buildings that are located close to the site. The first is a Grade II Listed Building known as the Round House, which is located north west of the A11/Newmarket Road Roundabout east of the site boundary and is screened by matures trees and planting to west. The second Listed Building of North House and the Farmhouse is located at the end of Meadow Farm Drive to the south of the site and is separated from the development by an existing terrace. The Councils Conservation and Design Architect has considered the potential impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings and concluded that there will be no significant impact on any of the heritage assets. The development therefore accords with policy IMP15 of the local plan, Section 12 of the NPPF and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Landscape, open space and public rights of way

Landscape

5.38 The application includes an appraisal of the landscape and visual effects of the development. The site falls within the Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland character area, but the assessment also considers impacts on the Yare Valley Urban Fringe. In brief, the appraisal concludes that the development of the site will not have a significant impact on the wider landscape, but the main visual impacts will be limited to those only in close proximity to the site. The general mitigation strategy envisaged for the site is for existing hedges and trees of a certain quality to be retained and incorporated into the masterplan and to carry out additional planting and creation of green spaces to soften the interface with the adjoining built up areas and the boundaries of the site.

5.39 The existing site is mostly level pasture and arable farmland from which historic boundaries have largely been removed, although some significant hedgerows and trees remain. The site to the north of the A11 corridor is relatively well contained by the existing Round House Park development to the east, Colney Lane to the north and a corridor of hedgerows and trees to the west. Along the A11, new hedgerow planting has been carried out to the south of the road, which is yet to provide any significant screening. To the south of the A11 the site is well contained by the existing urban extent of Cringleford and the A47 corridor to the west. This is bounded by some mature planting that screens most views of the landscape beyond. Of note is the old Cantley Lane corridor which is a distinct green corridor with associated matures hedgerows and trees.

5.40 Although the development will result in a significant change in the character of the site itself, the visual impact of the proposals will be limited in the wider context. Inclusion of a new area of open space to the east of the A47 of approximately 20 hectares, a landscape corridor along the A11 and the inclusion of a new area of open space to the north of Cantley Lane will help to enhance the new landscape created.
5.41 The development is within the southern bypass protection zone as identified within policy ENV6 of the local plan. The site is also within open countryside under policy ENV8 of the local plan and a strategic gap identified for no development. However, since these designations were made in 2003 the need for additional housing has led to the site being identified for development. Therefore even though the site in the current local plan is identified for no development, in the absence of a five year land supply and the making of the CNDP change the position on the ability to protect this land from development.

5.42 Under the requirements of the CNDP a 145m buffer zone is to be provided along the A47, to the west and south boundaries of the site. This land is identified as open space within the indicative masterplan submitted with the application, but it does contain the proposed open space and playing pitch provision. In principle this is considered to be an acceptable use of the land as the open and green nature of the land will largely be retained. The precise details of any additional structures such as changing pavilions would be determined at the reserved matters stage, but the principle of the use of the landscape buffer for formal open space provision is considered acceptable in this instance. The open space provision is considered further in the report below.

5.43 It should be noted at this point that some of the housing in the southern parcel of the proposed development is within the landscape buffer zone. The housing development covers around 5m of land designated under the 145m buffer zone to the north of this parcel. This has been considered for acceptability, but in the context of the overall amount of landscape buffer proposed, the acceptable density of the development and absence of a five year land supply this is not considered to be a matter that would be sufficient to merit refusal of the application on this ground.

5.44 Despite these areas of open space and landscape areas, described by the applicant in the landscape and visual impact assessment, the illustrative master plan appears to disregard many of the existing landscape features including the boundary hedgerows and mature trees. The most notable omissions are the hedge with trees parallel to Round House Way. The master plan also shows structures within the Root Protection Zones of retained trees to the south of the A11 and the currently gated section of Cantley Lane.

5.45 There are trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders to the south east of the site boundary. These trees could be protected during works to an appropriate degree. One tree is closer to proposed development, but the detail of this could be agreed through reserved matters to ensure the tree is retained in situ. However the above concerns relating to other trees on site still remains.

5.46 Together I consider that the proposed design and layout of the site show on the illustrative master plan could be likely to have a harmful impact on the existing trees and hedgerows. Insufficient information has been submitted at present to demonstrate this would not be the case. In its current form the outline application is considered to be contrary to policies IMP2 and ENV14 of the local plan, policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy, section 11 of the NPPF and policy ENV3 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Open space and playing pitches

5.47 The provision of open space on site is largely within the landscape buffer zone as identified above. These areas can be developed further at a reserved matters stage to ensure there can be good public access and use of this land. The provision of playspace would also be determined at the reserved matters stage. To ensure the delivery of both open space and play space these would be secured to an accompanying Section 106 agreement.

5.48 The current plans are to provide the required playing pitch provision under policy SCC5 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan to the west and south boundaries of the site, with the provision split by the A11 road between the north and south parcels of land within the application site.
Although this application is only at the outline stage the council would need to be certain that the proposed development and open space requirements could be accommodated on the site in line with the current development plan policies. If the open space needed to move to an area currently identified for housing, this could lead to housing being pushed into more sensitive areas of the site (such as the landscape buffer zone) or increase the density of the remaining housing areas. Both would have policy implications which would require due consideration.

At present there would not be a satisfactory form of playing pitch provision due to the separation of the provision across two sites with the A11 in between. This would either lead to the requirement for two changing facility buildings or people having to cross the A11 to access changing facilities. Sport England have been consulted on the principle of siting playing pitches in this location, comments will be verbally updated to Members at the committee meeting.

It should be noted that the applicants have indicated the full 3.8ha of open space on site required by policy SCC5 of the neighbourhood plan. Whilst it could be argued that provision has been provided over and above the required level this does not justify this split provision. The developers would reasonably only have to provide a proportion of open space relative to the development they are delivering, which in this instance would be around 2ha. But this provision would need to be adjacent to the other development site within the approximate 1200 allocation identified under the neighbourhood plan.

This may have implications on the layout of the housing as identified above, and so with the present information it is not possible to make a fully informed assessment of the whether the open space and playing pitch provision can be accommodated on site and be acceptable in terms of the development plan.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal on the grounds of inadequate indicative information on the provision of playing pitches by virtue of the positioning of the pitches across two separate sites divided by the A11 road, and insufficient information to determine the subsequent impact on housing siting and density of any alternative provision of playing pitches to address this issue, contrary to the requirements of policy SCC5 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014).

Public rights of way

There is a public right of way within the southern parcel of land in a north/south direction. The initial plans proposed would have adversely affected this public right of way, but subsequent revisions have enabled this to be accommodated within the proposed development. There is still some potential for public rights of way around the site to be improved to provide circular walks. These details would be decided when the final layout of development is determined at a reserved matters stage.

Ecology

Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the local plan require protected habitats and species to be considered before granting permission for any development. In the instance of this site the presence of Great Crested Newts has been considered on the site, along with increased visitor pressure to adjacent County Wildlife Sites and the need to ensure good links to green infrastructure (access to the countryside for recreation).

The information submitted with the application demonstrates there would be no adverse impact on protected species. To ensure biodiversity is encouraged on site an ecological management and enhancement plan could be conditioned to any consent granted to identify enhancement measures on the site.
The access to County Wildlife Sites and visitor pressure could be dealt with as a financial contribution through a Section 106 agreement to the maintenance and management of the adjacent CWS.

The detailed design at a reserved matters stage would need to ensure the mitigation of the loss of existing hedgerows on site through replacement planting. The provision of landscaping to ensure green infrastructure and habitat corridors are created would also be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

**Water and flood risk**

The requirement for water conservation under policy 3 of the JCS would require all dwellings to meet code level 4 for water usage. This could be conditioned to any consent issued. The issues of surface water and foul water are considered further below.

**Surface water**

To meet the requirements of both policy 1 of the JCS and consideration of the environmental impact of the development, the applicant has confirmed that the site is not at risk of flooding (i.e. being located within Flood Zone 1, low risk). As the site is over 1 hectare the possibility of surface water flooding also requires consideration.

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) includes details of how flood risk will be minimised through the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs). The assessment advises that the Environment Agency surface water flood maps indicate that there may be some susceptibility at the northern part of the site to surface water flood risk. The applicant advises that development will be directed away from any potential surface water flooding and where this is not possible floor levels will be raised to mitigate the potential flood risk from storm events. Site levels are also to be carefully designed to form flow routes for exceedance flows away from buildings and into landscaped areas. The indicative lay-out plan shows development alongside the areas shown as most susceptible to surface water flooding.

The applicant proposes to use SuDs to control the run-off from the site including the following elements; soakaways, permeable paving for source control and swales and infiltration basins for site control prior to discharge to the downstream drainage network. It is proposed to provide a series of soakaways, swales and infiltration basins around the development to store run-off from buildings and roads. No indication of where above ground features will be sited is shown on the indicative layout plan, but these could be determined at the reserved matters stage. Permeable paving is proposed for private driveways.

The Environment Agency raise no objection but would like appropriate planning conditions to be included to ensure that the development will meet the requirements of paragraph 103 of the NPPF to not to increase flood risk elsewhere.

**Foul water**

Anglian Water have confirmed that specific upgrades and connection points along with off-site reinforcements will be required in order to mitigate against an unacceptable risk of foul water flooding downstream. The final solution and the amount of mitigation required will be subject to Anglian Waters acceptance of a drainage strategy. Anglian Water and SNC Environmental Services have confirmed that this approach should be sufficient to prevent
foul sewage flooding events between the application site and Whittingham Sewage Treatment Works and has proposed both a condition and a scheme to deal with these issues.

Residential Amenity

5.66 Local Plan policy IMP9 requires that new development does not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. A development of this scale will inevitably increase the level of activity within the local area, including during the construction phases.

5.67 The additional dwellings will lead to further traffic movements, additional noise from residents, and impacts on outlook and privacy for some existing residences. The more direct impacts on existing residential properties will be where the development boundary faces on to Cantley Lane and backs on to Brettingham Avenue and Taylor Avenue. These impacts will be mitigated by the proposed layout which includes areas of open space located adjacent to properties along Cantley Lane and lower density development along the interface with existing properties to reflect local character.

5.68 The extent of the impact on existing residents will to a large degree be due to the final design of dwellings, which would be agreed through reserved matters phases. The height of buildings and positioning of building plots and windows will all require due consideration to ensure there is no significant adverse impact on residences. The impact on highway traffic has been considered above through the highways and access section of this report.

5.69 Other Local Plan policies relating to impact on residential amenity include Local Plan policy IMP10 (Noise). The Noise Assessment shows that noise from adjacent roads would exceed the usual guidance values without noise protection of dwellings. Whilst no modelling was undertaken of the internal roadways of the proposed development and no account taken of the proposed increase at the Thickthorn Interchange, SNC Environmental Services raise no objections to the scheme providing that a planning condition is included to require a further noise and air quality report and to specify the required control measures should this application reach the reserved matters stage.

5.70 The provision of open space and playing pitches could also lead to an impact on residential uses from noise and light pollution. These details could be conditioned at the reserved matters stage of the development through for example hours of use and positioning of lighting on any commercial or non-residential uses.

Affordable Housing

5.71 The proportion of affordable housing required by Policy 4 of the JCS for a development of this size is 33% and this percentage has been met by the applicants. This equates to 214 affordable housing units – 85% of which will be provided as social rent and the remaining 15% as intermediate units. Agreement has been reached on the mix and tenure of the properties and this part of the application is considered acceptable by the Housing Strategy Officer. It should be noted that a sheltered housing scheme is also proposed, which could help to meet a specific need. This provision would be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

Mineral extraction

5.72 The site has been identified by Norfolk County Council as likely to contain mineral deposits of use. The site is identified within the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (2013) as a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel, which should be safeguarded and not ‘needlessly sterilised’ by other development. This policy direction is reiterated in paragraph 143 of the NPPF.
Following further site investigation by the applicants and discussion with the county council a suitably worded condition could be agreed to require the recovery of any mineral deposits from the site prior to the construction of any development on site.

Local Financial considerations

Section 143 of the Localism Act on Local Finance Considerations requires consideration to be given to the financial benefits a development would bring to the council through grant income, such as New Homes Bonus. This development would also be liable for CIL, although the precise amount would only be calculated at the reserved matters applications stages once residential floorspace was known.

However the benefits the scheme would deliver need to be weighed against the different issues raise above and put into the planning balance when considering the merits of the application.

Education

Policy 10 of the JCS identifies the need for an additional primary school for this proposed growth, which is further identified under policy SCC1 of the CNDP. The secondary school provision would be at Hethersett Academy. The provision of land for the primary school would be secured through a Section 106 agreement, with Community Infrastructure Levy monies delivering the actual school building. At present a primary school building is to be provided on the adjacent site under application 2013/1793. There is no certainty that this school could be delivered at present, but as there is land where this could be provided, through an appropriately worded Section 106 agreement the provision of land for this school could be secured.

Other matters raised

The capacity of doctor’s surgeries in the area has been raised in a letter of representation. This issue is a matter which has been raised at a number of proposed growth locations around the district. There is no requirement for planning applications to ensure the adequate provision of doctor’s surgeries in the current development plan. In the absence of the local or national policy which enables the council to consider this requirement and the absence of any background study on current capacity and needs it is not possible to consider this as a reason for refusal for the application. The concerns of the local community are noted, and health is a matter which the council hold as an important issue, however it is not possible to this refuse planning application for this reason.

Norfolk Constabulary has responded with suggestions relating to design and requirements for contributions for the policing of this new development. The detailed design would be considered at the reserved matters stage of the application. In relation to contributions unfortunately there is no requirement under adopted policy for a contribution to be made to the police. Also no monies are identified through Community Infrastructure Levy for the police. It is therefore not reasonable to request any form of financial contribution from developers for this application.

The power lines across site have been considered. There have been no objections from either the National Grid or UK Power Networks, provided these structures do not need to be moved. No development is proposed under these power lines, with only open space and play pitch provision. The provision of playing pitches is raised above in the report. The lines would not be affected by this provision however as there would not be tall structures or the need for that much height for football pitches.
The issue of cumulative impact of the development has been raised, raising concerns all development within the surrounding area has not been taken into consideration. The application triggers the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment, and an accompanying Environmental Statement has been submitted. This considers this development in the wider context of other developments which have been permitted in the surrounding area, and its subsequent impacts. The cumulative impact has therefore been assessed through the above report.

Conclusion

The application for 650 dwellings at this site would provide a significant amount of housing, which will contribute to deliver the planned growth with the Norwich Policy Area. In the absence of a five year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, the benefits of this growth however must be weighed against the harm identified within this report as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

There are two significant remaining issues, the first relating to highways and the second relating to the provision of playing pitches. The land forming the south parcel of the site has in part been identified as a potential junction upgrade to accommodate the traffic to be generated by the planned growth within the Greater Norwich Area. The cumulative impact of this development, other development within the allocated housing area under the CNDP and wider growth permitted and allocated under the JCs all lead to the current capacity issue concerns. Whilst the options for upgrading these junctions have not been formally agreed yet, the principle of potential junction upgrades within policy TRA2 of the CNDP. This policy goes on to require an alternative mitigation scheme to be agreed with the local authorities and Highways Agency if land is not to be used. Following extensive discussions with the applicants, no agreement can be reached on this matter. Despite detailed discussion of the technical information provided with the application the local highway authority is of the opinion that the alternative mitigation strategy would not address the capacity issues of Thickthorn Interchange by 2026. The application is therefore recommended for refusal on these grounds.

The provision of playing pitches is a matter which needs to be identified at the outline stage of any application and secured through reserved matters. However, if this requirement cannot be met in addition to the housing on site consideration needs to be given to this at the application stage. The requirement for playing pitches on this site under policy SCC5 of the CNDP is for 3.8 hectares to be provided across the whole site, but in one location. The ideal solution would be to provide a component of these on each site adjoining each other. However the proposals have pushed these playing pitches to the landscape buffer zone to the west of the application site, and split these between the north and south parcels of land. Although revised details could be agreed through reserved matters, the local planning authority has no certainty that relocating the open space to one location would not have a subsequent impact on the siting or density of development. The application is therefore also recommended for refusal on these grounds.

In coming to the conclusion of the recommendations on this application the local planning authority has taken consideration of the need to delivery housing within the Norwich Policy Area, the absence of a 5-year land supply and the other benefits of community uses and infrastructure that this development would provide.

The development however as currently proposed could undermine the safe and free flow of traffic on the key junction of the A47 and A11 forming the Thickthorn Interchange when considering all the planned growth under the adopted JCS. The benefit of 650 dwellings to land supply, the community provisions and Community Infrastructure Levy payments this development would generate would not outweigh the
harm the impact this development in its current form could have on the highway network.

5.86 The principle of development is established at this site through the allocation of the wider site for the approximate 1200 dwellings. Even in the absence of a 5-year land supply for housing the harm of the development would have to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits resulting from the scheme. In this instance the harm is still considered to be sufficient and the benefits are not considered to be outweighed and the application is recommended for refusal.

5.87 The application is therefore recommended for refusal on the following grounds:

1) The development in its current form has not demonstrated it would not prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic on the A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange when considering all planned growth under the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted 2014), by virtue of proposing housing adjacent to land potentially identified for junction improvement, nor has it adequately demonstrated an acceptable alternative junction improvement proposal is deliverable and achievable. The development proposals are therefore contrary to policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014), saved policy IMP8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and policies 6, 9 and 10 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted in 2014).

2) The indicative site layout demonstrating the provision of playing pitches leads to an unacceptable form of development, by virtue of the positioning of the pitches across two separate sites divided by a movement of corridor, the A11 road. Insufficient information has also been provided to determine the subsequent impact on housing siting and density of any alternative provision of playing pitches to address this issue. The development in its current form is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of policy SCC5 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014).

3) Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate the impact of the proposed development on existing trees and hedges on the site, and whether these could be retained with the proposed development. In its current form the outline application is considered to be contrary to policies IMP2 and ENV14 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003, policy 1 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted in 2014), paragraphs 109 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and policy ENV3 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014).

Informative Notes:

1) The council has worked in a positive and proactive manner to try and resolve these issues but the applicants have not agreed to address the above issues despite attempts by both the council and local highway authority to address the above issues.
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Jo Hobbs 01508 533674
j hobbs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
CRINGLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL

e-mail clerk@cringlefordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Mrs Anne E. Barnes
Parish Clerk
16A Newmarket Rd
Cringeford
Norwich
NR4 6UE
Tel. 01603 250198

Mr C. Watts
Design Officer
Growth & Localism
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
NORWICH
NR15 2XE

12 September 2013

Dear Mr Watts,

Re: Planning Application Ref 2013/1494
Applicant: Land Fund Limited
Location: Land East of A11 and North and South of Round House Way,
Cringeford
Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save
access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class
C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1
floorspace, together with highway works, landscaping, public realm, car
parking and other associated works.

Cringeford Parish Council strongly objects to this application and requests
South Norfolk Council to refuse permission for the proposal.

Approval of this application would completely undermine, at this late stage,
the 2 years of community work in developing the Neighbourhood Plan to
address housing and other growth in Cringeford in a sustainable way. This
work has been done with the support of residents, other stakeholders, South
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The Neighbourhood Plan is strongly supported by the community and is at a critical stage with independent examination due to be carried out by an Examiner during October. His final report will be published at the beginning of November.

In addition to this major strategic objection there are other fundamental objections for refusing planning permission.

1. **Prematurity.** The proposed development is so substantial and the cumulative effect would be so significant that granting permission would prejudice not only the Neighbourhood Plan but also the Local Plan by predetermining decisions about scale, phasing, location, number and density of housing which are addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. Significant weight must be given to this document as it is an important element in the Local Plan.

2. **Prejudicial.** This single application is prejudicial to the coordinated approach to overall planning for growth in the development boundary stressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

3. **Scale of Development.** The scale of development will have adverse effects on the character and appearance of the village which the Neighbourhood Plan and its policies seeks to protect.

4. **Negative impacts.** The landscape setting of the village will be adversely affected, while the important landscape zones along the A47 and A11 will be severely compromised and erode further the strategic gap between the village and the countryside.

5. **Unacceptable design and density proposals.** Although the average density of building is given as 25 dwellings per hectare, this is deceptive since actually densities are proposed up to 32-46 dwellings per hectare. Too much detail of the design is left to reserved matters and this proposal will allow the uncoordinated expansion of the urban village edge to appear as sprawl.

6. **Community.** The application does not create high quality, sustainable mixed and inclusive communities within the development boundary.

7. **Traffic Management.** The application does not effectively address traffic management and highways infrastructure requirements identified by the Highway Authorities during the production of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

8. **Adverse effects.** The approval of this planning application would have an adverse impact on residential amenity and result in the loss of open space, wildlife zones and green infrastructure corridors.
The Parish Council accepts the need for growth but wants it to be on their terms as set out in the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Mr G. Mole

Chairman

CC: Mr Colin Gould, Chairman of the Council, Member of the Development Management Committee
Mr John Fuller, Leader of the Council
Mr Martin Wilby, Deputy Leader of the Council
Mr Murray Gray, Leader of the Liberal Democrats, Member of the Development Management Committee

To All Members of the Development Management Committee
Mr Joe Mooney – Chairman
Mr Derek Blake
Mrs Yvonne Bendle
Mr Lee Hornby
Dr Christopher Kemp
Mr Nigel Legg
Mrs Lisa Neal
Mr Tim East

To All Members of Growth & Localism Committee
Mrs Florence Ellis – Chairman
Mr Michael Edney
Mr John Overton
Mr Brian Riches
Mr Beverly Spratt
Mr David Bills
Mrs Pauline Allen

Mr Garry Wheatley – District Councillor
Miss Judith Virgo – County Councillor
Mr. C. Watts
Design Officer
Growth and Localism
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

12 March 2014

Dear Mr. Watts,

Planning Application Ref. 2013/1494
Applicant: Land Fund Limited
Land East of the A11 and adjacent to Round House Way

Following the acceptance of the amended Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) by South Norfolk Council on 24 February, 2014, Cringleford Parish Council would like to add its comments on this planning application (12 November 2013) and again urge the District Council to reject.

1. Contrary to Cringleford Parish Council's wish for a holistic approach to development in the Parish (CNDP 7.1 and Policy GEN 1), the applicants have treated the development of their site largely in isolation from that submitted by
Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation. This impacts access to their site, where problems have been identified by the statutory authorities, as well as the Parish Council, and upon the number of dwellings allocated to the Development Area. A formal joint proposal would be useful and should be required before planning permission is granted.

2. The applicants also disregard the existence of other potential development sites with the Development Boundary of the Parish. These include the site for which Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation is seeking planning permission (Application Ref. No. 2013/1793) but also two other sites. Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation own land lying to the south of that which is the subject of their current planning application. Another plot of land (ID 0205 on Map 28 in South Norfolk’s Site Specific Allocation document of August 2011) lies adjacent to both Land Fund/ Cirrus land also Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Institute. The combined area, excluding the Protected Zone identified in the GNPD, may amount to about 27 ha and possess significant development potential. Upwards of perhaps 600 dwellings could be built there, assuming a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is disingenuous of developers to ignore these sites when putting forward their plans. The Development Area of Cringleford must be viewed as a whole.

3. The total number of dwellings proposed in this planning application (650), taken with that proposed for land owned by Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation (800), exceeds the limit of ‘approximately 1,200’ given in the GNPD by 20.8 per cent. This is not acceptable to the Parish. In his report the Independent Examiner, Timothy Jones, introduced the term ‘approximately’ to permit a degree of flexibility in the determination of the
number of dwellings appropriate for the Development Area of the Parish and to avoid the possibility of the CNDP resulting in fewer than the 1,200 new dwellings specified in the Joint Core Strategy (Report of the Examination into the Gringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013-2026, paras. 37 to 43). Mr. Jones's amendment was not intended to push the number of houses significantly higher than that envisaged in the CNDP. Accordingly, an excess of 20.8 per cent cannot be regarded as approximating the 1,200 in the CNDP.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (6th ed. 1995), generally considered authoritative in these matters, defines approximate as 1) 'fairly correct or accurate' and 2) 'near' or 'next'. The online Business Dictionary definition of approximately is 'in general, having a high degree of closeness to accuracy. In mathematics, an approximation is neither a guess nor an error, but as exact as it possibly could be given the constraints'.

4. The Parish Council still maintains that the range of densities proposed (32-45 per hectare) is too high to deliver the design which it would like to see. Even if an average of 25.7 dwellings per hectare is accepted, the revised plan submitted by Deloitte with its letter of 11 December 2013 indicates a massing of housing and, overall, a very urban design. This is contrary to Policy HOU2 in the CNDP. In paras. 47 to 56 of his Report, the Examiner expressly recognised that the government's policy of 'localism' enables the promoters of a neighbourhood development plan to choose between meeting the strategic policies on housing numbers by high densities on less land or by lower densities on more land. In using the expression 'approximate average' the Examiner was concerned to ensure that the target of 1,200 dwellings would be met, while allowing an appropriate mix of property types. For its part, the
Parish Council is also concerned to avoid higher densities in order secure its environmental and amenity objectives (CNDP 6.2; ENV6).

5. Significant transport issues, remain to be resolved satisfactorily, particularly those concerning the Thickthorn interchange. The Parish Council urges collaboration between all the parties concerned and the production of an agreed strategy before planning permission can be given. In addition, the Parish Council is concerned that the road network should be adequate to take buses and utility vehicles.

6. In conclusion, the Parish Council argues that this application breaches the CNDP at a number of points and recommends rejection.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs A.E. Barnes PILCM
Parish Clerk
CRINGLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL

e-mail clerk@cringlefordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Mrs Anne E. Barnes
Parish Clerk
16A Newmarket Rd
Cringeford
Norwich
NR4 6UE
Tel. 01603 250198

Mr C. Watts
Design Officer
Growth and Localism
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

2 July 2014

Dear Mr Watts,

Planning Application Ref. 2013/1494
Applicant: Land Fund Limited
Land East of the A11 and adjacent to Round House Way

Thank you for the amended plans which the Parish Council has discussed. The recommendation from the Council is still to recommend refusal of this Application for the following reasons:

1. We note the new proposals for the playing field and see that it is now split over two sites, one north of the A11 with no changing or toilet facilities and one south of the A11. This is totally unacceptable to the Parish Council and neither site meets the requirements of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy SCC5 which states ‘a 3.8 hectare playing field’ must be provided.
One site lies within the 145m Landscape Protection Zone alongside the Norwich Southern Bypass and the 35m Gateway Zone alongside the A11. This proposal does not comply with CNDP Policies ENV1 and ENV2 showing the sites are to be protected and should not form part of the recreational space required.

Both proposed sites have electricity cables running overhead and the site south of the A11 is in close proximity to two dual carriageways, A11 and A47. Neither sites are suitable on grounds of health and safety.

2. The total number of dwellings proposed in this planning application (650), taken with that proposed for land owned by Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation (800), exceeds the limit of ‘approximately 1,200’ given in the CNDP by 20.8 per cent. This is not acceptable to the Parish.

3. The Parish Council still maintains that the range of densities proposed (32-45 per hectare) is too high to deliver the design which it would like to see. Even if an average of 25.7 dwellings per hectare is accepted, the revised plan submitted by Deloitte with its letter of 11 December 2013 indicates a massing of housing and, overall, a very urban design. This is contrary to Policy HOU2 in the CNDP. The Council is also concerned to avoid higher densities in order secure its environmental and amenity objectives (CNDP 6.2; ENV6).

4. Significant transport issues, remain to be resolved satisfactorily, particularly those concerning the Thickthorn interchange. The Parish Council urges collaboration between all the parties concerned and the production of an agreed strategy before planning permission can be given. In addition, the Parish Council is concerned that the road network should be adequate to take buses and utility vehicles.

5. The Parish Council’s comments in its letter of 12 March 2014 still apply and in conclusion, the Parish Council argues that this application breaches the CNDP at a number of points and recommends rejection.
Sonia Paris

From: Parish Clerk <colneypc@colneypc.freeserve.co.uk>
Sent: 02 April 2014 18:37
To: Planning
Cc: tim.onoridan@btinternet.com; Bee Korn; georgestedman@hotmail.com; graham@gandhmartin.freeserve.co.uk; Christopher Kemp; Garry Wheatley (external); judith.virgo@norfolk.gov.uk; ABarnes
Subject: Colney Parish Meeting response to Planning applications: 2013/1793 & 2013/1494
Attachments: Colney Parish Meeting letter to Chris Watts SNC re planning applications 2013-1793 2013 - 1494.docx

For the attention of Chris Watts, Design Officer, Growth and Localism, South Norfolk Council.
Please place this response on the SNC planning website.

Colney Parish Meeting wishes to express its solidarity with Cringleford Parish Council in its opposition to the combined proposed development of 1450 houses on the Newfound Farm site.

Cringleford Parish Council created an official Neighbourhood Development Plan which was accepted by the Examiner on the basis of a formal enquiry. This Plan is intended to be a definitive statement as to what allocation of housing the Parish was prepared to tolerate. This is a democratically created local policy which has the mandate of the Cringleford residents.

The Examiner noted that "approximately 1200 houses" would be tolerated in the agreed final Neighbourhood Plan, bearing in mind the submission of the Parish Council that no more than 1200 houses would be acceptable.

Colney Parish Meeting believes, as does the Cringleford Parish Council, that the combined proposed development of 1450 homes on this combined site goes far beyond any normal definition of "approximately".

The Meeting therefore joins with Cringleford Parish Council in objecting to this proposal on the grounds that the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan is a democratically agreed document which must guide the South Norfolk Development Management Committee.

Furthermore the proposed planning application deviates for agreed landscape and buffer open landscape policies built into the Joint Core Strategy. Even though the Examiner noted that the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan was broadly in agreement with the Joint Core Strategy, Colney Parish Meeting wishes to make it clear that it also opposes this combined development on landscape, density and open space grounds.

There are other areas of objection made by the Meeting in a separate letter to the SNDC Development Management Committee. This letter is attached to this note of the meeting.

Hazel Martin
Colney Parish Clerk
Colney Parish Meeting

4 Church Farm
Colney
Norwich
NR4 7TX
01603 457189
2.04.14

Dear Mr Watts,


Colney Parish objects to both the above applications for the following reasons:

- The proposals are contrary to recommendations made by South Norfolk Council regarding the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and Strategic and Important Gaps between the villages of Colney, Cringleford, Hethersett and Little Melton.
- Housing: a minimum of 1200 (CNDP/JCS); 1600 – 2200 Barratt/Land Fund. Cringleford concerns plus 400 houses yet to be built remaining from 1100 allocation. Total new houses; minimum 1600, maximum 2600. Most on green field sites, mainly productive farmland. Current number of houses in Cringleford 1200; at a minimum Cringleford would double in size and potentially treble.
- Traffic implications: new traffic -11,000 - 16,000 per day. Even the minimum increase will directly and adversely affect traffic flows through Colney, Keswick, Intwood, Eaton, Earlham and Bowthorpe with adverse knock-on effects on traffic through Hethersett, Little Melton, and Bawburgh.
- Colney Lane-Roundhouse Way is the only access to the NNUH and NRP. The increase in traffic will also be detrimental to access to the regional hospital and research park in Colney. The implications of such effects do not appear to be clearly spell out to many of these communities. Issues raised by both the Highways Authority and Highways Agency still appear to be unresolved.
- The County, City and District ecologists have expressed concerns about the adverse effects of these proposals and although the Environment Agency has no objection it feels more studies should be carried out.

- Colney Parish endorses the objections and concerns raised by Cringleford Parish and other consultees on traffic, landscape and the environment to the planning applications by Barratt and Land Fund.
• It seems clear that consultation on the implications of these proposals do not appear to have been adequately presented to the wider communities affected

• The consultation process is therefore inadequate and further consultations are required before any application is determined.

On a related matter; congratulations are due to Cringleford Parish Council on the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan, (CNDP). The production of such a professional document clearly shows a great deal of thought and effort. However, on the key issues of the number of houses proposed, traffic and other issues, essentially the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan can do little more than implement decisions made in the Joint Core Strategy and by South Norfolk Council.

The detailed responses to these applications made by Cringleford Parish Council on such issues raise concerns about potential liabilities. The cost of producing a Neighbourhood Plan is considerable but is it intended that parishes employ or train fully qualified planners and assume the responsibility arising from disputes with developers or other councils? The financial liabilities could be considerable.

Yours sincerely,

Hazel Martin
Parish Clerk

Email: colneypc@colneypc.freeserve.co.uk
David/Rob,

Further to our meeting last week I have now had the opportunity to review the Technical Note 01 from Parson Brinkerhoff dated 16 October 2013. I confirm I am in agreement with its content and comments and in particular the current lack of transport assessment for the A47/A11 Thickthorn interchange. In my view the Secretary of State will be unable to make an informed decision with regard to any affect this development proposal may have on the Strategic Road Network until such time as this assessment has been carried out and presented to the Highways Agency for review.

The Agency has issued a TR110 holding direction which is in force until 29 November 2013. It is unlikely that the required assessment will be provided and reviewed before that date and therefore I anticipate it will be necessary to extend the holding direction. I will therefore formally issue such further direction as it becomes necessary.

I would point out that there has been study work done by Norfolk County Council on the possible options for improvements to the Thickthorn Interchange in order to accommodate addition capacity requirements brought about by the current JCS and development proposals from which trips are likely to use Thickthorn Interchange in the future. The current options will require the use of some land on which the current development proposal is intending for use as housing. You are I believe aware of this issue and I request that you take this into consideration and discuss with Norfolk County Council in order that a way forward can be established or alternative options for additional capacity at Thickthorn can be agreeably formulated.

For completeness and clarity I attach the Parson Brinkerhoff Technical Note 01 in its entirety for your information and assistance in production of the necessary Transport Assessment.

Regards

Roger

Roger Chenery, Asset Manager, Asset Development Team
Highways Agency | Woodlands | Marston Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW
Tel: +44 (0) 1234 796008 | Mobile: + 44 (0) 7710 958380
Web: http://www.highways.gov.uk
GTN: 3013 6008

Safe roads, reliable journeys, informed travellers
Highways Agency, an executive agency of the Department for Transport.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On
leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) has been commissioned by the Highways Agency (HA) to undertake a review of the Transport Assessment (TA) and Framework Travel Plan submitted by Cannon Consulting Engineers on behalf of the developer Land Fund Ltd.

1.1.2 This is for a planning application for a proposed residential-led development for 650 dwellings (up to 1950 occupants) and 2,600sqm for community and local retail uses on land west of Cringleford, South Norfolk.

1.1.3 The site is located to the west of the settlement boundary of the village of Cringleford. The A47 forms the western and southern boundaries to the site, with agricultural land beyond this. A11 Newmarket Road runs through the site in an east-west direction, dividing it into two distinct parcels. The total site is approximately 45 hectares in size.

1.1.4 The Strategic Road Network (SRN) of concern to the Highways Agency (HA) is the A47 and the A11 namely:
- A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange – 5- arm roundabout junction
- A11 Newmarket Road/ Round House Way Roundabout – 3- arm roundabout

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

2.1.1 The following provides a summary of the TA review.

Development Proposal

2.1.2 The proposal is for a residential led mixed use development comprising the following elements:
- Up to 650 dwellings, of which up to 30% will be affordable units;
- 2,600sqm floor area use A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1

2.1.3 Main site access proposed off the A11 Newmarket Road at the roundabout junction with Round House Way. It is also proposed to create a new fourth arm at this junction; this will provide a direct access to the south of the A11 Newmarket Road development area.

2.1.4 There are proposal to make improvements to the walking and cycling facilities within the development area which do not impact on the A11 Newmarket Road.

2.1.5 Bus service improvements are proposed but no concrete evidence.
2.1.6 Parking is stated as per NCC Parking Standards but no numbers confirmed on how many will be provided.

2.1.7 Paragraph 4.5.1 of the TA states - Figure 5 shows the study area as agreed with Norfolk County Council but it shows the survey location plan. This should be corrected and study area plan provided.

Traffic Count Data

2.1.8 While MCC data has been provided for the various junctions in the study area, the observed count data does not appear to have been provided within the appendices for the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange. This information should be provided so that we can check these against the traffic flow diagrams in Appendix F.

Traffic Growth

2.1.9 Having reviewed the TEMPRO growth factors used to apply growth to the 2012 base figures the factors appear to be a little high. The slight difference is likely to be down to the specific methods used to adjust planning assumptions to remove the 700 dwellings in TEMPRO. Despite the slightly high growth factors in the TA these are still felt to be realistic, therefore we confirm that these are acceptable.

Trip Generation

2.1.10 We are content that the TRICS trip rates for the proposed residential, retail floorspace and community centre are correct. On initial inspection there does not appear to be an obvious correlation between the retail trip rates contained in the TRICS outputs in Appendix I and those in table 7.9 of the TA. We now understand that the Phase 1 and Phase 4 trip rates in table 8 only apply to the trips rates for 'local store' and that a 30% reduction has been applied (assumed to account for internalisation) which is a reasonable assumption.

2.1.11 Since trip rates for a convenience store are included in Appendix I we would request clarification that a convenience store does not therefore form part of the overall development in this application.

Traffic distribution

2.1.12 Despite the correct traffic generation and census data analysis we are not able to fully match how the traffic which has been assigned to the network and some of the development traffic appears to be missing. We would request that the original spreadsheet database is provided in order to check the resultant distribution and assignment of traffic onto the local highway network.

Committed Development

2.1.13 Section 6.3 of the TA states following developments are included;

- Roundhouse Park Residential Development
- Norwich Research Park
- Hethersett Residential Development

Travel Plan (TP) Summary

2.1.14 Section 9 of the TA provides a summary of the TP, has pages missing and therefore incomplete.

Thickthorn Interchange Improvements
PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

2.1.15 Section 5 of the TA – Highway and Transport Infrastructure proposals talks about Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) model for Thickthorn Interchange and states that this is one of a number of junctions that would see a significant increase in traffic demand.

2.1.16 Section 5.3 states that Mott MacDonald has been retained by NCC and commissioned to review the interchange studies undertaken by both NCC and HA to date and to consider these in terms of viable off-line option.

2.1.17 A preferred option (Option 13 A11 East to West Bypass shown in Appendix E of the TA) was considered to be the best option.

2.1.18 It is stated in paragraph 5.5.2 that this is a concept scheme and does not represent a formal preferred route which is some way off being confirmed.

2.1.19 Regarding this comment made above if this scheme is to be promoted in the future then it will impact on the developers proposal as this scheme will cut through the southern end of the developers proposals.

Capacity Assessment

2.1.20 Paragraph 4.7.4 of the TA states:

- "The capacity of the following junctions were not assessed using the 2013 base year flows or in the future 2026 scenario as early transport modelling for 700 dwellings has shown that there was not a significant increase in traffic flows at these junctions resulting from the development;"

- A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange

2.1.21 No evidence has been provided to confirm that there is no significant impact at this junction. This should be provided as part of the planning application as this cannot be assessed or commented upon.

2.1.22 Merg/merge assessments have been provided and these show no impact with development traffic in 2026.

2.1.23 Impact assessments have been undertaken on several junctions in the vicinity of the proposed development but the ones that impact the strategic Road Network (SRN) have been reviewed. These are as listed below:

- A11 Newmarket Road / Round House Way
- A11 Off-Slip / Colney Lane

A11 Newmarket Road/Round House Way

2.1.24 Assessment of the future year has been presented for the 2026 Base+ Committed and for Base+ Committed+ Development scenarios. The results show that the theoretical capacity will be exceeded in both cases. The Ratio to Flow Capacity (RFC) from the base to with development scenario show that the increase is predicted to be from 1.02 to 1.08 and queues are predicted to increase from 56.3 vehicles to 116.7 vehicles on the A11 Newmarket Road (West) link. Likewise the average delays are also predicted to increase from 57.9 seconds to 129.9 seconds.

2.1.25 A Traffic signal control (i.e LinSig) assessment has been undertaken and the results show that the proposed 4 arm signalised junction will operate within theoretical capacity. The maximum Degree of Saturation (DoS) is predicted to be 82.3% and queues will be 13.10 pceu and
average delays predicted to be 17.6 seconds for the AM peak on the A11 Newmarket Road (West). For the PM peak the DoS on the A11 Newmarket Road (East) is predicted to be 67%, queues of 11.6 pence and average delay of 20.8 seconds.

A11 Off-Slip / Colney Lane

This has been assessed for 2026 for without development and results show that theoretical capacity will be exceeded. No assessment has been undertaken for with development as there is a link provided from Round House Park Roundabout to facilitate access.

3 FRAMEWORK TRAVEL PLAN

3.1.1 A Framework Residential Travel Plan has been provided and has been done in accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) document ‘Making Residential Travel Plans Work: Good Practice Guidelines’ (September 2006).

3.1.2 Paragraph 2.2.2 of the framework residential travel plan – states “Figure 2 shows walk-time cordons from the site to key local destinations” but this is not the case, this should be provided.

3.1.3 The Framework Residential Travel Plan should expand to incorporate the retail element of the proposed development.

3.1.4 The Framework Travel Plan should be agreed and undertaken in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) before occupation including a named Travel Plan Coordinator.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

3.1.5 A construction management plan should be put in place before construction and agreed with all parties as to the routing and timings of construction traffic.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1.1 As this review demonstrates, we are largely content with the technical work undertaken to support the application for the land west of Gringleford, south Norfolk.

4.1.2 The overall methodology is generally acceptable.

4.1.3 We recommend that the following is included:

- Junction operational assessment is undertaken for the A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange in order that the impacts can be assessed and any mitigations agreed. A holding Direction is recommended.

- Consideration should be given to the Thickthorn Interchange Improvements Study undertaken by Mott MacDonald as to the likely impact on the proposed development.

- A Travel Plan incorporating all elements of the proposed developments should be agreed and undertaken in accordance with NPPF before occupation and targets agreed.

- A Construction Management Plan to be agreed before any works start.

- A holding Direction should be put in place until the A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange improvements and mitigations are agreed or a way forward has been agreed.
From: Cheney, Roger <roger.chenery@highways.gsi.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 November 2013 11:17
To: Planning
Cc: Christopher Watts; Higgins, David; Bates, David; Rob Evans
Subject: Land at Cringleford - application ref 2013/1494
Attachments: SMRT_42313112011060.pdf

Please find attached a letter and TR110 dated 19 & 20 November 2013 respectively regarding the above application.

Roger Chenery, Asset Manager, Asset Development Team
Highways Agency | Woodlands | Marston Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW
Tel: +44 (0) 1234 796006 | Mobile: +44 (0) 7710 958380
Web: http://www.highways.gov.uk
GTN: 3013 6008

Safe roads, reliable journeys, informed travlers
Highways Agency, an executive agency of the Department for Transport.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intrnet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Dear Mr Watts,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 2010.
PLANNING APPLICATION:- 2013/1494
PROPOSAL:- OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED (SAVE ACCESS) FOR CREATION OF 650 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C), UP TO 2,500 SQ M OF USE CLASSES A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 & D1 FLOORSPACE, TOGETHER WITH HIGHWAY WORKS, LANDSCAPING, PUBLIC REALM, CAR PARKING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS.
LOCATION:- LAND EAST OF A47, WEST OF ROUND HOUSE WAY AND NORTH OF A11.

Further to my letter of 26 September 2013 I write to confirm the Highways Agency position on the above application.

As you will know from my email of 30 October 2013 to David Bates and Rob Evans of Cannon Consulting, I have pointed out that there is, as yet, no assessment carried out for the Thickthorn junction which demonstrates the likely affect of vehicular trips generated by the proposed development. I will need this in order to form an opinion on the proposal with regard to the continued capacity and safety of the Strategic Road Network.

Since receipt of the above application, a further application has come forward for dwelling houses on adjoining land – Land south west of Newfound Farm, Colney Lane, Cringleford, your reference 2013/1793. In my view it would be appropriate for Cannon Consulting to provide a sensitivity test which includes the vehicular traffic likely to be produced by the Newfound Farm 2013/1793 application as well as that for 2013/1494 application in order that the Highways Agency can know the likely cumulative effect of these applications should you be minded to grant both.

It would be an advantage to all parties if both applicants can work together to provide any mitigation necessary for both applications collectively. Your authority could then
work with Norfolk County Council, the Highways agency and the applicants in understanding the cumulative effect and agree suitable planning conditions, as necessary, which address the requirements of the authorities involved.

I would point out that Norfolk County Council have emerging proposals to make improvements to the Thickthorn junction in order that its capacity is able to accommodate likely future growth in the area. The improvements will utilise some of the land included for proposed housing in the 2013/1494 application. It will be necessary for the applicant to demonstrate an alternative improvement to Thickthorn that delivers similar future capacity to that proposed by Norfolk County Council if the land is to be used for residential dwellings as, clearly the land cannot be used for both purposes.

The current holding direction issued on 26 September 2013 remains valid until 29 November 2013. It is clear that additional material could not be produced and reviewed by that date, I therefore attach a further TR110 directing that planning permission should not be granted until 17 January 2014. Should I be able to make a decision before that date I will respond accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Roger Chenery
Network Delivery & Development (East)
Email: roger.chenery@highways.gsi.gov.uk

cc: David Bates - Cannon Consulting
    Rob Evans - Cannon Consulting
    David Higgins - Norfolk CC
Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads
Highways Agency Response to an Application for Planning Permission


To: South Norfolk

Council’s Reference: 2013/1494

Referring to the notification of a planning application dated 25 September 2013 your reference 2013/1494 in connection with the A47 & A11 trunk roads. Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for creation of 650 residential dwellings (use class c), up to 2,500 sq m of use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 & D1 floor space, together with highway works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

Location: - land east of A47, west of round house way and north of A11, notice is hereby given under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 that the Secretary of State for Transport:-

a) offers no objection;

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

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

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

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

(delete as appropriate)

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 20 November 2013

Signature:

Name: ALAN KIRKDALE
Position: ASSET DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

The Highways Agency: Woodlands, Manton Lane, Bedford MK41 7LW
Annex A

Reason(s) for the direction given at b), c) or d) overleaf and the period of time for a direction at e) when directing that the application is not to be granted for a specified period:

There is currently insufficient evidence to enable the Secretary of State to form an informed decision on the application and its likely affects on the Strategic Road Network. This holding direction is to allow sufficient time for that evidence to be produced and reviewed by the Secretary of State.

This direction shall remain in force until 17 January 2014.
Ann Arnold

From: Chenery, Roger <roger.chenery@highways.gsi.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 January 2014 15:43
To: Planning: Christopher Watts
Cc: 'Rob Evans'; 'David Bates'; 'Higgins, David'; richard.doleman@norfolk.gov.uk;
    'Parkes, Ian'
Subject: Application 2013/1494 - 800 Dwellings Land East of A47, West of Round House Way, North of A11, Cringleford, Norwich
Attachments: Response letter & TR110.pdf, PB TN2 - Land West of Cringleford Norwich.docx,
            CCETechnical Note 002 14 01 14.pdf

FAQ Mr Chris Watts,

As promised in our meeting on 17 January 2014 please find attached my letter and TR110 together with the HA review of transport assessment in the form of Technical Note from Parsons Brinckerhoff dated 15 January 2014 (PB TN2). Additionally I also attach Cannon Consulting Technical Note 002 (CCETechnical Note) dated 14 January 2014 which assisted Parsons Brinckerhoff with some information prior to issue of their review.

Roger Chenery, Asset Manager, Asset Development Team
Highways Agency | Woodlands | Manton Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW
Tel: +44 (0) 1234 786008 | Mobile: +44 (0) 7710 959390
Web: http://www.highways.gov.uk
GTN: 3013 6008

Safe roads, reliable journeys, informed travellers
Highways Agency, an executive agency of the Department for Transport.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
Dear Mr Chris Watts

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 2010
PLANNING APPLICATION: 2013/1494
PROPOSAL: Erection of 700 dwellings
LOCATION: Land East of A47, West Round House Way, North of A11 Cringleford Housing Development

Further to my letter dated 19 November 2013 I have since received further documentation from the applicant regarding forecast traffic modelling of A11/A47 Thickthorn junction and proposed highway mitigation for the effects of traffic from the development proposed.

I have reviewed this latest information and for completeness and clarity I attach the review from my consultant, Parsons Brinckerhoff, in the form of a Technical Note 02 dated 15 January 2014.

There are a number of items in the Technical Note 02 related to traffic modelling, modelling outputs which suggest queues may be forecast to be longer than the space available and areas of the design of the mitigation where I am currently unsure of land requirements and ownership. I have taken these matters up in more detail directly with the applicant’s representatives in an email earlier today.

I understand that your authority have an extension of time arranged for this application which currently expires on 26 February 2014. For simplicity and to allow time to produce amendments and agree the outcomes of any further demonstrations necessary, I attach a further holding direction TRR110 which is valid until 26 February 2014. Should matters be concluded earlier I will confirm accordingly.

Yours Sincerely

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

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

To: South Norfolk Council

Council's Reference: 2013/1494


a) offers no objection;

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

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

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

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

(direct as appropriate)

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 20 January 2014

Signature: [Signature]

Name: ALAN KIRKDALE

Position: ASSET DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

The Highways Agency:
2nd Floor,
Woodlands,
Manton Lane,
Bedford, MK41 7LW
Reason for direction given at e)

To allow time for amendments & further agreement in order that Secretary of State can form a decision.

The direction shall remain valid until 28 February 2014
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) has been commissioned by the Highways Agency (HA) to review the additional information and technical note dated 12th December 2013 provided by Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE) with respect to the development known as Land West of Cringleford. The first PB/HA technical note response (Technical Note 01 dated 15th October 2013) followed a review of the CCE Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

1.1.2 This CCE technical note addresses previously raised queries in relation to trip generation, distribution, and the Travel Plan. It also now includes an assessment of the junction A11/A47 Thickhorn interchange.

2 TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

2.1.1 Our comments on CCE’s recent technical note submission are as follows.

Development Proposal

2.1.2 We are content with the evidence that the first bus service number 11 can be rerouted to potentially accommodate 340 dwellings and 2,000sqm of retail use. We are also satisfied that this proposal has been included in the Travel Plan, which will encourage residents to use sustainable modes of transport. We would support the delivery of this through the proposed S106 agreement.

2.1.3 We understand that parking numbers will not be included at this stage in the planning process. We recommend that the local authority parking standards are referenced when deciding on the number of spaces.

2.1.4 CCE have provided figure 5 stated in paragraph 4.5.1, which now correctly shows the Study Area of the local highway network.

Traffic Count Data

2.1.5 The observed count data has been provided within the appendices of the Technical Note for the A11/A47 Thickhorn Interchange. We are content that this data correctly matches the traffic flow diagrams in Appendix F.

Trip Generation

2.1.6 Our original confusion with the trip generation related to the fact the CCE appendices contained two separate trip rates for retail, one for a convenience store and one for local shops. However, the resultant retail trip generation figures in Table 7.9 only correlated to the trip rates for local retail. If the development proposals do then propose to include a
convenience store than we were confused as to why the convenience store trips rates were not applied.

2.1.8 CCE attempted to highlight that if phase 1 consisted of 900sqm of amalgamated retail units and only 100sqm of convenience store then the additional trip generation from 100sqm using the convenience store trip rate is minimal. We would argue that because the convenience store trip rates are higher, if the actual development consists of a higher level of convenience store floor area coming forward than the resultant trip generation would be considerably higher. Thus we would request that the reserved matters application should clarify the exact extent of the convenience store floor area.

2.1.9 We are content that the TRICS trip rates for the proposed residential development are reasonable.

Traffic distribution

2.1.10 The original spreadsheet was provided with rounding errors corrected.

2.1.11 The trip distribution and development traffic appears to have been correctly assigned to the network following receipt of Appendix D.

Travel Plan (TP) Summary

2.1.12 The two missing pages of Section 9 of the TA have been included providing a summary of the Travel Plan. Our comments on the Travel Plan are provided towards the end of this note.

Capacity Assessment Review

2.1.13 We initially provided a review of the following LinSig models of the Thicketthorn Interchange have been reviewed:

- Model 1: 2013.11.17 Thicketthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp NATS Flows
- Model 2: 2013.11.17 Thicketthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp AdjTemp NFF.
- Model 3: 2013.12.18 Thicketthorn AECOM Model + Bidwells Improvement + CCE Option 1 All Scenarios
- Model 4: 2013.12.18 Thicketthorn AECOM Model + Bidwells Improvement + CCE Option 2 All Scenarios

2.1.14 In the first instance we were unsure as to the purpose of Model 1 (2013.11.17 Thicketthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp NATS Flows). Following recent communication from CCE we understand that CCE have simply taken the results of the Bidwells Hatherstts 2026 base scenario, transferred them into scenario 1 of table 1 in the CCE technical note and produced their own replica of the Thicketthorn Interchange to then create the with development scenario (scenario 2).

2.1.15 While it appears as though CCE’s proposed Options 1 and 2 mitigate the impact of Cingleford and NFF development traffic, scenario 1 actually contains the results from the Bidwells model. Ideally CCE need to have produced their own CCE 2026 base LinSig ‘without’ Cingleford and NFF development and then use this as a basis with which to compare the CCE mitigation options. CCE state that the approval they have undertaken is one agreed with the HA.
2.1.16 It was initially assumed that model 2 (2013.11.17 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp Adj Temp NFF) was the base model for the scheme (as described in the second bullet point on Page 5 of the CCE's response to PB TN 01). The model, however, does not conform to the layout in Drawing TR 0021 as expected, but includes part of the proposed Option 1 mitigation measure (i.e. increasing the number of lanes exiting to A11 eastbound from two to three).

2.1.17 CCE have since confirmed that the wrong model was sent through for the 2026 base + development scenario and have since sent through a revised file. The correct file is titled 'Attachment 3 CCE 2026 Base Plus Committed Dev plus LF DEV plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp'. The results were also subsequently updated and incorporated into a new CCE technical note dated 14th January 2014.

2.1.18 Following receipt of the correct model for scenario 2 we are content that the flows have been correctly input into the 2026 base + development Linsig model and that the network layout generally represents the existing highway network plus Hethersett south section 4 lane improvement.

2.1.19 In terms of the Model 3 (2013.12.18 Thickthorn AECOM Model + Bidwells Improvement + CCE Option 1) we have the following comments to make:

a) Some predicted circulatory lane queues may be excessively long for the available stacking room. For example:
   - Lanes 8/1, 9/2, 12/3+12/4 in the AM peak;
   - Lane 10/3 in the AM and PM peak
   - Lane 12/1 in the PM peak
   These queues could, in actuality, periodically constrain upstream traffic entering or leaving the roundabout. This would invalidate the results provided as the degree of saturation for the entry arms would inevitably increase. We would recommend that before the junction mitigation is approved, these queues are considered further and the model optimisation adjusted where there may be a significant risk of upstream congestion.

b) The Option 1 additional lane on the A47 northbound off-slip has been modelled as a long lane, instead of a flare as in Model 4. This could lead to the results for this lane being somewhat optimistic in terms of capacity. It is believed, therefore, that the lane should be modelled as a flare.

2.1.20 In terms of Model 4 (2013.12.18 Thickthorn AECOM Model + Bidwells Improvement + CCE Option 2 All Scenarios) we have the following comments to make.

a) Some predicted circulatory lane queues may be excessively long for the available stacking room. For example:
   - Lanes 7/2 and 7/3 in the AM peak;
   - Lanes 8/1 and 8/4 in the AM peak;
   - Lane 10/2 and 10/3 in the AM and PM peaks

2.1.21 As in the case with Model 3, we suggest that these queues are considered further and the model optimisation adjusted to ameliorate any significant risk of upstream congestion.

2.1.22 Unlike Model 3, which models the additional lane on the A47 northbound off-slip as a long lane (see Model 3, comment b)), Model 4 uses a flared lane 26 PCUs long (about 150m). Although it is believed that using a flare is the more accurate approach, the flare shown in the Option 1 & 2 drawing appears to be only about 120m long.
Review of Thickthorn Interchange Highway Improvement:

2.1.23 PB have undertaken a DMRB design check for capacity improvement works at the A47/A11 Thickthorn Roundabout proposed through Options 1 & 2 as shown in CCE in drawing GB871/014. This has been reviewed against the standards listed below. It should be noted that these comments are on the basis that the revised capacity assessment is approved and the Option 1 and 2 proposed by CCE are taken forward:

- DMRB TD9/03 – Highway Link Design
- DMRB TD16/07 – Geometric Design of Roundabouts
- DMRB TD42/95 – Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions
- DMRB TD50/04 – The Geometric Layout of Signal-controlled Junctions and Signalised Roundabouts
- DMRB TA78/97 – Design of Road Markings at Roundabouts

Proposed improvement works:

2.1.24 Following a review of the 1:1000 scale drawing provided in the technical note and looking at Google Streetview photos and OS mapping, we have the following observations:

a) Addition of a fourth lane on the A47 NB Exit slip road approach to the roundabout, with associated widening of a section of the circulating carriageway towards the A11 WB;

b) Signalisation of the B1172 EB approach to the roundabout and introduction of new traffic signals within the circulating carriageway between the A11 EB arm and the A47 NB entry slip road;

c) Alteration of the lane destination markings on the EB northern quadrant of the roundabout circulating carriageway;

d) Widening of the circulating carriageway between the A47 SB exit slip road and the A11 EB entry arm in order to cater for the increased capacity modelling proposals (three lane entry onto the A11 EB carriageway).

2.1.25 We note that the mapping used for illustration on this drawing is not accurate as it doesn’t represent the current existing junction layout, hence the following DMRB check and comparison has been made based on aerial photos and updated OS mapping.

Widening of the A47 NB exit slip road approach

2.1.26 The proposal is to add a fourth lane (approx 150m) on the nearside verge of the existing slip road, from a point beyond the exit from the service road junction, up to the traffic signal stop line and to amend the circulating carriageway nearside kerbline between the A47 NB slip road and the A11 WB carriageway to accommodate this new extra lane.

2.1.27 The information provided on the drawing is basic and does not show any specific geometric details or notes in respect to this proposal. However, the proposed solution is generally acceptable at this stage but we would recommend the following considerations to be taken into account for the next stages of design:

2.1.28 The new lane width should be determined in accordance with DMRB TD 27/06 and to be consistent with the current slip road cross section configuration and traffic capacity requirements. The new four-lane slip road width should not exceed the width of a four-lane section of the circulating carriageway.

2.1.29 The new lane verge may require some widening near the stop lines and around the new LHS corner radii – in order to achieve adequate SSD and forward visibility to the traffic signals (TD 50/04).
2.1.30 Re-consideration of the drainage system will have to be addressed and vegetation removal will need to occur to the landscape earth bund in the nearside verge. Agreement needs to be sought from the Environment Agency (EA) and local authorities prior to any proposed site clearance and the limits of the highway boundary will have to be defined and agreed with the HA and local authorities.

2.1.31 Near the top of the slip road, where additional widening is required towards the A11 WB, a diversion and re-alignment of the pedestrian elevated access needs to be carried out, in a manner that will ensure traffic signals inter-visibility splay at a minimum.

2.1.32 As a result of this widening, the existing diverge taper into the service road in the SW quadrant of the roundabout needs to be re-assessed and possibly reduced to a direct taper in order not to clash with the new wider extents of the circulatory carriageway.

2.1.33 Road markings and lane destinations within the carriageway shall be re-defined and applied in accordance with the new layout and operation.

Signalisation of the B1172 EB approach

2.1.34 No comments are made on this proposal as the geometric layout of the slip road and circulatory carriageway are not subject to any amendments. Traffic signals inter-visibility needs to be ensured around the new signalised arms.

Alteration of lane destination markings on the NE quadrant of the circulatory carriageway

2.1.35 No comments are made on this proposal as the geometric layout of the circulatory carriageway is not subject to any amendments.

Widening of the A11 EB exit arm

2.1.36 The proposal is to increase traffic flow capacity within the roundabout by changing the lane destinations and allowing three lanes to head east onto the A11 towards Norwich, instead of two lanes as per the current layout. The proposal is to widen the nearside verge of the NE quadrant of the circulatory carriageway and a section of the A11 EB exit arm and to introduce a third lane which will tie-in with the current configuration layout of the A47 EB link road.

2.1.37 The improvement proposals shown in red outline on the aforementioned drawing show the amendment of the stop line of Newmarket Road, a second lane flare, widening of the nearside verge and tie-into a three-lane A11 EB dual carriageway. Looking at site photos in this area, the A11 is a two-lane carriageway in an easterly direction. We conclude therefore that the representation on the drawing may be erroneous as it implies that, after the improvement works, the A11 will operate as a three-lane dual carriageway. We recommend that this issue be clarified with the promoter of the scheme to ensure the proposed layout will tie-in correctly into the current highway configuration.

2.1.38 The information provided on the drawing is basic and does not show any specific geometric details or notes in respect to this proposal. However, for clarity, we append below a sketch with our understanding of the widening requirements: the three lanes exiting the roundabout onto the A47 EB will be reduced to two-lanes (offside lane-drop) and tie in with the current layout.
2.1.39 For the next stages of design and in order for the HA to be able to determine the application PB recommend that the following matters are addressed for the next stages of design.

2.1.40 The new lane width will need to be determined in accordance with DMRB TD 27/05 and to be consistent with the current carriageway cross section configuration and traffic capacity requirements. The offside lane-drop should follow the recommendations of TD42/85 in respect to the length of the merge.

2.1.41 We do not consider it is necessary to re-align the traffic island on Old Newmarket Road but just the eastern kerbline and corner radii, in order to tie-in with the new lane pavement extents. The alignment of the new lane should follow the swept path of the desired movement path of the three lanes within the circulatory carriageway heading towards the A11 EB.

2.1.42 The introduction of the additional nearside lane will require a re-configuration of existing earth-bund and vegetation clearance to achieve adequate SSD and forward visibility. Agreement needs to be sought from the EA and local authorities prior to any proposed site clearance and the limits of the highway boundary will have to be defined and agreed with the HA and local authorities.

2.1.43 Re-assessment and re-design of the road markings will be required following the re-allocation of lane destination within the roundabout and along the A11 EB.

General comments

2.1.44 Looking at aerial photos and Streetview images we noticed that the current pavement condition is poor, with layers of high friction surfacing peeling off, leaving areas of carriageway exposed to differential braking affects. We would recommend that any improvement scheme at this location should include re-application of high friction surfacing throughout the circulatory carriageway and new wider sections.

3 FRAMEWORK TRAVEL PLAN

3.1.1 We are content that Paragraph 2.2.2 figure 2 of the framework residential travel plan has been corrected to Figure 4 showing walk time cordonics from the site to key local destinations.

3.1.2 We are satisfied that due to the small size of the retail units that a Travel Plan for each one is not necessary. However, the implementation of public notice boards displaying travel
information and way finding signage for the employees/shoppers should be provided in order to encourage sustainable travel from the outset.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

3.1.3 We mentioned in section 3.1.5 of PB technical note 1 that a construction management plan should be put in place before construction and agreed with all parties as to the routing and timings of construction traffic. We would recommend this form part of a condition to read:

The commencement of construction shall not take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan, which shall incorporate adequate provisions to control and manage construction traffic and address any wear and tear to the highway, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (who shall consult with the Highways Agency on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport and with Norfolk County Council). Construction of the development will then be carried out in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: To ensure that construction of the development hereby permitted does not impact detrimentally on the safe and efficient operation of the A47 and A11 trunk roads.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1.1 The reserved matters application should clarify the exact extent of the convenience store floor area as the current assessment is likely to be underestimated the level of traffic that will be generated by the overall retail land use.

4.1.2 A Construction Traffic Management Plan should be agreed before any development works start. A condition of which is proposed.

4.1.3 Although it appears as though CCE’s proposed Options 1 and 2 mitigate the impact of Cingleford and NFF development traffic we are only able to compare the results against the Bidwells base model, which is a different model to the various scenarios tested by CCE.

4.1.4 Ideally CCE need to have produced their own CCE 2025 base line with Gringleford and NFF development and then use this as a basis with which to compare the CCE mitigation options.

4.1.5 Some circulatory lane flows may be excessive and could, in actuality, cause upstream congestion. In the models, it can lead to over-optimistic results for the roundabout entries. Consideration should be given to re-optimising the Models 3 and 4 to ameliorate any significant risk of upstream congestion.

4.1.6 The Option 1, additional A47 northbound off-slip lane has been modelled as a long lane in Model 3 and as a flare in Model 4. A flare would be more accurate but the Model 4 flare appears to be significantly longer than in the supplied drawing which should be revised and the results revised.

4.1.7 A DMRB design check has been undertaken on the proposed Option 1 & 2 improvements at the Thickthorn Roundabout on the A47/A11 at Cingleford. The preliminary design proposals for this junction are considered to be broadly acceptable at this stage, however a number of comments/recommendations have been provided that should be considered addressed.

4.1.8 The proposed layout will also need to be subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) which should be completed prior to the detailed design phase to assess the need for any further optioneering.

4.1.9 A holding direction is recommended until the A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange improvements and mitigations are agreed but PB will liaise with all parties to help resolve all outstanding issues as quickly as possible.
INTRODUCTION

1. This Technical Note has been prepared by Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE) to provide additional information following a request from PB who is reviewing Technical Note 1 on behalf of the Highways Agency.

2. The additional information requested is as follows;
   • To provide the PCU traffic flow diagrams that were used in the LinSIG Models.
   • Clarify which LinSIG model matches with each column in Table 1 and 2 of TN001;
   • Clarify why the results / model for the CCE 2026 Base plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 lane Imp scenario do not match. In addition it appears that the scenario includes the CCE improvement; and

3. Traffic flow diagram PCU9 (2026 Base Adj + Committed + Development + New Found Farm) shows the PCU flows that have been used in the assessment of scenarios 2, 3 and 4. PCUs have been calculated using the observed classified turning count survey. These were factored to 2026 and Committed and Development traffic added to form future traffic profile. Traffic flow diagrams PCU1 and PCU2 show the 2013 base and 2026 base in PCUs. Traffic flow diagrams are contained at Attachment 1.

4. For ease of reference, an additional row has been included at the start of Table 1 and 2 which shows a number for each scenario. The results for each scenario have been taken from the following source or LinSIG Model:
   • Scenario 1 – The results have been taken from the AECOM/HA Tech Note 009 (Dec 12), see Attachment 2
   • Scenario 2 – The results in the table have been updated, in Table 1 and 2, to reflect the correct base model. These results have been taken from the LinSIG model CCE 2026 Base plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp, see Attachment 3; and
   • Scenarios 3 and 4 – the results have been taken from LinSIG models 2013.12.18 Thickthorn AECOM Model + Bidwells Improvement + CCE Option 1 All Scenarios & CCE Option 2 All Scenarios. These have been sent previously and discussed with David Holdaway at PB.

5. Scenario 2 has been updated, in Tables 1 and 2, to reflect the corresponding LinSIG file.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>CCC 2026 Base Plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp</th>
<th>CCC 2026 Base Plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp Mitigation</th>
<th>CCC 2026 Base Plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp Mitigation Option 1</th>
<th>CCC 2026 Base Plus Committed Dev plus LF Dev plus NFF Dev inc Hethersett 4 Lane Imp Mitigation Option 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>NCC 2032 Thickthorn Improvement Mort Max Option 13 T7.15 pg 76-77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidwell Lane 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (E) Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (E) Ahead/Right Lane 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (E) Right Lane 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside /middle Lane 3</td>
<td>4 or 6</td>
<td>4 or 14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1172 left Lane 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1172 Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1172 Ahead Lane 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - A14 Southbound Offside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A147 Southbound Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket Road Lane 1</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P - Newmarket Road (Old)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A11 (W) Left Lane 1</th>
<th>A11 (W) Ahead Lane 2</th>
<th>A11 (W) Ahead / Right Lane 3</th>
<th>A11 (W) Ahead Right Lane 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E - A11 Westbound**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</th>
<th>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</th>
<th>Circulatory Offside Lane 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F - A47 N(M) Off-Slip**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A47 N(M) Left Lane 1 (Cp 1&amp;2 Spits over 2 Ln)</th>
<th>A47 N(M) Ahead / Right Lane 2</th>
<th>A47 N(M) Right Lane 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2: LINSIG Model Results PM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE Modelled Storage Length (pct)</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE Measured Storage Length (pct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A - A13 Last bound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (E) Left Lane 1</td>
<td>A11 (E) Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (E) Ahead/Right Lane 3</td>
<td>A11 (F) Right Lane 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside (middle) Lane 3</td>
<td>4 or 6</td>
<td>4 or 14</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSET Improvement Lane 4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B - B1172 Norwich Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1172 Left Lane 1</td>
<td>B1172 Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1172 Ahead / Right Lane 3</td>
<td>B1172 Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C - A47 Southend and Offlip</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 5th Left Lane 1</td>
<td>A47 5th Ahead Lane 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 5th Left / Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td>A47 5th Left Lane 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 5th Offlip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Newmarket Road (Old)</td>
<td>E - A11 Westbound</td>
<td>F - A47 NBlk Off Slip</td>
<td>HSEt Improvement Lane 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ahead / Right Lane 3</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>95.3</strong></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket Road Lane 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (W) Left Lane 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (W) Ahead Lane 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (W) Ahead / Right Lane 3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11 (W) Ahead Right Lane 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 NBlk Left Lane 1 (Dp 182.5pills over 24%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 NBlk Ahead / Right Lane 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47 NBlk Right Lane 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Nearside Lane 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Centre Lane 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulatory Offside Lane 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSEt Improvement Lane 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Management Committee 23 July 2014

Appendix 4D

Highways Agency
Safe roads, reliable journeys, informed travellers.

Our ref: G184054
Your ref: 2013/494

Roger Chenery
2nd Floor
Woodlands
Manton Lane
Bedford MK41 7LW

South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR16 2XE

Direct Line: 01234 798008
1 May 2014

For the attention of Mr Chris Watts

Dear Mr Watts

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 2010
PLANNING APPLICATION: 2013/494
LOCATION: Land East of A47, West Round House Way, North of A11
PROPOSAL: Erection of 700 Dwellings

Further to my letter of 3 April 2014 enclosing a TR110 Holding Direction.

You will know that Norfolk County Council has commissioned a report from their consultants Matt McDonald which was issued on 11 March 2014 entitled A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange Improvement, Impact of Residential Developments at Cringleford. This report identified a number of flaws with the original Cannon Consulting Engineers Transport Assessment in support of the planning application. Similar issues were identified by the Agency in a review of this early submission. Matt MacDonald suggested that having corrected the identified issues and re-run forecast models, the mitigation proposed would not be sufficient to accommodate traffic to 2026 and beyond. Whilst this may be true, the Agency is required to assess development proposals in line with circular 02/2013, The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development which demands assessment at opening year to determine mitigation requirements. With that in mind I have continued my discussions with Cannon Consulting Engineers to produce a more credible assessment.

Cannon Consulting Engineers provided further information on 11 April 2014 which I have now reviewed via my consultants Parsons Brinkerhoff who has provided their view of this latest information in the form of Technical Note 04 dated 24 April 2014. I include the technical note for completeness and transparency reasons. The note is a record of information for the Agency on which I base my formal response to you regarding the planning application and any trunk road highway mitigation required as a result of the development to ensure that the Strategic Road Network continues to operate in a reasonable way.

G184054
I am content that Cannon Consulting Engineers have sufficiently demonstrated that their suggested mitigation measures for Thickthorn Interchange manage forecast traffic flows in a manner such that the effect of the development cannot be said to be severe in accordance with Circular 02/2013.

I am also confident that the mitigation shown on drawing No G871/014 Rev D produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers date 4 April 2014 titled Proposed Thickthorn Improvement (Options 1&2) is of sufficient detail as to not represent significant departures from DMRB and am therefore content to provide the attached TR110 directing the application of appropriate planning conditions which ensure delivery of mitigation at an appropriate threshold as the development progresses. The detailed design will need to comply in all respects with DMRB which will include Road Safety Audits and Non-Motorised User Context Reports which I am content will be dealt with as the design progresses towards S.278 Agreement.

I trust you find the above helpful in terms of the directed planning condition to be applied should your authority be minded to grant permission.

Yours sincerely

Roger Chenery
NDD East Asset Development
Email: roger.chenery@highways.gsi.gov.uk

cc: David Higgins
    Richard Coleman
    Ian Parkes
    NCC (Norfolk County Council)

    Rob Evans
    David Bates
    CCE (Cannon Consulting Engineers)

    David Haddaway
    (Parsons Brinkerhoff)
Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads
Highways Agency Response to an Application for Planning Permission

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

To: Planning & Development Management – South Norfolk Council

Council’s Reference: 2013/1494:

Referring to the notification of a planning application dated 26 September 2013, your reference 2013/1494, in connection with the A47, Erection of 700 Dwellings, Land East of A47, West Round House Way, North of A11, notice is hereby given under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 that the Secretary of State for Transport:-

a) offers no objection;

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

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

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

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

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 15 May 2014

Signature: R. Cottam

Name: Roger Cottam

Position: Asset Development Team

The Highways Agency:  
Woodlands, Manton Lane  
Manton Industrial Estate, Bedford  
MK41 7JW
Annex A

Condition(s) to be attached to any grant of planning permission:

1. No more than 50 dwellings of the permitted development shall be occupied unless and until an agreed design for highway mitigation works at A11/A47 Thickthorn roundabout junction has been approved in writing by planning authority following consultation with Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council as highway authorities. The design shall be substantially in the form of that shown on drawing No G871/014 Rev D dated 4 April 2014 produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers titled Proposed Thickthorn Improvement (options 1&2). The design shall comply in all respects with the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges and shall include the provision of appropriate MOVA traffic signal control as modelled in the Transport Assessment now agreed with the Highways Agency.

2. No more than 100 dwellings of the permitted development shall be occupied unless and until the approved design in 1. Above has been constructed, opened to traffic and certified as such by the planning authority in consultation with the Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council as Highway authorities.

3. No part of the permitted development shall be commenced unless and until a suitable Travel Plan has been approved by the planning authority in consultation with the Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council. The Travel Plan will contain appropriate vehicular trip reduction targets, provision for future administration and monitoring.

Reason(s) for the direction given at 1), 2) & 3)

In order that the A47 and A11 trunk roads continue to perform its function as part of the Strategic Road Network under Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and for the reasonable requirements of road safety on those roads.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) have been providing technical advice to the Highways Agency (HA) with respect to development on Land West of Cringleford and to date have had several rounds of correspondence with Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE), specifically in relation to the modelling of the A47/A11 junction. Further to comments PB provided on 31st March focusing on the revised base model and improvement option, PB received further correspondence from CCE on 11th April including final refinements to the model.

2 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

2.1 Proposed Improvement drawing G371-14 D

2.1.1 The updated drawing includes further widening at the A11 East circulatory link following the additional mitigation and incorporates the necessary road marking requested in previous PB correspondence with CCE.

2.2 Capacity Assessment Review

2.2.2 In the most recent round of correspondence we reviewed the following A47/A11 Thickthorn junction models submitted by CCE:

- Base Model (including the proposed Hethersett capacity improvements) received on 22nd April 2014 (Ref. 2014.04.22 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp AdjTemp NFF REV C Final);
- Option Model comprising the Base Model layout plus the Option capacity improvements proposed in CCE drawing ref. G371/014, received on 11th April 2014 (Ref. 2014.04.11 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Improvement Opto...).

2.1.3 We also reviewed the following flow scenarios:

- Base Model: 2026 AM and PM peak, plus committed development flows, but excluding the Newfound Farm and Cringleford development flows.
- Option Model: 2026 AM and PM peak, plus committed development flows, plus the Newfound Farm and Cringleford development flows.

2.1.4 The review noted that some internal queues were still slightly long, particularly in the Option model AM peak scenario, at the A11 West node. Minor adjustments were made to address these issues. The scenario cycle times were also made the same to allow easier comparison between the models.

2.1.5 The Option and Base model AM and PM peak outputs were compared to determine whether the proposed capacity improvements would fully mitigate the impact of the Newfound Farm and Cringleford Development traffic. As all internal links were operating within capacity, the main constraining influence at the junction in 2026 would be at the entry arms. The entry arm
outputs for the models were thus compared to ensure that the option scenario was no worse than the base scenario capacity wise:

1. In the Option model, the capacity of each entry arm should be equal to, or greater than, that of the Base model plus the development traffic demand flow at each entry.
2. The Degree of Saturation at each entry arm should be no higher in the Option model than in the equivalent Base model scenario.
3. The predicted mean maximum queues in the Option model should be no longer than those in the equivalent Base model scenarios.

2.1.6 It was found that the A47 (North), A11 (East), A47 (South) and A11 (West) arms all satisfied the above conditions in both 2026 peak periods (the Newmarket Road minor arm was not evaluated). The B1172 arm did however perform worse, mainly as a result of the proposed signal control.

2.1.7 We note the following reservations:

1. With the Option model, it was not possible to ensure that the internal circulating queue at the proposed B1172 signal-controlled node would not cause upstream congestion. There would be very little stacking room at the internal stop line with the existing layout. It may be better to consider if, instead, the capacity of the existing priority node could be further improved.
2. Although longer flares on the internal approaches may enhance the stacking room and thus reduce queue lengths back from the stop lines (particularly important in the case of the A47 off-slips) and also allow more traffic to enter during a given green time, ultimately, the capacity of the overall roundabout will be restricted by the capacities of the internal stop lines. Thus, for example, consideration could be given to increasing the A11 (West) internal approach to four full lanes, as is proposed for the A11 (East) node.
3. It is accepted that the proposed measures do not seek to allow the junction to operate fully within capacity with all background traffic. The Option model predicts that it would still be oversaturated by 2026 (and likely much earlier). Further measures would be needed to ensure that it would have sufficient capacity up to 2026 or beyond.

2.1.8 Notwithstanding the likely disbenefit caused by the B1172 signalisation, it is believed that the proposed capacity improvement measures would fully mitigate the Cringleford and Newfound Farm flows. In particular, the risk of A47 off-slip arm queues blocking back on to the upstream A47 main carriageways would be no greater with the Option model measures with development flows, than with the Base model without development flows.

3 NEXT STEPS

Planning Condition

3.1.1 While it may be appropriate for a larger scheme to be implemented at the A47/A11 junction in the future, such as that proposed by Matt MacDonald, in light of the application submitted by CCE for development at Cringleford it would be unreasonable to expect the developer represented by CCE to fund the full cost of a major improvement scheme.

3.1.2 With this in mind we would advise that there are two options available:

1) To condition that the development proceed to deliver the mitigation as identified in drawing GB71 14 D (including the future cost of maintenance which should be paid as a commended lump sum).
2) To condition that the development provide a contribution to the sum of the proposed mitigation as identified in drawing GR71-14-D (including the future cost of maintenance which should be paid as a commuted lump sum), the funds of which could be put towards a more substantial future highway improvement scheme.

3.1.3 As we have previously discussed with CCE, because CCE have included predicted traffic generation associated with development at 'New Found Farm' in their 'with development' scenarios, the improvement proposal effectively mitigates both Cringleford and New Found Farm development traffic. It would be reasonable therefore for the total cost of mitigation to be apportioned to the level of traffic predicted to use the A47/A11 junction from both developments. In the absence of any discussions between both developers on this subject, the full mitigation proposed in this application must be provided by the developers promoting the Land West of Cringleford development. Otherwise, the Highways Agency (HA) will run the risk of a reduced contribution that will not cover the impacts of the Land West of Cringleford development at the junction.

Highways Agency Mitigation Criteria

3.1.4 As previously advised, mitigation measures on the strategic road network will be subject to approval by the appropriate HA operational team. Appendix C of the HA document titled "Protocols for Planning and Development, 2012" provides a checklist of the criteria that must be met before the HA can sign off mitigation proposals requiring works to the highway network.

3.1.5 To summarise this, the next stage will be for CCE to provide the HA with a Non Motorised User Context Report as set out in para 3.6 of HD 42/05 'Non Motorised User Audits'.

3.1.6 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) should then be carried out in accordance with HD19/03, albeit before this:

- The Design Team should prepare a draft Audit Brief for the Stage 1 RSA and send it to the designated HA Project Sponsor for approval. The draft Audit Brief should comply with the requirements of HD19/03 paras 2.61 to 2.63.
- The designated HA Project Sponsor should also be supplied with proposals for the Audit Team, including their relevant qualifications, experience and CPD, for the consideration and approval of the Project Sponsor. This will enable their suitability to be compared against the requirements of HD19/03 (paras 2.54 to 2.59). Para 2.51 of HD 19/03 requires the Project Sponsor to be satisfied as to the independence and competence of the team to undertake the audit. Therefore the Project Sponsor will also require confirmation that the proposed Audit team are independent of the Design Team (HD 19/03 para 2.49).
- The Project Sponsor should also be provided with contact details for the proposed Audit Team Leader.
- It should be noted that there should be no contact between the Design Team and the Audit Team other than on the restricted basis set out in HD 19/03.

3.1.7 Please note that any proposed exceptions to the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit will need to be considered at Director level within the Highways Agency (HD 19/03 para 2.75).

3.1.8 The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be complete and submitted to Highways Agency Network Services team for approval including any identified existing or proposed departures from standard before the holding direction should be lifted. This is in accordance with the HA’s protocol above.
Dear Mr. Dolman

LAND AT CRINGLEFORD - REF: 2013/1494 - COMPLIANCE WITH JCS AND TRA2

Thank you for your letter of 21 May 2014 in which you specifically ask whether, in the Agency’s view, the mitigation proposed by Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE) is sufficient to cater for full JCS growth to 2026.

In my formal response to South Norfolk Planning dated 1 May 2014 I enclosed for reasons of transparency, Parsons Brinkerhoff (PB) Technical Note 04 dated 24 April 2014. PB is commissioned by the Agency to review the forecast traffic modelling submitted by CCE in support of the 2013/1494 planning application. In section 2.1.7 of TN04 PB express some reservations regarding the forecast model. In particular item 3 states:-

3. *It is accepted that the proposed measures do not seek to allow the junction to operate fully within capacity with all background traffic. The option model predicts that it would still be oversaturated by 2026 (and likely much earlier). Further measures would be needed to ensure that it would have sufficient capacity up to 2026 or beyond.*

I therefore confirm the Agency’s view that it is likely that further measure will be necessary to ensure the efficient operation of the Thickthorn junction with full JCS growth in 2026.

I trust this answers your question and allows you to pursue further discussions with South Norfolk Council.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Chenery
NDD East Asset Development
Email: roger.chenery@highways.gsi.gov.uk

Land at Cringleford
Dear Mr Watts

Cringleford: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with high ways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

Land East Of A11 And North And South Of Round House Way, Cringleford, Norfolk.

Thank you for your consultation on the above development.

The Highway Authority has a fundamental concern about the prematurity of the proposed development.

The South Norfolk growth locations in the adopted Joint Core Strategy require infrastructure to support the impacts of that growth. The infrastructure plan in Appendix 8 of the Joint Core Strategy and subsequent updates on the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) identify that a major improvement of Thickthorn Interchange is required to be brought forward during the Local Plan period to address the cumulative impacts of traffic from allocated development. This application does not consider the impacts of the proposals on the function of the existing Thickthorn Interchange junction or the impact on delivery of an appropriate improvement required for growth of the area.

The application in its current form is contrary to the delivery of the adopted growth strategy and is being recommended for refusal, unless the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed development is not prejudicing the delivery of the options for improvement of Thickthorn Interchange currently under consideration. Supporting evidence should be provided, to show that an acceptable alternative junction improvement proposal in terms of capacity and cost can be achieved if an alternative approach is to be taken. The evidence required will need to be of a similar level of detail as the work carried out by to date.

The Highway Authority in partnership with South Norfolk and the Highways Agency is in the process of developing a scheme which will improve Thickthorn in order to cater for the anticipated growth and this has been shared at the Stakeholder forum and was discussed.
at the pre application Enquiry by Design sessions. Although the Consultants justification for not including the preferred option within your development is presented, the Highway Authority considers that the development prejudices the delivery of a suitable improvement to Thicketthorpe required to support planned growth. The work carried out by NCC has identified an area of interest that could be required for delivery of the scheme and this area has not been taken account of in the evidence to support the applicants proposals.

The Highway Authority has also considered the detailed information provided within the Transport Assessment and have the following comments:

The application is for 650 dwellings. The phasing and number of dwelling drawings show that there could be between 569 and 700 dwellings. Whilst it is appreciated that the modelling considers 700 dwellings - exactly what is being applied for and if it is to be 569 dwellings then only these should be considered, similarly if there are to be 650 dwellings, then only this number should be considered. Whilst consideration of 700 dwellings could be seen to be robust, it may be too onerous and give a false impression of the traffic impacts.

In section 4.7.4 of the Transport Assessment Junctions 9 and 10 are not considered - The work that demonstrates why they should not be considered is not provided.

The Highway Authority has not done any detailed analysis of the traffic modelling provided as there are a number of concerns which will need to be overcome before this would be appropriate. However, there are a number of base 2013 models which do not seem to validate with the observed queues such as the Newmarket Road/Roundhouse Way roundabout. The modelling only produces one queue and in order to validate the observed queues with the modelled queues, the different observed queues in each lane need to be added together to get a single queue to compare/validate with the modelled queue. So in the AM peak, the observed queue is 19 and the modelled queue is 2. This is not a good validation. Another example is Newmarket Road/Colney Lane, the observed queue is 8 and the modelled queue is 38.

With regard to committed developments and sensitivity testing. The Highway Authority had asked that the Transport Assessment take into account the impact of the Newfound Farm development in the form of a sensitivity test. This has not been done.

With regard to layout, the Highway Authority has some fundamental concerns regarding the access strategy. The engineering layout drawing and the masterplan drawing do not tie up and show different access strategies. Both drawings have too many access points, especially for the land shown as Phases 3 and 4. Roundhouse Way is a HGV access route and an important route to the hospital and research park an unnecessary access points should be avoided. Whilst development will help enhance a sense of place along the road between the A11 (Newmarket Road) and Colney Lane, this is a key route and access points need to be strictly limited. Phase 3 (between 182 and 206 dwellings) should be accessed from one arm off the 'The Firs' roundabout. There is no need for any other access points. Phase 4 (between 80 and 118 dwellings) should be accessed from one priority junction only and this should be the one closest to the northern roundabout. This should be a simple priority junction and does not need to be a Right Hand turn lane junction. The landscape strip between the two phases should be an emergency vehicle/pedestrian/cyclist access route between the two.

With regard to Phases 1 and 2. These are primarily accessed from the roundabout on Newmarket Road/Roundhouse Way. However, the engineering drawing shows a short two
lane stub and the masterplan shows access from a square or something similar. Drawings are required which show how the proposed access connects with the site in a technically compliant and safe manner.

None of the engineering drawings show adequately how the site will be accessed. Each junction shows a short stub but it is not clear how that will actually tie in with the layout.

In terms of sustainable travel, there is no clear indication of how good walking and cycling links will be achieved and how sustainable access the local facilities will be provided.

With all the issues highlighted above, the Highway Authority recommends refusal of the application on the following grounds:-

**Proliferation of Accesses**

SHCR 10 The proposed access would add to a proliferation of accesses on to the public highway and lead to additional interference with free and safe flow of traffic, to the detriment of highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policies T2 and IMP7 &8

**Conflict with Future Road Proposals**

SHCR 29 The site is affected by future road proposals, which would be prejudiced by the development as proposed. Contrary to Development Plan Policies T2, IMP7 and TRA13

**Premature Development**

SHCR 30 The proposed development is premature until such time as a preferred scheme for Thickthorn Roundabout is agreed between the Highways Agency, the Local Planning Authority and the Local Highway Authority. Contrary to Development Plan Policies T2, IMP7 and IMP8.

**Inadequate Highways and Transport Information**

SHCR 31 The application is not supported by sufficient highways and transport information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway/highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policies T2, IMP8 and TRA17.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

David Higgins

Principal Engineer - Major & Estate Developments

for Director Environment, Transport and Development
From: Christopher Watts  
Sent: Tue, 25 Mar 2014 09:58:37 +0000  
To: Planning idox  
Subject: please add to file 2013/1494

NCC Highways comments

Christopher Watts  
Design Officer  
t 01506 533755 e cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk  www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

From: Higgins, David [mailto:david.higgin@norfolk.gov.uk]  
Sent: 25 March 2014 09:52  
To: Christopher Watts  
Cc: Parkes, Ian; Doleman, Richard; Chenery, Roger  
Subject: Cingleford applications 2013/1494 and 2013/1793

Chris,

Further to our recent meeting to discuss the Cingleford applications my colleagues have now released the final version of the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange Improvement technical report prepared by Mott MacDonald on behalf of the Norfolk County Council as local Highway Authorities and the Highways Agency. Copies of report have been sent to both applicants and the Highways Agency as well as yourself. The report is important evidence in considering whether applications 2013/1494 and 2013/1793 are consistent with policy in the Joints Core Strategy and the Cingleford Neighbourhood Plan (CNP).

The report has considered the evidence put forward by both applicants and the work carried out by the local authorities to provide evidence on what a likely improvement at Thickthorn may be to meet policy requirements. Clearly all parties will wish to reflect on the detail of its contents, however at section 5 the report sets out its conclusions. The key findings of the report are that...
Evidence presented to support the small scale improvement promoted by Cannon Consulting Engineers promoted as part of application 2013/1494 is not found to be robust to justify that such an improvement is acceptable.

The AECOM modelling promoted as part of application 2013/1793 has not adequately considered the base line traffic

No small scale at grade improvement has been identified that would meet the requirements of the JCS and CNP policy TRA2

Therefore the applications in their current form should not be recommended for approval. I would expect the applicants to want time to consider the report and I note that Cannon Consulting have already requested additional information. At this stage I think that it would be premature to prejudge the outcomes of the discussions between the various transport consultants and what actions the applicants will have to take to satisfy both NCC and the Highways Agency that these developments will not be detrimental to the local highway network and fully comply with the the requirements of the JCS and CNP policy TRA2.

Regards

David

--------------------------------

David Higgins  B.Sc.(Hons), C.Eng, MICE
Principal Engineer

Major and Estate Developments Team
Developer Services Section
Environment, Transport and Development
Direct dial telephone number: 01603 222789

Fax 01603 223128
E-mail: david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk
Norfolk County Council
General enquiries: 0344 800 8020 or information@norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.norfolk.gov.uk
Thickthorn Junction

Introduction

The purpose of this note is to set out the short and medium term actions to agree an appropriate improvement to the existing Thickthorn Junction, in support of planned housing and employment growth in the period to 2026, contained in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). This work is required to inform the Norfolk County Council, Highways Agency and South Norfolk Council responses to the two current applications for planning permission in Cringleford.

Background

To support development of the JCS, the GNDP commissioned work to look at the junctions on the Norwich Southern Bypass including Thickthorn http://www.gndp.org.uk/content/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/03/A47-Southern-Bypass-Junction-study.pdf
That work identified that Thickthorn would require improvement. Potential improvements were shown ranging in cost from about £150,000 to over £40m. None of the designs were assessed in terms of traffic capacity and a favoured improvement was not identified.

That pointed to the need to look at a significant improvement and section 5.3 indicated that a large scale (£30m plus) improvement will be required.

Following adoption of the JCS work has continued to understand what improvement is required to support growth across the JCS area. The Highways Agency commissioned AECOM to sketch up a range of smaller scale improvements that could be made to the existing junction arrangement. The County Council carried out detailed junction modelling work to assess the impacts of these improvements. That work concluded that there were no small scale measures that individually or in combination provided the required capacity improvement to adequately provide for the planned growth of the area. There is no formal report from that assessment work.

The latest work of the County Council to determine a suitable improvement to the Thickthorn Junction has drawn on all the previous work, both published and unpublished. Two reports considering options for improvement have been published, a traffic assessment report and an engineering report. They are published on the GNDP website.

Planning Context

The JCS identifies that an improvement at Thickthorn is required to support planned growth. This issue was tested to some degree at the examination of the Cringleford Neighbourhood plan. Through the Neighbourhood plan process the Examiner’s report considers that the Plan should include a policy that safeguards an improvement of Thickthorn by requiring that any development should consider its impacts on the likely land required and demonstrate that those development proposals are not prejudicial to the implementation of an appropriate and necessary improvement.

Policy TRA 2 of the adopted neighbourhood plan sets the requirement to consider that impacts on delivery of an improvement to Thickthorn.

TRA2
Developers of land in the area will be expected to make an appropriate and proportional contribution or deliver improvement to the Thickthorn Interchange. As applications come forward they will need to demonstrate that they do not prejudice the delivery of the options for improvement under consideration by the local authorities (as published on the GNDP website). If a development proposal would prevent delivery of an emerging preferred or identified improvement scheme, then the proposal will need to be supported by appropriately detailed evidence to show that an acceptable alternative junction improvement proposal is deliverable and achievable that meets the requirements of the local authorities and the Highways Agency.

Current Applications

There are two applications under consideration by South Norfolk Council that between them take up and exceed the all the 1,200 units allocated in the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan. These are Land West of Cringleford (2013/1494) and Land at Newfound Farm (2013/1793). To comply with policy TRA2 the proposals need to demonstrate that they do not prejudice an appropriate improvement of Thickthorn.

Evidence put forward by developers of Land West of Cringleford indicates that a minor improvement to Thickthorn would be appropriate to meet the demands of their site and would also provide an adequate solution to meet the requirements of all of the planned JCS growth in the Norwich area.

Promoters of Land at Newfound Farm have prepared an assessment that indicates that their proposal would not require any improvement to Thickthorn. Both assessments are still the subject of discussion between the applicants, the Local Highway Authority and the Highways Agency.
Issues

The work of the Highway Authorities has shown a need for a major improvement at Thickthorn to support planned JCS growth. This is at odds with the assessment submitted in support of the Land West of Cringleford application.

The 2 concurrent planning applications have differing assessments of the base traffic situation

There is not agreement as to what an appropriate solution for Thickthorn should be. Consequently it is not resolved whether the junction improvement will require land allocated for development subject to Policy TRA 2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

The Thickthorn Junction assessments supporting the two planning applications have yet to be agreed by the highway authorities. A timely and robust answer is required to aid determination of the applications.

Future work

A draft brief for a review of the transport evidence impacts and mitigation of the applications on Thickthorn has been prepared by the County Council. This is attached at Appendix 1.

This work will be carried out on behalf of the Highways Agency, Norfolk County Council as Local Highway Authority and South Norfolk Council as Local Planning Authority.

One joint commission of the assessment of Thickthorn brings with it the advantage of having a single report that considers the evidence presented by both applications and gives a fair and consistent view on behalf of the 3 bodies.

The outcomes of the work will be:

- A review of both applicants’ traffic forecasts for Thickthorn in 2026, in comparison with output from the latest NDR Saturn model which contains full JCS growth.

- A review of the minor improvement for Thickthorn proposed by the Land West of Cringleford applicant as being appropriate for a 2026 ‘full JCS’ scenario. This review will focus on the validity of input data and assumptions made in their LinSig modelling.

- If necessary consider whether there is any form of minor improvement for Thickthorn which would operate within capacity in a 2026 ‘full JCS’ scenario.
The further stages of work will depend on whether it is agreed that the developer assessments and proposed mitigation meet technical requirements and the policy requirements of the JCS and Gringleford Neighbourhood plan to meet the needs of planned growth to 2026.

It is expected that the technical work will be concluded by 10 March 2014, subject to agreement and cooperation on the assessment from the Highways Agency and South Norfolk Council and background data being supplied from the applicants as required.

The outcome of the assessment will be shared with the applicants.

If a minor scheme is shown to be needed to release development and is adequate to support the delivery of planned JCS growth then the task will be to agree this and put in place agreement and or conditions as appropriate to secure delivery.

As the flow of work beyond the immediate assessments is complex, dependant on its outcomes and could impact on consideration of both applications, a diagram showing the flow of work and decisions is attached at appendix 2.
Appendix 1 - Technical Brief

A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange Improvement scheme
Brief for work to evaluate developer and current preferred proposals

1.0 Purpose

The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies that a strategic improvement to Thickthorn Interchange is required to support planned growth. There are two current planning proposals in Cingleford and for each, evidence of impact on Thickthorn has been presented. The work required is to check the assessment work presented by each applicant and determine:

- Whether traffic forecasts are representative of planned JCS growth, as represented by the latest NDR Saturn model; and
- Whether LinSig capacity assessment work presented in support of proposed minor improvement schemes is robust, in a 2028 full JCS scenario.

2.0 Background

Mott MacDonald has carried out a number of studies for Norfolk County Council over recent years that investigate the problems and issues at the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange and recommend possible improvement schemes. These include:

- Thickthorn Interchange Improvement – Concept Scheme Options Traffic Assessment (June 2013)
- Thickthorn Interchange Improvement – Concept Scheme Options Engineering Assessment (June 2013)

In addition to these studies and reports the Highways Agency consultant AECOM has suggested a number of incremental improvements to the junction including ‘hamburger’ style junctions and the provision of additional lanes on approaches. A note of this work is shown in Appendix A. Prior to the “Concept Scheme Options Traffic Assessment” work, some of these incremental improvements were tested by Mott MacDonald using LinSig and did not appear to offer much benefit over the existing layout, or were worse.

Collectively, these reports and other assessment work carried out has suggested that incremental improvements are unlikely to be sufficient in themselves and have pointed to the need for a large scale, possibly grade separated solution, to accommodate additional traffic arising from planned growth in the Norwich area and provide future years capacity.

The Mott MacDonald “Concept Scheme Options Engineering Assessment” focusses on a solution which involves separating out the A11 through movement from the
junction as this is the largest single movement based on traffic count data. This work has used standard highway scheme time horizons and considered an opening year of 2017 and a design year of 2032.

2.0 Current situation

There are two applications under consideration by South Norfolk Council that between them take up and exceed all the 1,200 units allocated in the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

The application on the Land West of Cringleford (2013/1494) is for 650 houses. The application proposes development on land that has been identified as being needed for improvement of Thickthorn junction. If this housing development is granted permission the currently favoured junction improvement would no longer be able to be delivered. The developer has submitted a transport assessment which seeks to demonstrate that an at-grade and relatively minor scheme of improvement, which introduces additional lanes and circulating carriageway is sufficient both to mitigate his development impacts and those of the full Joint Core Strategy (JCS) in 2026.

The application on Land at Newfound Farm (2013/1739) is for 750 dwellings. That application does not directly impact on the current proposal for improvement at Thickthorn, but to comply with the policy of the Development Plan this needs to be demonstrated alongside the usual requirement to present the highway impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.

3.0 Brief

This brief has two aspects. One is to assess the developer’s Transport Assessment produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE) and AECOM. The other is to review the Mott MacDonald work carried out to date and determine whether an at-grade solution is sufficient to cater for the JCS growth to 2026 or a grade separated solution as currently proposed is required.

The examination of the transport assessments will need to consider the forecasting used, its compatibility with NGC JCS assumptions and the robustness of base modelling of Thickthorn. In addition it will need to review developer promoted Thickthorn improvements to determine how they perform. The assessment will look at modelling, predicted capacity and operational issues (For example, four parallel circulating lanes may "work" in LinSig, but will driver behaviour based on current evidence mean that the effective capacity is only three lanes).

The review of the Mott MacDonald work will need to substantiate in numerical and capacity terms whether the raft of at-grade solutions considered to date, including
that proposed by CCE, provide the capacity required to cater for the JCS growth to 2026. If not, a reasoned justification will be given.

The work will need to be sufficiently robust to support its conclusions at subsequent stages of the planning process. The intention is that a draft report is prepared and used to obtain in principle support for this piece of evidence from both the HA and their consultants Parsons Brinckerhoff and Norfolk County Council’s Developer Services (David Higgins). Engagement with these parties during the preparation of the draft report is required as it will help with the process of gaining a consensus.

4.0 Governance

NGO Economic Development and Strategy will be the ‘client’ for the study which will be carried out by Matt Macdonald who will be known as the ‘consultant’. Some interaction with key stakeholders such as the Highways Agency, their consultants and South Norfolk District Council may be required.

The consultant is to update the client on at least a fortnightly basis by way of emails, telephone calls and ad hoc meetings.

5.0 Timescales

It is envisaged that the work will take approximately 6 weeks to complete after allowing time to produce and agree a resource estimate with the final report due at the end of this period by 7 March 2014.

6.0 Outputs and key meetings

- Consultant to provide a programme and a cost estimate for carrying out the study by Friday 24 January 2014
- Prior to the issue of the draft report, any significant issues found in the CCE transport assessment should be communicated to the client as soon as they are discovered
- Consultant to engage with the HA, their consultants Parsons Brinckerhoff and Norfolk County Council’s Developer Services (David Higgins) in undertaking this work
- Consultant to provide a draft report of this work by 21 February 2014 (4 weeks)
- Consultant to meet with client on by 21 February 2014 to discuss the report
- Consultant to provide a final report by 7 March 2014 (2 weeks)
- As well as client contact, at least two meetings with other interested parties should be allowed for
7.0 Cost control

Consultant to provide monthly invoices stating what proportion of the total commission has been achieved. This is to enable the client to identify any potential cost overruns at the earliest opportunity and take corrective action.
Appendix 2
Thickthorn Work Flow

Review of Cirrus/Cannon Thickthorn Assessment

Review of Barratt/AECOM Thickthorn Assessment

Authorities ensure assessments are compatible and robust.

Assessment and Mitigation meet requirements of planned growth?

Yes

No

Land safeguarded from development

Agree to protect LA scheme

No

Yes

Deliver agreed Developer promoted scheme

Development will prevent delivery of strategic infrastructure.

No

Yes

Developer agrees to design deliverable alternative

Alternative agreed by Highway Authorities?

No

Yes

New agreed schemes to protect
Dear Chris Watts,

Cringleford: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

CRINGLEFORD
Land East Of A11 And North And South Of Round House Way Cringleford Norfolk

Further to the initial response of the Highway Authority on 2nd October 2013 significant progress has been made towards identifying a package of measures that acceptably addresses the impacts of the development. However there is still not agreement about the ability of an improved Thickthorn Interchange to accommodate JCS growth in the future.

I am pleased to report that a reply has been received from the HA in response to our query on the implications of development in the vicinity of Thickthorn junction on planned growth. A preliminary view of the evidence from the County Council’s technical advisors, Mott MacDonald, has also been received. I will send you both the letter from the Highways Agency and the preliminary view by separate e-mail for your information.

The HA summarise the position by quoting from the Parsons Brinkerhoff Technical Note 4 dated 24 April 2014. That note states: "It is accepted that the proposed measures do not seek to allow the junction to operate fully within capacity with all background traffic. The Option model predicts that it would still be over-saturated by 2026 (and likely much earlier). Further measures would be needed to ensure that it would have sufficient capacity up to 2026 or beyond. From this the Highways Agency confirm that further improvements will be required for the junction to cater for planned growth to 2028. And the letter goes on to '..confirm the Agency’s View that it is likely that further measures will be necessary to ensure the efficient operation of the Thickthorn Junction with full JCS growth in 2026.'

In addition it should be pointed out that the note also says in 2.1.6 that the impact on Newmarket Road has not been assessed and the impact on the B1172 shows a worsening of conditions. This is of particular concern as the route along the B1172 and

www.norfolk.gov.uk
Newmarket Road is the main high quality public transport link between Norwich, Cingleford, the Norwich Research Park and strategic growth locations at Hethersett And Wymondham.

Add to this the assessment of the CCE evidence carried out for the County Council, by Mott MacDonald. This highlights a number of fundamental issues with the modelling on which the applicants conclusions have been made.

- the base model is not the same as or the North Hethersett development and the changes made result in increases in modelled capacity;
- the CCE model is overestimating the capacity of links at the signal stop lines and on give way links;
- the CCE model is overestimating the efficiency by not reflecting the MOVA operation (which is assumed to have to remain in place in the future);
- the CCE model is overestimating the capacity of the junction by assuming that approach lanes are longer than they actually are.

Even without resolving the above detailed modelling points Parsons Brinckerhoff Technical Note dated 24 April 2014 is clear on the overall conclusion that the proposed mitigation will not meet the requirements of planned growth to 2026. I will send you a copy of the note by separate e-mail, although you should already have a copy.

Taking these sources of evidence together it is clear the requirements of Cingleford Neighbourhood Plan Policy TRA2 have not been met as it has not been reasonably demonstrated that the mitigation proposed will facilitate planned growth, nor has a suitable alternative been shown and it been demonstrated that land is available for its delivery.

Therefore at this time it is recommended that on the evidence provided the application should be refused.

The County Council as Highway Authority would be happy to consider any response from the applicant on the issues raised, but until further substantive evidence is produced the position must be that the requirements of Cingleford Neighbourhood Plan Policy TRA2 have not been met.

Yours sincerely,

David Higgins

Principal Engineer - Major & Estate Developments
for Director Environment, Transport and Development

www.norfolk.gov.uk
Thickthorn Roundabout

Review of CCE submission received by NCC 12/05/14

Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE) have produced a further submission for improvements to Thickthorn Roundabout in support of a proposed residential development on land west of Cingleford. This latest submission includes 2 LinSig models:

- '2014.04.11 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp Adj Temp NFF R'
- '2014.04.11 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Improvement Optio'.

It appears that the file names were too long and have been truncated automatically, and therefore the designs they refer to have had to be worked out by the construction of the network. The second model appears to be of the proposal shown on drawing GR71/014 Rev D which includes further improvements by CCE, mainly the addition of a fourth lane on the circulating carriageway on the east side of the intersection.

This review is based on the LinSig model '2014.04.11 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Improvement Optio', but most of the comments apply to both models.

CCE claim that they have addressed most of the issues raised in the MMD report, apart from the issue of modelling the junction as multi streams as opposed to a single stream on each side of the junction, however this does not appear to be the case.

The existing junction is controlled by MOVA. There are two controllers, one operating each side of the junction, as intersected by the A47. Each controller has single stream MOVA control operation. The base model should therefore model this approach and have a single stream controlling each side of the junction. It is Mott MacDonald's opinion that this is still the best approach for controlling the junction, particularly on the west side of the junction where there is very limited stacking space on the circulating carriageway on the approach to the A11 West entry. Due to this very limited space, any MOVA detectors would be very close to the stop line and provide MOVA with very little opportunity to optimise the green times. Also, due to the very short internal link(s), there is a need to link the signals very carefully, and this will restrict MOVA's ability to optimise the signal timings.

The saturation flows used are still very high. Most of the values are directly entered and there is no evidence of how these were determined. The values are higher than used in the 'approved' Hethersett model that this is based on and, in some cases, lanes with a smaller turning radius have larger saturation flows than those with a larger turning radius.

Pedestrian links and pedestrian phases across the bottom of the off-slips are still not included.

The A11 West approach is coded as 4 long lanes. As the A11 starts as two lanes and flares to 4 lanes, lane 1 and lane 4 should be coded as short lanes (as in the Hethersett model). The A47 NW bound off-slip is coded as 4 lanes at the stop line with lanes 1 and 4 being short lanes. Lane 1 should be coded as approx. 120m long and lane 4 approx. 40m long, but have both been coded as 57.5m
(10pcu) long. Circulating arm 12 lanes 3 and 4 are both short lanes but only lane 4 has been coded as such. They should be coded as a short multi-lane.

One of the files provided is '2014.05.07 Thickthorn Rev C Results – 2032 NATS Results'. This is a table of Degree of Saturation and Mean Max Queue results, however this does not appear to be the results from either of the models provided, in fact there is a column with no title which looks a bit like TRANSYT link numbers.

The results from the model '2014.04.11 Thickthorne AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bicwells Improvement Optio' still show long queues on the internal links particularly with 2032 NATS AM flows. This shows unacceptably long queues on the internal links – Arms 7, 10 and 12 which cannot be accommodated within the existing road space without impeding other traffic movements on the roundabout.

In conclusion, it is believed that the issues raised by Mott MacDonald have not been addressed and the previous conclusions remain valid:

- the LINSIG base model used by CCE is not the same as that used for the North Hethersett development and the changes made result in increases in modelled capacity;
- the CCE model is overestimating the capacity of links at the signal stop lines and on give way links;
- the CCE model is overestimating the efficiency by which the overall junction can operate by not reflecting the MOVA operation (which is assumed to have to remain in place in the future);
- the CCE model is overestimating the capacity of the junction by assuming that approach lanes are longer than they actually are, both for the base model and with the proposed improvement scheme.

If these changes are made, the Interchange would be shown to be operating at well above capacity, therefore, the overall conclusion that a major improvement scheme is required at Thickthorn to accommodate the predicted traffic demand to 2026 is still valid.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) have been providing technical advice to the Highways Agency (HA) with respect to development on Land West of Cringleford and to date have had several rounds of correspondence with Cannon Consulting Engineers (CCE), specifically in relation to the modelling of the A47/A11 junction. Further to comments PB provided on 31st March focusing on the revised base model and improvement option, PB received further correspondence from CCE on 11th April including final refinements to the model.

2 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

2.1 Proposed Improvement drawing G871-14 D

2.1.1 The updated drawing includes further widening at the A11 East circulatory link following the additional mitigation and incorporates the necessary road marking requested in previous PB correspondence with CCE.

2.2 Capacity Assessment Review

2.2.1 In the most recent round of correspondence we reviewed the following A47/A11 Thickthorn junction models submitted by CCE:

- Base Model (including the proposed Hethersett capacity improvements) received on 22nd April 2014 (Ref. 2014.04.22 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Imp Adj Temp NFF REV C Final);
- Option Model comprising the Base Model layout plus the Option capacity improvements proposed in CCE drawing ref. G871/014, received on 11th April 2014 (Ref. 2014.04.11 Thickthorn AECOM Model CCE Flows + Bidwells Improvement Opto...).

2.1.3 We also reviewed the following flow scenarios:

- Base Model: 2026 AM and PM peak, plus committed development flows, but excluding the Newfound Farm and Cringleford development flows.
- Option Model: 2026 AM and PM peak, plus committed development flows, plus the Newfound Farm and Cringleford development flows.

2.1.4 The review noted that some internal queues were still slightly long, particularly in the Option model AM peak scenario, at the A11 West node. Minor adjustments were made to address these issues. The scenario cycle times were also made the same to allow easier comparison between the models.

2.1.5 The Option and Base model AM and PM peak outputs were compared to determine whether the proposed capacity improvements would fully mitigate the impact of the Newfound Farm and Cringleford Development traffic. As all internal links were operating within capacity, the main constraining influence at the junction in 2026 would be at the entry arms. The entry arm
outputs for the models were thus compared to ensure that the option scenario was no worse than the base scenario capacity wise:

1. In the Option model, the capacity of each entry arm should be equal to, or greater than, that of the Base model plus the development traffic demand flow at that entry.
2. The Degree of Saturation at each entry arm should be no higher in the Option model, than in the equivalent Base model scenario.
3. The predicted mean maximum queues in the Option model should be no longer than those in the equivalent Base model scenario.

2.1.6 It was found that the A47 (North), A11 (East), A47 (South) and A11 (West) arms all satisfied the above conditions in both 2026 peak periods (the Newmarket Road minor arm was not evaluated). The B1172 arm did however perform worse, mainly as a result of the proposed signal control.

2.1.7 We note the following reservations:

1. With the Option model, it was not possible to ensure that the internal circulatory queue at the proposed B1172 signal-controlled node would not cause upstream congestion. There would be very little stacking room at the internal stop line with the existing layout. It may be better to consider it, instead, the capacity of the existing priority node could be further improved.
2. Although longer flares on the external approaches may enhance the stacking room and thus reduce queue lengths back from the stop lines (particularly important in the case of the A47 off-slips) and also allow more traffic to enter during a given green time, ultimately, the capacity of the overall roundabout will be restricted by the capacities of the internal stop lines. Thus, for example, consideration could be given to increasing the A11 (West) internal approach to four full lanes, as is proposed for the A11 (East) node.
3. It is accepted that the proposed measures do not seek to allow the junction to operate fully within capacity with all background traffic. The Option model predicts that it would still be oversaturated by 2026 (and likely much earlier). Further measures would be needed to ensure that it would have sufficient capacity up to 2026 or beyond.

2.1.8 Notwithstanding the likely disbenefit caused by the B1172 signalisation, it is believed that the proposed capacity improvement measures would fully mitigate the Cringleford and Newfound Farm flows. In particular, the risk of A47 off-slip arm queues blocking back on to the upstream A11/A47 main carriageways would be no greater with the Option model measures with development flows, than with the Base model without development flows.

3 NEXT STEPS

Planning Condition

3.1.1 While it may be appropriate for a larger scheme to be implemented at the A47/A11 junction in the future, such as that proposed by Matt MacDonald, in light of the application submitted by CCE for development at Cringleford it would be unreasonable to expect the developer represented by CCE to fund the full cost of a major improvement scheme.

3.1.2 With this in mind we would advise that there are two options available:

1) To condition that the development proceed to deliver the mitigation as identified in drawing G871-14-D (including the future cost of maintenance which should be paid as a commuted lump sum).
2) To condition that the development provide a contribution to the sum of the proposed mitigation as identified in drawing GR171-14 D (including the future cost of maintenance which should be paid as a commuted lump sum), the funds of which could be put towards a more substantial future highway improvement scheme.

3.1.3 As we have previously discussed with CCE, because CCE have included predicted traffic generation associated with development at ‘New Found Farm’ in their ‘with development’ scenario, the improvement proposal effectively mitigates both Cringleford and New Found Farm development traffic. It would be reasonable therefore for the total cost of mitigation to be apportioned to the level of traffic predicted to use the A47/A11 junction from both developments. In the absence of any discussions between both developers on this subject, the full mitigation proposed in this application must be provided by the developers promoting the Land West of Cringleford development. Otherwise, the Highways Agency (HA) will run the risk of a reduced contribution that will not cover the impacts of the Land West of Cringleford development at the junction.

Highways Agency Mitigation Criteria

3.1.4 As previously advised, mitigation measures on the strategic road network will be subject to approval by the appropriate HA operational team. Appendix C of the HA document titled ‘Protocols for Planning and Development, 2012’ provides a checklist of the criteria that must be met before the HA can sign-off mitigation proposals requiring works to the highway network.

3.1.5 To summarise this, the next stage will be for CCE to provide the HA with a Non Motorised User Context Report as set out in para 3.6 of HD 42/05 ‘Non Motorised User Audits’.

3.1.6 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) should then be carried out in accordance with HD19/03, albeit before this:

- The Design Team should prepare a draft Audit Brief for the Stage 1 RSA and send it to the designated HA Project Sponsor for approval. The draft Audit Brief should comply with the requirements of HD19/03 pars 2.61 to 2.63.
- The designated HA Project Sponsor should also be supplied with proposals for the Audit Team, including their relevant qualifications, experience and CPD, for the consideration and appropriate approval of the Project Sponsor. This will enable their suitability to be compared against the requirements of HD19/03 (pars 2.54 to 2.59). Para 2.51 of HD 19/03 requires the Project Sponsor to be satisfied as to the independence and competence of the team to undertake the audit. Therefore the Project Sponsor will also require confirmation that the proposed Audit team are independent of the Design Team (HD 19/03 para 2.49).
- The Project Sponsor should also be provided with contact details for the proposed Audit Team Leader.
- It should be noted that there should be no contact between the Design Team and the Audit Team other than on the restricted basis set out in HD 19/03.

3.1.7 Please note that any proposed exceptions to the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit will need to be considered at Director level within the Highways Agency (HD 19/03 para 2.75).

3.1.8 The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be complete and submitted to Highways Agency Network Services team for approval including any identified existing or proposed departures from standard before the holding direction should be lifted. This is in accordance with the HA’s protocol above.
Dear Chris Watts

Cringeford: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

CRINGLEFORD
Land East Of A11 And North And South Of Round House Way Cringleford Norfolk

Further to the formal response of the Highway Authority dated 20th June 2014 I write to update you on progress with discussions with the developer’s highways consultants.

A revised access strategy for the land served off Roundhouse Way has been agreed which minimises the number of new access points onto the important local access route. Agreement has also been reached on walking/cycling and public transport for this part of the site.

However agreement has not been reached on the land to the south of the A11 Cringleford Bypass as the developer is not setting aside any land to allow for the future improvement of the Thicketn Interchange as required by policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

In considering this application regard must be given to Policy 10 of the JCS which states that Cringleford being a location for major expanded communities is dependent on expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thicketn junction. Further to this, policy IMP8 of the local plan requires development to not prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

The South Norfolk growth locations in the adopted JCS require infrastructure to support the impacts of that growth. The infrastructure plan in Appendix 7 of the JCS and subsequent updates on the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) and most recently the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan (GNIP) identify that a major improvement
Dear Chris Watts

Cringeford: Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.

CRINGLEFORD
Land East Of A11 And North And South Of Round House Way Cringleford Norfolk

Further to the formal response of the Highway Authority dated 20th June 2014 I write to up-date you on progress with discussions with the developer’s highways consultants.

A revised access strategy for the land served off Roundhouse Way has been agreed which minimises the number of new access points onto the important local access route. Agreement has also been reached on walking/cycling and public transport for this part of the site.

However agreement has not been reached on the land to the south of the A11 Cringleford Bypass as the developer is not setting aside any land to allow for the future improvement of the Thickthorn Interchange as required by policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

In considering this application regard must be given to Policy 10 of the JCS which states that Cringleford being a location for major expanded communities is dependent on expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction. Further to this, policy IMP8 of the local plan requires development to not prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

The South Norfolk growth locations in the adopted JCS require infrastructure to support the impacts of that growth. The infrastructure plan in Appendix 7 of the JCS and subsequent updates on the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP) and most recently the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Plan (GNIP) identify that a major improvement
The application in its current form is therefore considered by the Highway Authority to be contrary to the delivery of the adopted development plan and should be refused. Although the applicant has provided a justification for not including a preferred option within the development proposals, the Highway Authority still considers that the development prejudices the delivery of a suitable improvement to Thickthorn Interchange to support planned growth. Whilst a Travel Plan would mitigate the some impacts of this development, secured through a Section 106 agreement, this would not be sufficient to deal with the wider issues relating to the Thickthorn Interchange.

Consequently the Highway Authority recommends that the application be refused based on the grounds that it has not been demonstrated that the mitigation proposed will facilitate planned JCS growth, nor has a suitable alternative been shown and that land is available for its delivery. The development proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies IMP8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), and policy TRA2 of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014).

If you have any queries about the above advice or recommendation please contact me.

Yours sincerely

David Higgs

Principal Engineer - Major & Estate Developments
for Director Environment, Transport and Development

www.norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2014/0319  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: Norfolk Homes Ltd & Badger Building  
Site Address: Land North of Shotesham Road (Area D), Poringland, Norfolk

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for residential layout including all house details and landscaping for next phase (following planning permission 2011/0476/O)

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Conditions on outline must be met
2. In accordance with amended plans and documents
3. External finishes in accordance with plans and materials schedule
4. Means of enclosure in accordance with plans
5. Surface water sewer network plan submitted and approved in writing for the eastern half of the proposed Area D.

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 08: Promoting healthy communities
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 7: Supporting Communities
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)
   LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
   UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
   TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
   TRA 18: Off street parking provision
   TRA 19: Parking standards
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   ENV14: Habitat Protection
   ENV15: Species Protection

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.
1.5 Development Management Policies

DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document

South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0393  Reserved Matters application for 57 dwellings and 3539m2 (GIA) office accommodation, associated parking and green spaces  Approved

2.2 2014/0498  Variation of conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 2011/0661/F- (Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works) - construction in accordance with submitted drawings and construction of drainage lagoon  Approved

2.3 2014/0714  Discharge of conditions 9 and 10 of planning permission 2011/0476/O- detailed schemes for speed limits, foot/cycleway and works to Carr Lane  Awaiting Decision

2.4 2014/0991  Discharge of condition 12 of planning permission 2011/0476- Speed limit  Awaiting Decision

2.5 2014/1107  Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16 & 17 of planning permission 2011/0476/O - Drainage, Highways, traffic management, wheel cleaning, foul and surface water, landscaping, tree protection and boundary treatment  Pending Consideration

2.6 2011/0661  Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works  Approved

2.7 2011/0476  Residential & Commercial (office) Development  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Recommends approval, subject to the hedge owned by Church Close residents being retained

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No comments received

3.4 Environmental Services
- The information submitted does not fully support the discharge of Condition 3. Further details are not required at reserved matters stage.

3.5 Environment Agency
- The surface water condition for the outline permission requires the surface water drainage scheme to be built prior to the commencement of development. The surface water details are not required at reserved matters stage.
- No surface water sewer network plan for the eastern half of Area D is available.

3.6 County Ecologist
No comments received, to be reported if appropriate

3.7 Historic Environment Service
No comments received

3.8 Housing Strategy Officer
No objection

3.9 Landscape Officer
- No Arboricultural Impact Assessment or plan showing the proposals in relation to the trees’ constraints provided
- Important to be more definite about the likely rooting extent of key trees along the southern boundary
- As the theoretical RPA (Root Protection Area) for most of these trees is generally much greater than the canopy spread, we should insist on a comprehensive assessment, with possibly some on-site investigation. Plots 62 to 68 will have their rear façades and gardens shaded to some degree throughout the day, whilst plots 60, 61 will see their front (southerly) aspects shaded too
- The physical proximity of some of these large trees is of concern, with little or no clearance being left between the identified canopy extents and some of the dwellings; most critical is the relationship of plots 61, 62, 65, 66 and 71 to their neighbouring trees.

3.10 NCC Highways
- The layout drawing should show the widening of Carr Lane taken to the west of the access on the north side of Carr Lane.
- Requests that a lay-by be provided on the nearside of the new type 3 road adjacent plots 73-76 (Badger Building) and the open space to accommodate visitor parking.
- The parking spaces in front of the garages for plots 24, 25 & 82-85 (Norfolk Homes) remain short of the recommended 6m and should be enlarged.

3.11 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
No comments received

3.12 Play and Amenities Officer
No objection, Public Open Space areas are well located.

3.13 Planning Policy
No objection, the site was a residual 2003 Local Plan site, and as such has been carried forward and re-allocated in the emerging Site Specific Allocations Local Plan.
3.14 Representations

7 letters received from residents, mostly relating to concerns over residential amenity.

- No objection, but have two areas of concern relating to proximity of plot 39 to our property relating to residential amenity and the proposed location of the cycle path along our boundary.
- We will be overlooked by two properties and expect additional screening.
- The hedge running alongside our property and opposite neighbour’s property 28 Church Close belongs to us and should not be removed.
- Will be able to see directly into houses to be erected next to 28 Church Road.
- No objection, but would like consideration in respect to overlooking of proposed properties on to Bellamy Way and Baynes Close.
- Haven’t finished building other phases of development with a Primary School. Density also looks high.
- No objection, but 2 bedroom houses numbers 7,8,9, will all have their gardens backing directly onto our back garden. The plans are different to that of plans dated the 20/2/14 drawing no.SL01 job no.6646.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application is for approval of reserved matters for 221 dwellings and public open space submitted by Badger Building and Norfolk Homes Ltd for their part of the site given outline consent under 2011/0476 (referred to as Area D). The outline application proposed the erection of 300 dwellings, along with associated assess, garaging, visitor parking, open spaces and cycleway/footpaths and office accommodation. The full details of the spine road and lagoon have been agreed under 2011/0661 and implemented, together with the revisions agreed this year.

4.2 The application site is located off Shotesham Road, which takes its access off The Street (B1332). Carr Lane is located to the east and Bellamy Way to the west.

4.3 This reserved matters application now seeks the approval of appearance, scale, landscaping, layout and phasing of the development only.

4.4 In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the due weight given to the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the emerging policies of the new Local Plan as they advance through their preparation, is dependent on the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The relevant polices to this application that are considered to be consistent with the NPPF are listed above in Section 1. Some policies subject to objections have not been included in the list as these issues are unlikely to be resolved within the time frame of the application, and therefore should be afforded little weight. The Government launched the Planning Practice Guidance web-based resource on 6 March 2014, after this reserved matters application was submitted. The content of the guidance has been considered but in this case the Planning Practice Guidance is not considered to offer any further new significant guidance that would materially affect the advice contained in the NPPF.

4.5 As the principle of development and access to the site has already been established, the remaining considerations to take into account in this planning application are:

- Layout and appearance
- Scale
- Landscaping
4.6 The main impacts which need to be taken into consideration are:

- Highways impacts
- Residential amenity
- Drainage

4.7 An approved Masterplan document seeks to guide development within the site and this application has been assessed against the requirements of this document.

Layout and Appearance

4.8 The application includes an analysis of the site context and the surrounding character of Poringland. The analysis and character assessment shows how the development proposals have been developed to take into account the assessment’s findings as well as influence from the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

4.9 The site is split into two distinct areas of housing served by cul-de-sacs from the spine road that run alongside a central area of open space. Each of the areas have been designed to provide a distinct character, with the Norfolk Homes scheme utilising a more contemporary design style, with use of render, assertive gables and timber cladding with corner window detailing, whilst the Badger Building scheme adopts a more vernacular style with traditional brick and tile detailing and with porch and dormer window detailing that aim to respond to some of the older property in the village.

4.10 The site layout shows how the streets and spaces have been well enclosed and are predominantly fronted by built form set back from the edge of the highway. Frontage to the public open space creates attractive focal points within the development, offering a sense of enclosure and increasing the quality of the public realm. Buildings are also used to terminate key views and create a sense of enclosure around key spaces, which help to create an attractive development.

Scale

4.11 The overall density of the site is 30.9 dwellings per hectare, which is lower than that approved under the outline planning application. The layout responds well to the principles of the Masterplan, with lower density towards Carr Lane along the west and north boundaries and higher and medium density proposed to provide feature / focal points into the site and within the site. The only exception to this is a slightly higher density in the southeast corner of the Norfolk Homes site, although the layout responds positively to this part of the site by enclosing key spaces fronted by built form offering a sense of enclosure and increasing the quality of the public realm.

4.12 In terms of the size of dwellings the development provides a range of one-bedroomed homes to five-bedroomed houses, comprising detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. All dwellings are two-storey with the exception of single storey garages.

4.13 The layout, appearance and scale of the development proposals have been evaluated against the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Building for Life criteria and scores 11 out of 12 greens, which confirm that the layout and designs of the site and dwellings are acceptable and accord with JCS Policy 2 (Design).

Landscaping

4.14 The majority of existing landscape features on the site boundaries have been retained and reinforced in places, which include hedges and tree planting. These help to maintain the character of the site and to reinforce its boundaries. A number of changes to the layout have also been made in response to comments received from the Landscape Officer.
These relate to the boundary along Carr Lane where plots in the northeast section of the site have been moved back from the edge of the development and an additional hedge provided to help soften the edge of the site.

4.15 The Landscape Officer has raised a number of concerns relating to the proximity of existing mature trees rated as category ‘A’ or ‘B’ along the southern boundary of the Norfolk Homes site and their impact on the residential amenity of plots 61 – 67. Whilst it is accepted that there will be a degree of shading caused by the trees, the dwellings have been designed to provide single aspect flats over garages with their habitable room windows facing the opposite direction. It is felt that the design and these dwellings and their proximity to the trees minimises any unacceptable impacts in terms of overshadowing and loss of residential amenity and is therefore acceptable.

4.16 With regards to the proximity of dwellings to the Root Protection Areas, the Landscape Officer has requested that further investigation work and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment is carried out in this location. In response to this a report has been provided by M Foster of Farmland Forestry, which states that the roots are very unlikely to extend beyond the crown spread of these trees due, not least to the depth of an existing ditch to the rear of the properties, but also in light of recent inspections carried out during clearance and maintenance of the ditch. Given that the trees are not afforded any landscape protection and the need to achieve the best possible layout based on the approved masterplan, a refusal on these grounds would not be supported in the context of advice in the NPPF and JCS.

4.17 In summary, it is considered that the retention of the majority of the existing trees and vegetation around the site boundaries as well as additional tree planting, demonstrates that the site can be developed in a sympathetic and respectful manner to the existing landscape characteristics and accords with Local Plan Policy IMP2 (Landscaping).

Children’s play space and open space

4.18 The Spine Road location is fixed by the approved outline planning permission and already constructed. The desire to front dwellings onto the open space has resulted in the open space bisected by the Spine Road but that does not detract from the overall layout due to the layout and usable sizes of each of the three areas of open space. The Play and Amenities Officer has reviewed the arrangement of open spaces and considers them as being well located.

4.19 Under the requirements of the Section 106 agreement a children’s play space of at least 1,000sq meters is required to abut the South Norfolk Council estates site boundary and the proposed open space accordingly. The Section 106 requires that the detail of the open space will be submitted later i.e. prior to 20% of the dwellings occupied. The applicant at that stage will be required to confirm that this obligation is to be met by using the land identified onsite with an equipped play area to the central of the 3 areas of open space identified. The applicant has confirmed that an area of children’s play space that exceeds 1,000sq meters will be provided onsite and provision in the site layout has been made for this.

4.20 In terms of the requirements of the S106 requirement for adults play space this is partly met by the remaining onsite provision as well as additional land south of Heath Loke adjoining Phase 2 that forms part of the overall Poringland site allocation. This area will contribute to the remaining area of adult open space required as part of the Section 106 agreement, which provides an overall open space of circa 20 acres. This area far exceeds the overall open space requirements for this development and other phases of approved development combined and is well connected by public footpaths and cycle links.
Highway Impacts

4.21 The Highways Authority have raised a number of concerns, in particular that the layout drawing should show the widening of Carr Lane taken to the west of the access on the north side of Carr Lane as well as a lay-by on the nearside of the new type 3 road adjacent plots 73-76 (Badger Building) and the open space to accommodate visitor parking. Whilst these issues have not been fully resolved, Members should note that the means of access and overall transport strategy for the site has already been agreed and approved by means of the previous outline permission and are therefore not for consideration. This includes details of access onto Carr Lane and the general internal road layout for the site, which was approved in accordance with the Masterplan.

4.22 In addition the Highways Authority have stated their desire to see larger car parking spaces in front of the garages for plots 24, 25 & 82-85 (Norfolk Homes) that remain short of the recommended 6m. Whilst this has not been resolved at the time of writing this report, it is considered that the proposed size of the car parking spaces, which exceed 5.5m, are adequate to accommodate an average sized car and therefore this is not a reason for refusal as they can be counted as a car parking space.

4.23 The majority of parking is provided on-plot and is generally located to the side of dwellings within an individual parking bay and/or garage set just back from the building line to allow ease of access to dwellings. Courtyard parking is designed to serve only a few units, creating private and well-defined areas with good surveillance from dwellings. Parking in these areas is provided so that it is convenient for the user to promote its use. Parking numbers are provided in accordance with the Highway Authority standards and have been designed to provide accessible car parking spaces.

4.24 In conclusion and having taken into account the technical information received from NCC Highways who have confirmed that the highways proposals are acceptable, I am satisfied that the application accords with Local Plan Policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow Traffic).

Residential amenity

4.25 A number of concerns have been raised by residents about the potential overlooking caused by the proposed dwellings, particularly along the south and east boundaries. These concerns have been taken into account by the applicant and amendments have been made to the site layout and landscaping scheme. These include reconfiguring plot 39 by moving the dwellings away from the boundary and providing addition landscaping along the length of some boundaries. Whist it is accepted that there will be some loss of privacy caused by the proposed development, it is considered that the development has been designed in such a manor to avoid any unacceptable overlooking or impacts in terms of loss of amenity of the nearby residential properties.

4.26 The design of the properties and additional planting along the boundaries help to minimise any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. I am therefore satisfied that the development accords with policy IMP9 of the SNLP and the emerging Local Plan relating to residential amenity.

Drainage

4.27 The Environment Agency and Anglian Water have confirmed that they wish to raise no objections to the development subject to the approval of Conditions and a surface water sewer network plan for the eastern half of the proposed Area D. Information relating to the discharge of Conditions will be provided and agreed in writing before development commences, including submission of a full surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and a condition to ensure a sewer network plan is submitted and approved in writing.
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The appearance, scale, landscaping and layout of the development are considered acceptable in the context of the site and would not have a significant detrimental effect on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

5.2 Having assessed the application against the development plan the proposed development is considered to accord with saved policies IMP1 (Design), IMP2 (Landscaping) and IMP8 (Safe and Free flow of Traffic) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, the NPPF and the emerging policies listed in section 2 of this report and therefore the application is recommended for approval.

5.3 The application is not subject to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as it was submitted before the 1 May 2014.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2014/0732/D  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

**Applicants Name**: Mr Sean Marten  
**Site Address**: Land West of Norwich Road and South of Caistor Lane Poringland  
Norfolk  NR14 7QR

**Proposal**: Reserved Matters application for 150 dwellings and associated appearance. Approval is sought for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

**Recommendation**: Authorise DGL to approve

1. In accordance with amendments  
2. Conditions on previous permission  
3. Approval of drainage management plans  
4. Affordable Housing accommodation schedule  
5. Play areas to be agreed  
6. Renewable energy  
7. Details to be agreed - pumping station  
8. Details to be agreed - footpaths in open space  
9. No alterations to lose garage  
10. Tree protection  
11. Detailed landscaping to be submitted  
12. Hard surfaces in accordance with plans

Subject to no new substantive grounds of objection being raised by outstanding consultees including the Highway Authority and Parish Councils

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 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
POR 1: Housing allocation, west of The Street, Poringland (Continued)

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

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

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

3. Consultations

3.1 Poringland Parish Council Comments on amended plans: Poringland Parish Council would like to recommend approval of this application. It would be beneficial to have a footpath on both sides of the road for the safety of all road users, whether pedestrian or vehicles.

Original comments - Recommend approval of the application subject to the following:
• There are still grave concerns in connection with the highway structure in and around the development for pedestrians and all road users; bearing in mind we have a High School and shops within the vicinity.
• As far as drainage arrangements for the site are concerned, moving from west to east across Norwich Road to the area of the school, we have concerns about the capacity of the current drainage system under the road and would urge that this be viewed to ensure the drainage is able to carry the anticipated capacity, bearing in mind the impacts of climate change.
• In connection with Caistor Lane, it might be appropriate to have a footpath on both sides of the road from the development through to Norwich Road on safety grounds to stop people having to crisscross a busy road close to the junction.

Comments on amended plans are awaited and will be included in the updates report or verbally updated to Committee.

Original comments - Recommend approval of the application subject to the following:

• There are still grave concerns in connection with the highway structure in and around the development for pedestrians and all road users; bearing in mind we have a High School and shops within the vicinity.
• As far as drainage arrangements for the site are concerned, moving from west to east across Norwich Road to the area of the school, we have concerns about the capacity of the current drainage system under the road and would urge that this be viewed to ensure the drainage is able to carry the anticipated capacity, bearing in mind the impacts of climate change.
• We would strongly recommend the footpath runs along Caistor Lane from Norwich Road to Field View House, not just to the new development. We also strongly recommend traffic calming measures are introduced on Caistor Lane. We believe both of these recommendations will be paramount to the safety of pedestrians and motorists following the increase in traffic which will result.

3.2 District Members
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Design Officer
Building for Life Assessment: 10 Green, 2 Amber

3.4 Environment Agency
Comment that the surface water drainage condition imposed on the outline is not inline with their suggested wording. However they raise question as to the location of the proposed attenuation cells and swales within the proposed layout.

3.5 NCC Highways
Comments are awaited on the amended plans and will be included in the updates report or verbally updated to committee.

Comments on original plans –
Amended plans and additional information is requested to address the following:
• All garage sized must be 3m x 7m.
• Increase in number of parking spaces required for some of the four bed properties.
The agreed visibility splays, road widening and footpath provision needs to be shown on the plan.

A number of amendments required to estate road layout, road types, turning heads and speed tables.

The combination of the use of rear parking courts and a long spine road may result in some on-street parking. The inclusion of lay-bys in the design to accommodate any on street parking is advised.

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager

No objection.

The applicants have provided details of the affordable housing on this site, demonstrating that it all meets the requirements of the S106 Agreement.

3.7 Landscape Officer

Having reviewed the submitted arboricultural and landscape appraisal I do not dispute the findings and conclusions. The proposed layout works well with the existing trees and vegetation, which will be retained as a positive feature of and setting for the development. The following comments are however offered:

- There is potential conflict with plots 135 and 150 to the vegetation to the western boundary.
- The submitted landscape management plan needs to be more precise and specific. This can be resolved by condition.
- Further work on the tree protection plan is required. This can be resolved by condition.
- If permission is granted conditions will also be required to cover the approval and implementation of a detailed planting plan.

3.8 SNC – Play and amenities Manager

The amount of open/play space was secured through the S106 at outline. There is provision to allow the play space to be provided on the area forming Phase II of the development. In the case that the southern phase is not developed, then a detailed plan for provision of play equipment on the northern phase should however be provided.

3.9 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Comments that should the developer wish to achieve a ‘secured by design’ award, a number of alterations would be required to the layout of the scheme to reduce the permeability of the site by reducing the multiple footpath links across the site or, achieve higher standards of physical security for individual dwellings (in terms of type of glass and locks in ground floor doors and windows).

3.10 Flood Defence Officer

Offers the following comments:

- The Environment Agency advises that the proposed drainage features will result in a reduced risk of flooding to existing and future residents due to the drainage improvements.
- The layout drawings do not show the proposed swales, attenuation cells and existing ditch networks.
- Further confirmation is needed as to who will adopt and manage the surface water drainage system.
- Water butts are recommended to be fitted to all rear down pipes to encourage water conservation.

3.11 Historic Environment Service

No objection subject to a condition to secure of programme of archaeological work.
3.12 Representations

27 letters of representation consisting of 24 objections, 1 support and 2 with no comment.

Letters of objection on the following grounds:
- There are too many houses
- Question the need for more housing in Poringland
- The site is not in walking distance of facilities and services in Poringland
- Loss of views
- Impact on existing house prices
- Will exacerbate existing surface water flooding in Poringland
- The Poringland sewage system cannot handle the increased volume from this development
- Widening Caistor Lane will not relieve congestion. Traffic lights are necessary
- The size and design of the dwellings and gardens are not inkeeping with the surrounding area
- Concern as to who will manage the drainage system
- There are no details of the pumping station
- The toucan crossing will cause more congestion
- The toucan crossing should be better positioned in relation to existing driveways
- Concern with the surface water ponds and ditches becoming a breeding ground for vermin and also safety issues
- Concern with capacity of existing facilities and infrastructure
- The proposal does not enhance the village
- Concern with impact on amenities of existing properties in respect of privacy and overshadowing
- Lack of detail for proposed footpath links to Norwich Road
- Will worsen existing inappropriate school parking and existing congestion and road safety issues
- New housing will introduce light and noise pollution
- The type, number and location of the new landscaping will be key to protect existing residents’ amenities.

4 Assessment

The site

4.1 The application site forms part of a larger site which is allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan (Site allocations policy POR01). The whole area allocated for development is 15 hectares. The application site forms only part of that wider site, with an area of 6.8 Ha. It currently consists of a single, fairly flat agricultural field located to the west of Norwich Road. The site is bounded by existing residential development to the north, east and south. The west boundary is currently delineated by a hedgerow interspersed with semi-mature and mature trees. A site location plan is attached.

The application

4.2 The application is for the erection of 150 dwellings at land to the west of Norwich Road, Caistor Lane, Poringland. The application is a reserved matters approval following outline consent 2013/1986/O. This application seeks approval of those matters reserved at the outline stage which include appearance, landscape, layout and scale.
4.3 A full application for 150 dwellings on this site was refused by the committee in October 2013 (2013/0506) for reasons of poor design which failed to provide a distinctive character, the lack of integration of the affordable housing within the scheme and particular concern with the impact of two of the proposed plots on the amenities of existing residents.

4.4 Since that time the outline permission has established the principle and the means of access to the development. This application seeks to address those previous reasons for refusal.

4.5 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, plus some small apartment buildings. The majority of the development would be traditional two storey height. Eight bungalows are proposed in the north-east corner of the site and the large majority of plots have single storey garaging.

4.6 49 of the dwellings are proposed to be affordable. These are located in two separate areas across the site.

4.7 2.3 Hectares of open space is proposed which is largely located around the edge and to the south of the site, this area to the south is intended to link into the open space on Phase II of the development.

4.8 A combination of a piped system and SUDS is proposed as part of the package of measures for the surface water drainage. This includes the existing drainage ditch which runs along part of the north and eastern boundaries of the site.

4.9 Vehicular access to the site was approved at outline stage and this is from Caistor Lane at the north of the site. Two pedestrian links are proposed to link through to Norwich Road along the eastern boundary of the site.

4.10 Off-site highway works secured by condition at outline stage include the widening of Caistor Lane and the provision of a footway from the development to Norwich Road; enhancements to the walk to school route including the installation of a Toucan crossing on Norwich road in the vicinity of the High School and enhancements to the bus stops on Norwich Road by making them DDA compliant and by providing shelters.

4.11 A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the site and this secured a number of obligations. Precise details secured under this obligation are detailed later in the report.

4.12 Amended plans have been submitted which include revisions to highway specifications, removal of the reference to the use of the southern pedestrian access from Norwich Road as an ‘emergency access’; certain dwelling type details and some elevational changes to address relationships with existing properties; clarification on boundary treatments to the footpath links to Norwich Road.

Main issues for consideration

4.13 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development; landscape impact; housing layout and mix; design and scale; residential amenity; crime and disorder; sustainable construction; open space and landscaping; ecology; drainage; affordable housing; highways issues; heritage assets; and developer contributions.
Principle of Development

4.14 The application site forms part of a larger site which is allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan (Site allocations policy POR01). Whilst this policy is yet to be adopted and is to be considered by the Inspector later this year, the principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2013/1986. This had regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy area, the status of the site as a preferred option for allocation and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of 150 dwellings on the northern part of the site allocation POR01 and its proposed access. Outline consent has also been granted for the southern part of the allocation under permission reference 2013/0505 for 100 dwellings. As such the principle is established for this development and it is only the details reserved which are now for consideration. These are the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development.

Landscape Impact

4.15 The site is fairly flat and well related to the existing built form of Poringland and is not overly prominent to the wider landscape. There are a number of mature trees and a hedgerow along the western boundary of the site, which inline with the requirements of site allocation POR1 and Policy IMP2, are to be retained. This will help soften the edge of the development and provide screening. This coupled with the variety of dwelling heights and forms will ensure that the proposal would not result in any significantly adverse impact on the wider landscape.

Housing Layout and Mix

Layout

4.16 In terms of the layout of the proposed development, the scheme has responded well to its surrounding context and has provided variety and interest within the development with three character areas being defined.

4.17 The relationship with existing properties along Norwich Road and Caistor Lane is respected with the use of rear gardens backing on to this boundary and the pattern of existing development reflected by the use of semi-detached units with on plot parking between dwellings.

4.18 The layout of the development along the south and west boundaries of the site aims to respect the countryside and parkland edge of the development by proposing detached dwellings at a lower density that reflect the more rural character of houses and farm buildings in the countryside and boundary treatments are sympathetic to the edge of development location. The properties on this fringe front on to the fields to the south-west and so have a positive relationship to the landscape and the open areas to the south.

4.19 The remainder of the site integrates well into the existing development and the higher density reinforces and defines the street hierarchy of this main spine road running through the development.

4.20 The proposed density of the development is 22.1 dwellings per hectare or 33.3 when excluding the public open space from the site area. It is considered that this density respects the form and character of the surrounding area whilst also maximising the site for housing delivery and as noted above the variation of densities across the site helps create the various character areas and therefore distinctiveness across the development.
4.21 JCS Policy 4 seeks to deliver a mix of housing that provides balanced communities and meets the needs of an area. The application proposes a total of 15 one-bed, 36 two-bed; 48 three-bed; 38 four-bed and 13 five-bed properties which is an acceptable mix and furthermore the affordable mix meets the needs of the area as reflected in the housing needs study.

Design and scale

Design

4.22 The Councils Design Officer has carried out an evaluation of the proposals using the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Building for Life criteria. This secured 10 greens and 2 ambers under the Building for life criteria. The Design Officer considers that the site is well integrated into its surroundings and the layout, form and design respects its context and the existing pattern of development in Poringland whilst also achieving distinctiveness with the creation of three strong character areas. He considers that the buildings are designed and positioned to define and enhance streets, that care has been taken to ensure parking will not dominate the street scene both with variety in its siting and the use of landscaping and that the areas of open and public spaces are well defined and addressed by the proposed buildings. He considers that the creation of a simple layout around a central public open space and gateway feature helps provide clear and legible routes across the site. The overall layout and design of the proposed development is therefore considered acceptable.

A materials schedule has been submitted with the application which details the use of a variety of materials including red and yellow brick, painted render, painted timber cladding, black and terracotta plain and pantiles and white pvcu fenestration. These are varied across the three character areas to help distinguish and define those areas. The agent has requested that a condition be imposed on any permission to agree precise details of the materials prior to their use on the site, this is because there is currently uncertainty with securing bricks due to a brick shortage. Officers consider that this is reasonable subject to securing appropriate quality materials that are varied across the site to reinforce the character areas as described above.

4.23 It is therefore considered that subject to the above conditions that the development will comply with NPPF paragraph 7; requiring good design and JCS Policy 2; promoting good design.

Scale

4.25 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, plus some small apartment buildings. The majority of the development would be traditional two storey height with max ridge height of 9m. Eight bungalows are proposed in the north-east corner of the site with max ridge heights to 5.4m. The scale of the proposed development is considered to be appropriate for its context.

Residential amenity

Amenity of nearby residential properties

4.26 In regards to the amenity of nearby residential properties, the development site sits to the rear of properties which front on to both Caistor Lane and Norwich Road. These properties are largely characterised by detached bungalows/chalet bungalows and semi detached two storey properties, all within reasonably sized gardens. The layout of the proposed development addresses the relationship with those properties well, with the drainage ditch and proposed open space providing a natural buffer of between approx. 9m and 20m
respectively. Garden depths for the proposed dwellings backing on to these have a range of between approx. 8m and 12m depth. Therefore in the opinion of Officers, and notwithstanding concerns raised by local residents in respect of impact on amenity which are noted, the distances achieved coupled with the retention of and further planting of landscaping along this north and east boundary of the site would ensure that no significantly adverse impact on the amenities of those existing properties would result.

4.27 There are two pedestrian links proposed from the eastern side of the site to link into Norwich Road. Both footpaths are to be screened to the adjacent properties by close boarded fencing which should ensure that no adverse impact in terms of loss of privacy and undue noise/security issues would result. The exact details of the fence including the length of the fence and its detailing will need to be secured by way of condition.

4.28 An underground pumping station together with associated enclosures is proposed at the north-west corner of the site. This will be adequately screened by shrub and hedge planting and will be secured by lockable entrance gates. It is not considered that the pumping station would therefore result in any significantly adverse impact to the outlook of existing or proposed residents.

Amenity standards for the proposed dwellings

4.29 The proposed internal floor spaces will provide acceptable levels of amenity and in regard to external space, garden sizes are generally of a size of equal to or greater than the footprint of the properties and their size and shape is appropriate for their intended occupiers. The proposed apartment buildings have shared outdoor space which should adequately accommodate bin and cycle storage areas and clothes drying.

4.30 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in respect of amenity standards for the proposed development.

Crime and disorder

4.31 The Committee will note that the Police Architectural Liaison Officer has indicated that should the developer wish to achieve a ‘secured by design’ award, which is a voluntary award aimed at designing out crime in new developments, that a number of alterations would be required to the layout of the scheme to reduce the permeability of the site by reducing the multiple footpath links across the site or, achieve higher standards of physical security for individual dwellings (in terms of type of glass and locks in ground floor doors and windows). Since the award is voluntary and the design and layout of the development is satisfactory and achieves good levels of surveillance, the development is considered acceptable in this regard.

Sustainable construction

4.32 JCS Policy 3 sets out the Council’s requirements for sustainable construction techniques, on-site renewable energy and water efficiency for new developments. Conditions were imposed on the outline to ensure that the proposal accords with the requirements for water efficiency.

4.33 The provision of renewable energy was identified at the outline consent. Now a detailed application has been submitted the solar panels proposed can be conditioned for details to be provided.
Open space / Landscaping

Open space

4.34 2.3 hectares is proposed for open space on the site. This is largely located around the edge and to the south of the site with a small number of informal open space areas within the development including an area of open space and surface water drainage ponds forming a gateway at the northern entrance to the site. The area to the south is intended to form part of a larger site with linked open space on Phase II when this comes forward.

4.35 The area of open space indicated therefore technically fulfils the requirement of 6250sqm of recreational space and 2750sqm of play area required for the development under saved Local Plan policy LEI7 and as secured in the S106 at the outline stage, however, no specific area has been indicated for the play area. The S106 leaves the option to deliver this on the emerging site to the south. If this is not delivered there is sufficient open space to the south-east corner of the site to facilitate the provision of the play area. Therefore subject to a condition to agree the location, size and equipment proposed for this play space on this application site, the proposal is acceptable and considered to comply with the Development Plan. The trigger to agree this condition will be securing details prior to commencement and delivery on completion of 100 dwellings unless the alternative scheme and a timetable for its delivery is approved.

Landscaping

4.36 In respect of landscaping, a landscape masterplan has been submitted with the application. This indicates that existing trees and hedging along the northern, western and eastern boundaries are largely to be retained with further landscaping proposed. A number of trees are to be removed at the north-west corner of the site to facilitate the access into the development, however this has already been agreed in principle given that means of access to the development has already been approved in this location. The general approach to the landscaping, respecting the existing mature landscaping features of the site and further enhancing those with planting is acceptable and would accord with the aims of Policy JCS 1, Saved Local Plan policy IMP2 and NPPF section 11. Exact details of the landscaping plan including planting schedules will need be secured by way of condition.

4.37 Members will note that the Council’s Landscape Officer considers that the tree protection plan and landscaping plan are lacking in detail, however there are no objections to the overall landscape strategy and as such this detail can be secured by condition. There is some concern with the close proximity of two of the plots to the existing vegetation along the western boundary. Clarification has been sought from the agent which confirms that these properties are over 4.5m from the tree canopy and outside of the root protection zones. As such whilst the close proximity of plots 135 and 150 is of concern in respect of shading of those properties and added pressure for their removal in the future, it is not considered that this threat is so significant to justify re-location of these plots nor a refusal of the application.

4.38 A landscaping Management plan has been submitted with the application and was a requirement of the S106 for the outline consent. This ensures that the proposed public open space and public landscape areas will be adequately maintained and managed. The management plan is not clear in terms of details of the maintenance schedule and who would have responsibility for that management plan, although the applicant has indicated that this would be by a management company that would be set up. Details of the management plan in this regard will need to be secured by way of condition.
Ecology

4.39 A Phase 1 Habitat report was submitted with the outline permission which found no protected species and no further work or conditions were considered necessary, it was therefore concluded that the proposal would not result in any harm to protected species.

4.40 Existing trees and hedgerows are to be retained as part of the development and further landscaping proposed. This coupled with the use of open space around the site to create a buffer to the development would help create a green infrastructure network and habitat corridor which should result in a net enhancement to biodiversity.

4.41 Therefore subject to a condition to secure precise details of planting within the public landscape and open space areas, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with saved Local Plan policies ENV14 and ENV15, the aims of NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

Drainage

Foul water

4.42 In respect of foul drainage, the Committee will note that Anglian Water confirmed at outline stage that there is sufficient capacity in the network to connect to the existing foul system and that the proposed foul drainage strategy (incorporating on-site storage and pumping to a connection point on Castor Lane) was acceptable.

Surface water

4.43 In regards to surface water drainage, a package of measures was proposed and approved at outline which adequately controlled surface water drainage within the site and sought to improve the existing drainage problem for local residents whereby the poorly maintained drainage ditches surrounding the site have led to localised flooding events.

4.44 The strategy, which was supported by both the Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Defence Officer, included the use of the existing drainage ditches along the eastern and northern boundaries (to be cleared); additional ditches along the eastern boundary to link existing ditches; swales and attenuation ponds; piped surface water; under-ground attenuation cells; an on-line storage tank and a vortex flow control system to control run-off rates from the site in addition to new outfalls and culverts.

4.45 Members will note that the Council’s Flood Defence Officer has commented that the layout submitted with this reserved matters application does not indicate the location of the proposed swales, attenuation cells and existing ditch networks. However there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate these measures and this can be agreed by condition. The Flood Defence Officer also has concern with the future management of the drainage system to ensure that responsibility for this is understood. The Environment Agency has confirmed that the long term maintenance of the surface water drainage network and flow controls will be offered to Anglian Water for adoption but any features outside of their responsibility would need to be maintained by a management company. A condition will need to be imposed on any consent to agree management arrangements for all surface and foul water drainage systems prior to the commencement of development to ensure that it is satisfactorily implemented and maintained. Therefore whilst objections raised by residents in respect of drainage are noted, for the above reasons and subject to conditions, the proposed drainage is considered acceptable.
Affordable Housing

4.46 49 of the 150 proposed dwellings are affordable which equates to 32.7% in accordance with the requirements of the S106 agreement agreed at outline stage. The S106 also secured the tenure mix of 84% social rented and 16% intermediate (a mix of shared ownership and shared equity), the development as proposed accords with this mix required by JCS Policy 4, housing delivery.

4.47 Whilst the overall tenure mix has been agreed, the application is not clear or specific on which of the affordable units are intermediate and which are social rent to make up that ratio. Therefore in the absence of an affordable housing accommodation schedule specifying each plot by tenure, a condition is required on any consent to secure this prior to the commencement of development.

4.48 Affordable housing should be mixed within the development to create a balanced community, and this was a particular criticism of the previously refused full application on the site which concentrated all of the affordable dwellings in one area. The application now submitted has separated the affordable units into two areas. 15 are located in the south-east corner of the site adjacent to the area of open space. The remaining 34 affordable units are located further north and more centrally within the site. Given that the affordable units have been better dispersed, officers consider that the distribution of the affordable units as proposed is acceptable and accords with the Development Plan.

Highways issues

4.49 The proposed access from Caistor Lane in the north-west corner of the site and off site highway works required to make the development acceptable were secured at outline stage. These included appropriate visibility splays on to Caistor Lane, the widening of Caistor Lane and the provision of a footway from the development to Norwich Road; enhancements to the walk to school route including the installation of a Toucan crossing on Norwich road in the vicinity of the High School and enhancements to the bus stops on Norwich Road by making them DDA compliant and by providing shelters. Objections raised by local residents in respect of the number of dwellings proposed, highway impact and congestion are noted however, the principle of the development and the access have already been established and those impacts were considered to be acceptable from a highway perspective. Details of the internal estate layout and parking are for consideration.

Estate road layout

4.50 On consideration of the estate road layout, a number of amendments were requested by the County Highway Authority. The plans have been amended to address those requirements and include: increasing the size of all garages to 3m x 7m in line with policy requirement; additional parking spaces to some plots; demonstration of visibility splay, road widening and footpath provision on the plan; amendments to estate road types, widths, turning heads and addition of speed tables; inclusion of a cycle path through to the south of the site and deletion of reference to use of the footpath link to Norwich Road as an emergency access.

4.51 Two areas have not been amended inline with the comments of the Highway Authority. Firstly, parking spaces have been left at 2 per plot for plots 55,139 and 147 despite comment from highways that the parking standards require 3 parking spaces for 4 bed properties such as these. Secondly Highways suggested the inclusion of some on street parking bays along the main road through the development to prevent on the likely on street parking of some cars which are served by rear parking courts.
4.52 The agent has indicated that the parking bays have not been added so as to prioritise the character of the streetscene with landscaping rather than dominating with parking bays, inline with the expressions of the Parish Council.

4.53 Those two matters result in a shortfall in parking across the development of only 3 parking spaces along with the possibility of some on street parking on the spine road due to the use of rear parking courts. Officers would however consider that subject to no objection from the Highway Authority, the slight shortfall in parking across the entire site is not significant and would unlikely give rise to any significant or adverse on street parking. Furthermore whilst rear parking courts are not encouraged, their use in this scheme helps provide a variety of parking types and location to avoid uniformity and its domination within the streetscene and as such this too is on balance considered to be acceptable.

4.54 Comments are awaited from the Highway Authority in respect of these amended plans and members will be updated at Committee.

Heritage assets

4.55 The Historic Environment Service has indicated that heritage assets of archaeological significance were found at the site. These were identified at a shallow depth directly beneath the modern ploughsoil and consequently their significance will be adversely affected by the proposed development. They however raise no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.

Therefore subject to these conditions it is not considered that the proposal would result in any harm to the significance of heritage assets and would accord with the Development Plan.

Developer contributions

4.56 The Outline consent is subject to a S106 legal agreement which secures the following:

1) Funding for increased capacity of educational facilities within the catchment area of the development which include nursery, primary and secondary school contributions.

2) Funding for the improvement of the library service serving the development (£60 per dwelling)

3) Affordable Housing comprising of at least 32.7% of the dwelling units

4) Provision of a minimum of 1000 sqm of play area (equipped with a minimum of three items of play equipment) on the land together with a further 17.5sqm of play area in relation to each dwelling unit over 50.

5) Provision of a minimum of 2000sqm of recreational space together with a further 42.5sqm of recreational space on the land in relation to each dwelling unit over 50 or in the event of a shortfall additional funding for the provision of adult/older children recreational facilities with the parish of Poringland.

6) Funding towards the costs associated with the Travel Plan.

Members will note that the affordable housing proposed at 32.7% accords with the requirements of the obligation, as does the 2.3hectares of public open space which provides for the required recreational and play space.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle, number of dwellings and means of access have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2013/1986.
5.2 Officers consider that the key issues regarding poor layout and lack of distinctiveness in a previously refused scheme have been addressed. The layout better respects its context and the creation of three character areas with varying house design, densities and landscaping treatments ensures that there is variation and distinctiveness across the site. This in addition to the creation of a green buffer around the edge of the development with a larger area of open space to the south helps to create a quality and distinctive built environment.

5.3 The proposal delivers policy compliant affordable housing at an acceptable tenure which is well distributed across the site.

5.4 The use of the open space around the edge of the site to create a buffer and sensitive layout of the properties ensures that acceptable levels of residential amenity are achieved.

5.5 Subject to no objection from the Highway Authority and the imposition of a number of conditions as detailed in the report, and notwithstanding objections raised by local residents, it is considered that the landscape, layout, appearance and scale and other relevant issues are appropriate and that the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS, SNLP and any relevant emerging local plan policies.

5.6 Accordingly the application is recommended for approval subject to no new substantive issues being raised by outstanding consultees.

5.7 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as this is a reserved matters application following grant of outline consent prior to the adoption of CIL.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tracy Lincoln
and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2014/0823/D  
**Parish**: THARSTON AND HAPTON

**Applicants Name**: Taylor Wimpey East Anglia  
**Site Address**: Land At Chequers Road Tharston Norfolk NR15 2YA  
**Proposal**: Reserved matters application (following planning permission 2010/2225/O) for residential development of 120 dwellings including details of appearance, landscaping, layout & scale.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Conditions on outline must be met  
2. In accordance with amended plans and documents  
3. Details of a revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be submitted and approved  
4. Removal of permitted development rights on the southern boundary of the site in the Tree Root Protection area of the group of Poplar Trees (G3)

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 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 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 18: Off street parking provision  
TRA 19: Parking standards  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
ENV14: Habitat Protection  
ENV15: Species Protection

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.
1.5 Development Management Policies
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.7 Statutory Duties
Listed Buildings Act 1990 Section 66 (1)

2. Planning History

2.1 2010/2225 Outline application for residential development of up to 120 dwellings and associated works including access from Chequers Road and Jermyn Way (amended proposal) Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received
3.4 Environmental Services No objection
3.5 Conservation Officer No comments received
3.6 Environment Agency No comments received
3.7 County Ecologist • The submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan has not addressed recommendations of the original outline applications ecology report.
  • Recommends conditioning that a revised Ecological Management Plan is submitted and agreed before works commences.
3.8 Historic Environment Service • Work has been undertaken to determine that the risk to archaeological deposits is low. Possibility that locally important heritage assets remain to be investigated.
  • A Written Scheme of Investigation should be undertaken as part of the approved Conditions of outline planning application 2010/2225.
3.9 Housing Strategy Officer • No objection, but requests the possibility of an additional affordable home using a commuted sum from a site elsewhere in Tharston.
3.10 Landscape Officer

First consultation:
- If the Poplars on the southern boundary are to remain then the nearest dwellings should be arranged so that any conflicts are avoided. No assessment is made of the potential shading effect of these trees.
- The submitted Tree Constraints Plan does not include an indication of the anticipated growth of the existing trees.
- Disappointing that the proposed layout does not make more of a feature of the best trees on the site; with the exception of T18, T25 and T40 (notably the loss of T37 and T39).
- The close-boarded boundaries of the plots that abut the footpaths to north and south at the Chequers Lane side is an approach which, to my mind, will result in a ‘back alley’ character for these public routes.
- Need details of the proposed highway improvement works in order to assess the impact of trees along Chequers Road.
- Support the concept of a community orchard, but will need to ensure it is in the right place and managed to achieve its long-term aims.

Second consultation:
- No assessment of the shading effect of the Poplar trees has been made.
- Plot 26 has its parking allocated to an area directly under some of the poplar trees.
- The spine road does not impact upon tree T39, so this could be retained.
- The proposed development has not capitalised on the best identified specimens. If anything, the proposed layout compromises the best retained trees by the relationship of private gardens.
- New planting is all well and good, but much fails as a result of many different factors. It is far better to seek to retain identified higher-quality trees where possible.
- Cannot fully support approval and consider that revised proposals are required.

3.11 Natural England - No objection.

3.12 NCC Highways

First consultation:
- Identified a number of technical issues relating to the site layout, parking and size of proposed garages.

Second consultation:
- No objection, but remain of the view that garages should have internal dimensions measuring a minimum of 3.0m x 6.0m.

3.13 Public Rights Of Way

First consultation:
- Widths of existing footpath FP28 and FP29 should be a minimum of 4m and 3.5m respectively to alleviate sense of enclosure along rear boundary.
- Plot 111 obstructs FP29 near to its junction with FP28. This could be diverted.
- Line of Tharston FP31 should be checked to ensure it is not affected by the development.
Second consultation:
- Concerned that a diversion of footpath FP29 to the rear of properties 1 – 7 will change the nature of the footpath from being a rural right of way to a pavement adjacent to a road.
- Acknowledges that the Architectural Police Liaison Officer would prefer footpath FP29 to be moved away from the back of the properties.

3.14 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

First consultation:
- The two existing footpaths FP28 and FP29 are considered unnecessary and compromise the safety and security of dwellings.
- Permeability across the site has capacity to facilitate anti-social behaviour and crime.
- Recommends Secured by Design elements which relate to secure exterior doors & windows, boundary fences, rear gates and security lighting.

Second consultation:
- No comment received.
- Footpath FP29 moved in response to above comment.

3.15 SNC - Play and Amenities Manager

First consultation:
- The toddler play area is located too close to an open water structure on the fringes of the development.
- It would be more suited to have been located on the POS area to the Eastern section of the site.

Second consultation:
- The relocation for toddler play is an acceptable compromise, taking in to account the payment provision off site to enable SNDC to establish a more modern play area at Jermyn Way Thorston.

3.16 Planning Policy

No comments received.

3.17 Listed Buildings Officer

- No objection.
- Proposals need to ensure that vegetation around the listed building ‘The Meadows’ remains at the boundary to retain the natural character of the site as well as providing some degree of screening from the new development.

3.18 Representations

13 letters of objection received from residents, mostly relating to concerns over highways and access.

- Chequers Road and Jermyn Way is narrow, difficult to pass and not suitable for an increase in traffic.
- Uncertain about which trees will be removed along the site boundaries.
- Feel that there are more suitable site accesses available by either extending the newly opened access road from the care home or via a new link road located behind number 1 – 8 chequers Road.
- Jermyn Way not a suitable access as it is narrow and bendy.
- Majority of existing homes have little or no front gardens and will be affected by the extra traffic.
Development Management Committee 23 July 2014

- Safety concerns for children especially using the play areas.
- Would like to see a number of road safety measures to reduce the speed of vehicles entering Jermyn Way such as road humps, pinch points etc.
- Concerns of Poplar trees to the rear of Jermyn Way should be avoided where possible.
- Inadequate access and highways provisions.
- Concerns about the future impacts, volume of traffic, types of traffic and speed of traffic on Chequers Road.
- Boundary Plan does not detail proposals for any of the site boundaries, just the boundaries between development properties.

1 letter of objection received from Long Stratton Surgery.

- The plans are likely to impact on the community’s practice as we receive no additional funding for additional patients.
- We urge the council to look at how the proposed plans will impact upon health care provision within the ward and work collaboratively with us to make sure that we are able to continue providing an excellent level of care to our patients.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application follows outline planning permission granted in October 2013 under application ref 2010/2225 for the residential development of up to 120 dwellings and associated works including access from Chequers Road and Jermyn Way. All matters were reserved apart from the principle of erecting 120 dwellings and access which is not before members for consideration.

4.2 Members will recall that outline permission was granted with appropriate conditions and subject to a Section 106 Planning Agreement. The agreement was approved in October 2013 and related to the payment of developer contributions and other matters concerning the implementation of the development. This included 10% affordable housing and a sum of £500,000 to be used for off-site highway works, namely the installation of traffic signals at the junction of Flowerpot Lane and the Street, Long Stratton and a contribution to the Long Stratton by-pass.

4.3 This reserved matters application now seeks the approval of appearance, scale, landscaping and layout of the development only.

4.4 In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the due weight given to the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the emerging policies of the new Local Plan as they advance through their preparation, is dependent on the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The relevant polices to this application that are considered to be consistent with the NPPF are listed above in Section 1. Some policies subject to objections have not been included in the list as these issues are unlikely to be resolved within the time frame of the application, and therefore should be afforded little weight. The Government launched the Planning Practice Guidance web-based resource on 6 March 2014, after this reserved matters application was submitted. The content of the guidance has been considered but in this case the Planning Practice Guidance is not considered to offer any further new significant guidance that would materially affect the advice contained in the NPPF.

4.5 As the principle of development and access to the site has already been established, the remaining considerations to take into account in this planning application are:

- Layout and appearance
- Scale
- Landscaping
4.6 The main impacts which need to be taken into consideration are:

- Heritage assets
- Highways impacts
- Residential amenity
- Drainage
- Ecology

Layout and Appearance

4.7 The application includes a comprehensive analysis of the site context and the surrounding character of Tharston. The analysis and detailed character assessment of Tharston shows how the development proposals have been developed to take into account the assessment’s findings as well as influence from the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

4.8 The proposed layout creates a low density development accessed by a primary access from the west via a new junction / mini roundabout off Chequers Road and a secondary access via Jermyn Way. Several existing public right of ways accessed from Chequers Road have been retained and enhanced across the site, including an off-road pedestrian route through the public open space which links to the wider pedestrian network. Additionally, a new link east of the site is proposed that connects to an existing footpath route that leads to Stratton High School.

4.9 The site layout shows how the streets and spaces have been well enclosed and are predominantly fronted by built form set back from the edge of the highway. Frontage to the public open space and attenuation basins creates attractive focal points within the development, offering a sense of enclosure and increasing the quality of the public realm.

4.10 The detailed design of the proposals provide a good mix of styles and features commonly found in this location and within South Norfolk, informed by a Character Area Assessment of Tharston and its surroundings. Proposed materials and architectural detailing include multi facing brickwork, pantiles, timberwork porches and chimneys to selected dwellings. Key buildings address and mark the entrance to the development and are located at street corners to play a vital role in making the scheme legible for residents to navigate. These buildings are also used to terminate key views and create a sense of enclosure.

Scale

4.11 The South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and the character area assessment inform three new character areas for the proposal. These character areas integrate with the existing character of Tharston through a variation in densities and locally distinctive materials.

4.12 The ‘Gateway’ character area comprises large detached units located at the gateway to the site, to reflect the existing scale and density of Chequers Road, whilst the ‘Frontage to Green Spaces’ character area consists of predominantly 2 storeys with intermittent 2.5 storey dwellings that are used to enclose the areas of public open space with dwellings set well back from the road with small front gardens, taking influence from Chequers Road and Tharston. The ‘Core Housing’ character area uses certain aspects of the adjacent Jermyn Way development such as similar scale, density and materials. Two single storey properties are also proposed in the north-eastern corner of the site that respects the existing site context.

4.13 The layout, appearance and scale of the development proposals have been evaluated against the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Building for Life criteria and scores 11 out of 12 greens, which confirm that the layout and designs of the site and dwellings are acceptable and accord with JCS Policy 2 (Design).
Landscaping

4.14 The majority of existing landscape features on the site boundaries have been retained and reinforced in places, which include hedgerows and tree planting. These help to maintain the character of the site when viewed from Chequers Road and Swan Lane as well as acting as screening, particularly along the south-western edge adjacent to existing built form, which includes a listed building known as ‘The Meadows’.

4.15 A central open space has been provided that not only provides an attractive green space but also takes advantage of a number of existing landscape features. The existing ditch and a number of existing trees have been integrated into the design of the scheme, providing a strong landscape framework. Proposed trees and the attenuation basin offers potential for habitat creation and grassland, where wildflower meadow grass provides an ecological feature at the centre of the site.

4.16 Further to the outline planning permission that suggested that the existing Poplar trees to the rear of plots 15 to 24 may be removed, it has become apparent during community engagement that there is considerable support for these to be retained. This reserved matters application proposes that the existing Poplar trees are retained in their entirety to maintain a degree of separation and screening between the proposed and existing properties that back onto Jermyn Way. The Landscape Officer has raised a number of concerns relating to the shading effect of these trees and their relationship to the proposed new plots, including the take up of optional conservatories. Whilst it is accepted that there will be a degree of shading caused, as well as increased pressure to remove the trees in the future, it is considered that this is outweighed by a strong desire from residents to retain the Poplar trees, as well as the benefits mentioned above. The nearest neighbouring dwellings affected would be between approximately 20 and 30 meters from windows directly overlooking towards their windows. If these trees were to remain in due course there would be an impact from overlooking, but this would not be sufficient enough to merit refusal of the application. If future residents wish to seek the removal of these trees then this is something that can be assessed on an individual basis at that time through the appropriate process. A suitable worded condition removing permitted development rights on the southern boundary of the site in the Tree Root Protection area is included to limit the future take up of rear extensions in this location.

4.17 The overall layout has been revised to avoid conflict with Root Protection Areas by removing the optional conservatories from properties that back on to the existing Poplar trees and within with root protection areas. It is considered that a suitable worded planning condition could be used to remove permitted development rights for optional conservatories where there is an identified conflict.

4.18 With regards to the removal of T37 & T39 and alignment of the main road, a balance between the various constraints and the need to provide an engaging urban environment has been taken into account. The position of the highway which results in the loss of T37 & T39 is dictated by the required highways standards and development ‘blocks’ so that active frontages are achieved to both sides of the highway. To reposition the highway would result in a single sided road that would be detrimental to the urban environment. It is acknowledged that while the removal of these trees will change the immediate landscape setting, the overall visual impact could not be considered to creating significant harm to the landscape. Given that the trees are not afforded any landscape protection and the need to achieve the best possible layout, a refusal on these grounds would not be supported in the context of advice in the NPPF and JCS. It should also be noted that of the twelve identified Category A trees / groups of trees on this site, only three individuals are identified for removal.
4.19 The Landscape Officer’s suggestion regarding the planting of fruit trees in rear gardens to encourage an ‘orchard’ approach has been noted and the applicant has confirmed that this will be implementation in the detailed landscape designs. With regards to the failure of new planting, this is acknowledged however condition 7 of the outline planning permission refers to a five year period in which any failures will be replaced and therefore offers adequate control to ensure that the local authority is able to deliver appropriate mitigation for these proposals.

4.20 In summary, it is considered that the retention of the majority of the existing trees and vegetation around the site boundaries as well as additional tree planting, demonstrates that the site can be developed in a sympathetic and respectful manner to the existing landscape characteristics and accords with Local Plan Policy IMP2 (Landscaping).

Heritage Assets

4.21 The development backs onto a Grade II Listed building known as ‘The Meadows’ to the south of the site. The main aspect of the house is to the west towards the vehicular entrance and a range of outbuildings between it and the site.

4.22 The SNC Conservation Officer has carried out an assessment of the Listed Building and its setting and agrees that the mature vegetation around the site is an important part of its setting which retains the natural character of the site as well as providing some degree of screening from the new development. The location of the proposed single storey garage block on the land closest to the listed building and proposed new trees also helps minimise the impact on the building and will not interrupt immediate views around the setting of the listed building.

4.23 In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting under the provisions of Section 66 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990. I therefore feel that the scheme would not harm the setting of the listed building in accordance with paragraph 137 of the NPPF and IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Highway Impacts

4.24 It is noted throughout the course of the application that local residents have raised concerns relating to the increased amount of traffic that will be generated by the development and the suitability of access onto Chequers Road and Jermyn Way. However, Members should note that the means of access and the overall transport strategy for the site has already been approved by means of the previous outline permission and is not for consideration. The agreeing of the general layout of the development by means of a masterplan as part of the same outline consent has also established the arrangement of internal access roads. The Highways Authority have confirmed that they have no objections in respect of the most recent set of plans proposed for the site, but would wish to see larger garages proposed where they measure less than 3.0m x 6.0m. While the Highways Authority have stated their desire for larger garages this is only guidance and the proposed garage sizes, which measure 3m x 5.8m are capable of accommodating an average sized car, plus an area of storage.

4.25 As part of this application some amendments have also been made in response to officer comments to ensure car parking is better integrated into the street scene. The majority of parking is now provided on-plot and is generally located to the side of dwellings within an individual parking bay and/or garage set just back from the building line to allow ease of access to dwellings. Courtyard parking is designed to serve only a few units, creating a private and well-defined area with good surveillance from dwellings. Parking in these areas
is provided so that it is convenient for the user to promote its use. Parking and cycling parking numbers are provided in accordance with the Highway Authority standards and have been designed to provide accessible car parking spaces.

4.26 In conclusion and having taken into account the technical information received from NCC Highways who have confirmed that the highways proposals are acceptable, I am satisfied that the application accords with Local Plan Policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow Traffic).

Residential amenity

4.27 Concerns have been raised by residents about the increased use of Chequers Road and Jermyn Way. These concerns were noted at outline stage, particularly in relation to Jermyn Way where dwellings are in close proximity of the road. However as previously advised in my report, the Highway Authority does not raise an objection on safety grounds and I do not consider the impact on increased usage will be so detrimental to warrant refusal on residential amenity grounds.

4.28 Having assessed the site layout it is considered that the development has been designed in such a manor to avoid any direct overlooking or impacts in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties.

4.29 The design of the properties and additional planting along the boundaries help to minimise any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. In a similar manor, where the development backs on to existing properties there is a generous distance between the existing properties and the proposed development as well as the existing and additional proposed landscaping. I am therefore satisfied that the development accords with policy IMP9 of the SNLP and the emerging Local Plan relating to residential amenity.

Drainage

4.30 The Environment Agency and Anglian Water have confirmed that they wish to raise no objections to the development. Information relating to the discharge of Conditions will be provided and agreed in writing before development commences, including submission of a full surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment.

Ecology

4.31 As part of the outline approval and Section 106 Planning Agreement it was decided that an identified grassland site will be brought into use and managed for 10 years, as well as a sum of £10,000 provided as compensation for the loss of the southern meadow of the site. In addition to this a SUDs corridor from north to south and a widened wetland area to the north of the site is proposed, which helps to provide mitigation against this loss. The County Ecologist has requested that these areas are defined on a plan in a revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

4.32 In addition, the County Ecologist has requested that the revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan takes into account the recommendations of the original outline ecology report and Ecology Consultants letter dated 13th October 2011. These include safeguarding existing areas that are not designated as open space; details of the grassland management to specify the mix and subsequent habitat that they mean to create or maintain and the enhancement of the existing pond on site.

4.33 Subject to some minor mitigation and enhancements and the submission of a revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and Lighting Plan to be conditioned as part of the application, the County Ecologist raises no objection. Therefore the proposals are considered to accord with the relevant development management policy, as well as the requirements of Section 11 of the NPPF.
Other Matters

Public Rights of Way

4.34 Issues relating to the position of the two existing footpaths FP28 and FP29 have been raised by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer as compromising the safety and security of dwellings to the rear. In response to this, footpath FP29 has been relocated in front of plots 1 – 7 to reduce opportunities for crime and permeability across the site. A diversion order under Section 257 of the Town and County Planning Act has been sought for the footpath to be moved. In the event that this diversion order is not successful then the proposals will revert back to the former FP29 route within the back gardens to Plots 1 to 7 by repositioning the garden fences.

4.35 It is proposed that footpath FP28 will remain in the same location to the rear of plots 109 – 120, as it forms part of the wider footpath network that connects to existing footpaths outside of the site as well as forming an access to the existing pump station adjacent to the site. To improve surveillance over this area, the boundary has been reduced to 1.5m high close boarded fence, topped with 0.3m trellis. The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has also made a number of recommendations which relate to additional security measures to exterior door, windows and boundary treatments in this location.

4.36 Having assessed the benefits of the relocation of footpath FP29, it is considered that the footpath location, should a diversion order be successful, will help to significantly increase natural surveillance and also enhance the appearance of the site entrance. It is also considered that the measures put in place to increase natural surveillance along the existing routes of footpaths FP28 and FP29 are adequate to address the security concerns raised.

Local Services

4.37 Concerns have been raised by the Long Stratton Surgery relating to the likely increased demand on services with no identified additional funding for patients. The surgery have urged the council to look at how the proposed plans will impact upon health care provision within the ward and to work collaboratively to make sure that they are able to continue providing an excellent level of care to patients.

4.38 Whilst the capacity of doctor’s surgeries cannot be given material weight in the consideration of this reserved matters planning application, as there is no identified need or requirement in adopted policy or other material considerations to ensure this, the council is committed to working proactively with local service providers outside of the planning process to try and increase local capacity. The council also recognises that essential infrastructure will be needed in the longer term to ensure sustainable developments in Long Stratton are delivered including increasing social infrastructure of education, healthcare and community facilities. The council acknowledges this in its Area Action Plan for Long Stratton that it wants to submit to Government for Examination in Public. The plan currently has very limited material weight as it is at a pre-submission stage but will be used to guide future development up to 2026.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The appearance, scale, landscaping and layout of the development are considered acceptable in the context of the site and would not have a significant detrimental effect on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.
5.2 Having assessed the application against the development plan the proposed development is considered to accord with saved policies IMP1 (Design), IMP2 (Landscaping) and IMP8 (Safe and Free flow of Traffic) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, the NPPF and the emerging policies listed in section 2 of this report and therefore the application is recommended for approval.

5.3 The application is not subject to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as it was submitted before the 1 May 2014.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2014/0840/RVC  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

- **Applicants Name**: Mr Tim Shattock  
- **Site Address**: Poundstretcher Farrier Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0WF  
- **Proposal**: Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2007/0497/F to allow increased range of goods to be sold from the premises.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. Restricted sales (amended)  
2. Tree and hedge retention  
3. Hours of trading  
4. Retain parking/servicing areas

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
   Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Wymondham Area Action Plan Policy WYM 18  
   Sequential approach and impact assessment for retail provision in Wymondham

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2007/0497  
   Erection of a Class A1 non-food DIY retail store (2,437 sqm gross internal area) together with garden centre, servicing and car parking for 120 cars, the formation of a new access onto the internal estate road, landscaping and associated works  
   Approved (with later modification)

2.2 2011/1784  
   Alterations to external elevations of existing building and associated internal works to form 2 units  
   Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Wymondham Town Council  
   Approved

3.2 District Member  
   To Committee – possible impact on Town Centre shopping
3.3 Planning Policy

- Unauthorised floorspace is below 1000sqm threshold in SNLP and WAAP so should not require formal impact assessment.
- Unauthorised floorspace is below 500sqm threshold in emerging WAAP for sequential test.
- GVA Report supports the view there are no sequentially preferable sites available.
- Difficult to argue the additional convenience sales would harm the Town Centre and there is some merit in applicant’s claim this will complement existing retail offer to enhance the trade clawback effect.
- Support approval subject to condition to limit floorspace permitted.

3.4 NCC Highways

No objection

3.5 Representations

(1 correspondent)

- Concern at avoidance of restrictions by use of ancillary sales clauses.
- No reference to Pet Hut sales – should be restricted.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application relates to an existing Class A1 retail unit on Farrier Close, an out of centre location on the Gateway 11 development in Wymondham. Permission (2007/0497/F) was originally granted in May 2007 for the erection of a non-food DIY retail store with garden centre, servicing and 120 car parking spaces. Its original occupier was Focus DIY. The store has a gross floorspace of 2,437sqm and net retail floorspace of 1,609sqm. The permission was granted (and subsequently modified) subject to condition 8 restricting retail sales as follows.

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use classes) Order 1987, or the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying those Orders, there shall be no display for the retail sale, or retail sale, of any of the following goods within the retail unit hereby approved:

a) Food;
b) Alcoholic drinks;
c) Tobacco;
d) Fashion clothing and fashion footwear;
e) Chemist/pharmaceutical goods;
f) Jewellery/fancy goods and luggage;
g) Books, newspapers and magazines (unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted within this development);
h) Crockery, glassware, china, kitchenware (unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted within this development);
i) Perfume or toiletries;
j) Sports clothing and equipment;
k) Audio and visual recordings (unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted within this development);
l) Mobile phones;
m) TV’s, DVD’s, hi-fi’s, microwaves, ovens and similar non-DIY electrical equipment (unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted within this development) and
n) Animals or fish.”

4.3 Following the closure of Focus DIY the unit stood empty for some time but has now been occupied by Poundstretcher, a discount retailer who currently sell a wide range of goods in accordance with the original permission. However, they also sell certain products in breach
of the above condition. The current application seeks permission to modify the condition to enable the continued sale of particular products up to maximum specified amounts. This involves the proposed modification of 3 of the categories currently prohibited by the above condition and the changes requested are as follows:

a) Food (up to 12.5% of net sales area) [equates to 201sqm];
f) Jewellery/fancy goods and luggage (up to 1% net sales area) [16sqm]
i) Perfume and toiletries (up to 6% net sales area) [97sqm]

The other product ranges referred to in the condition would remain as at present, either totally prohibited, or only permitted as ancillary items.

4.4 Members may be aware that the owners of the property did submit two applications for a Certificate of Lawful Use for this store, claiming that the retail use could be operated entirely without restriction. It was argued, due to a permission given subsequent to the original permission for minor alterations, that the original restricted permission had been superseded by the later permission which did not contain any restriction on retail sales. South Norfolk Council refused one such Lawfulness application and the applicant appealed against non-determination of a second application. The appeal has been held in abeyance because this highly contentious legal interpretation of the effect of subsequent permissions was challenged in a similar case as far as the Court of Appeal. That Court has now ruled to the effect that the original restrictive condition does still apply. A request has been made to challenge this ruling in the High Court and a decision is awaited. The appeal remains in abeyance.

4.5 Members should note that the current application only seeks specific modification of the condition as outlined above which is clearly different to the entirely unrestricted retail use claimed in the Certificate of Lawfulness applications. They are therefore of little relevance to the current application which must be considered on its own merits.

4.6 Taking account of relevant policies and guidance, the current application raises two main considerations. Firstly, the need for retail development proposals to satisfy the sequential test and secondly, the need to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre.

Sequential Test

4.7 The NPPF (section 2) seeks to protect the vitality and viability of town centres and promotes accessible locations for service development, by requiring a sequential approach to the location of town centre uses such as retail development. It also requires that a flexible approach is taken by both local authorities and retailers when seeking to identify alternative sites that are suitable, available and viable. A balance has to be struck between the commercial needs of the retailer and the requirements of planning policy to promote more centrally located sites. However, recent case law suggests that any sites identified must be suitable for the retailer’s requirements.

4.8 As noted above, the existing store has a net retail floorspace of 1,609sqm. However, the proposal in this application would only alter the retail use of 314sqm of that floorspace (201sqm-food; 16sqm jewellery/fancy goods; and 97sqm toiletries). No new floorspace is proposed.

4.9 The emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan contains policy WYM 18 which requires that a sequential test should be applied to proposals exceeding 500sqm. Full weight cannot be given to this as yet unadopted policy, but it does put the scale of the current proposal, which only alters 314sqm, into context.
4.10 The applicant indicates, and I concur, that there are no suitable alternative premises of a similar size to the existing store in sequentially preferable locations in Wymondham. In view of the large size of the total retail floorspace and the relatively small floorspace proposed to change, it is appropriate to consider whether the retailer should be required to consider disaggregating their store to be able to occupy smaller premises. However, consideration must also be given to the applicant’s trading method and their established business model as a discount retailer.

4.11 The applicant indicates that its business model requires an integrated store and its brand is recognised as selling a number of lines across a range of product types within a single store. They maintain that disaggregation would not create a viable business model and that many goods are complementary to others being sold within the store. It should be remembered that planning permission runs with the land, so that the particular retailer occupying the store could change in the future. However, the business requirements of the applicant are still a material consideration.

4.12 Taking account of the established business model employed by this discount retailer; the absence of sequentially preferable alternative premises of the required scale; and the fact that the total retail floorspace already exists in this location; I conclude that the proposal is consistent with the sequential approach required by planning policy.

Impact Test

4.13 In addition to a sequential approach to site selection, the NPPF also requires consideration of how larger retail developments will impact on the vitality and viability of Town Centres. Local Authorities should require an impact assessment for proposals which exceed locally set floorspace thresholds or, in default, 2,500sqm. The SNLP Policy SHO2 sets a threshold for requiring impact assessments at 1,000sqm and this figure is maintained in the submitted Wymondham Area Action Plan in policy WYM18.

4.14 As noted above, the existing store in this case has a net retail floorspace of 1,609sqm, but the proposed change would only expand the range of products able to be sold within an area of 314sqm. In these circumstances a formal retail impact assessment has not been required, but consideration should still be given to the issue.

4.15 Members may recall recently considering two competing proposals for supermarkets in the Town when the question of retail impact also arose. It was concluded (based on submitted assessments and advice from our consultants GVA) that, although the impact of one supermarket would be acceptable on the Town Centre, the cumulative impact of two would not. The fact that one supermarket of 2,022sqm net retail floorspace has been approved at Postmill Close is relevant to assessing the current proposal.

4.16 The current proposal requests relaxation of the planning condition to permit 298sqm of convenience goods (food and toiletries) and 16sqm of comparison goods (jewellery and fancy goods). Compared to a new supermarket, this is a modest amount and, although similar in some respects, the Poundstretcher store does not carry the same range or choice of products as might be expected in a typical convenience supermarket.

4.17 The clauses in the existing planning condition also permit sales of some prohibited products if they are ancillary to other permitted goods. This requires a degree of interpretation, but the applicant in the current application has agreed that any revised condition can exclude the proposed additional product ranges from having ancillary sales applied to them. This removes any uncertainty in respect of the potential extent of ancillary sales associated with the current application.
4.18 The applicants suggest that Poundstretcher is more likely to compete with other discount retailers such as Aldi or Lidl, who are not present in the Town, rather than the established and proposed traders that are present. I am cautious in giving this argument great weight, but National Planning Guidance does advise that impact should be assessed on a like-for-like basis. I am more sympathetic to the suggestion that the Poundstretcher proposal adds greater choice and variety to the retail offer in Wymondham as a whole, so that it will enhance the ‘clawback’ of available convenience trade, approximately 60% of which is currently lost to other destinations.

4.19 Members may note that the Town Council have recommended approval to the application. One correspondent has expressed concern regarding the large amount of pet related sales, but this is already permitted and unrestricted in the existing permission. I find no justification to impose a restriction and the applicant is unwilling to lose any retail activity which is already allowed. Concern about the ancillary sales has been addressed as noted above.

4.20 I find that, although there may be some degree of trade diversion and competition within the Town, the overall impact is likely to be positive in attracting additional trade to the Town as a whole, which is more likely to benefit the Town Centre than to harm it. I therefore find that the modification of the planning condition as proposed is consistent with national and local policy on retail impact.

5. Conclusion

5.1 I conclude that the proposed revision to the existing planning condition (subject to minor amendment), would not lead to unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of the Town Centre. Furthermore, there are no premises in a sequentially preferable location that could reasonably accommodate the revised retail operation. In these circumstances the application accords with the NPPF as well as the existing and emerging local Development Plan. In these circumstances the application should be approved.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy as it does not create additional floorspace

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett 01508 533794 ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No** : 2014/1064/F  
**Parish** : WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name** : Endurance Estates Strategic Land Ltd and Pelham Holdings  
**Site Address** : Land West of Station Road Wymondham Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Provision of a new pedestrian and cycle subway under the existing Norwich to Cambridge railway line located between the existing Station Road underpass and Wymondham Railway Station.

**Recommendation** : Approval with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. Standard Estate Road  
4. Standard Estate Road  
5. Construction Traffic (Parking)  
6. Construction Traffic Management  
7. Wheel Cleaning Facilities  
8. Full details of external lighting  
9. Tree planting (full applications)  
10. External materials to be agreed  
11. Scheme to control noise dust and odour  
12. No burning of waste  
13. No works until highway drainage scheme implemented

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 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 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 17: Off site road improvements

1.4 **Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan**  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.
1.5 Development Management Policies
   DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM3.9 Design Principles
   DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic

1.6 Wymondham Area Action Plan
WYM3 Land at south Wymondham

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0505 Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape plant (outline) Approved

2.2 2012/0371 Mixed use development of up to 730 dwellings, up to 128 bed care home / homes (in one or two buildings), up to 250 square metres of retail / commercial floor space, a new primary school together with all other associated temporary and permanent infrastructure and green infrastructure, including new access arrangements, sports pitches, allotments and community orchard (outline) Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council Object to the application on the following grounds:
   - Lack of a traffic management plan
   - Problems with drainage
   - Concern for anti-social behaviour in underpass

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Historic Environment Service No objection - the proposal does not have any implications for the historic environment in respect of archaeology.

3.4 Conservation Officer No objection. Part of the proposed works is situated within the Wymondham Conservation Area but should not adversely impact on any key views.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection subject to conditions to control the noise and dust emitted during construction, restrict any burning of vegetation removed from the site and control of any lighting system for the subway.
3.6 **Landscape Officer**

A number of trees and vegetation will need removal however as this project is of a strategic nature and necessary to improve pedestrian links to Wymondham there is no objection to the application. Appropriate replacement tree and further planting should be secured.

3.7 **Environment Agency**

No objection. Comment that in relation to drainage that surface water drainage is a matter for County Council, in relation to contamination, that an advisory note should be included on any permission to require a remediation strategy to be approved should any contamination be found on site during development.

3.8 **Flood Defence Officer**

To be reported

3.9 **Norfolk Police**

No comments received

3.10 **Network Rail South East**

No comments received

3.11 **NCC Highways**

- The principle that there would be a subway in this location has already been established in consideration of the two outline planning permissions for residential development.
- All the supporting information has been assessed and is considered acceptable.
- It is proposed to connect the drainage from the subway and approach footways/cycleways into the improved highway drainage system of Station Road which is currently being designed by Norfolk County Council. The new drainage system will be able to accommodate this additional drainage requirement.
- The subway structure will need to be subject to the ‘Approval in Principle for Structures’ process by the Highway Authority before the subway is built. It no doubt will need technical approval from Network Rail as well.
- The Highway Authority recommends no objection to the application subject to conditions.

3.12 **Representations**

None received.

4 **Assessment**

**The site**

4.1 The site is located at the railway bridge underpass adjacent to Wymondham Railway Station. The application site forms part of the railway embankment which lies to the north and south of the railway line and to the western side of the existing road. The existing western embankment is steep and covered with trees and mature vegetation.

4.2 The road under the railbridge is fairly narrow and has a raised pedestrian walkway running alongside the western side of the carriageway. There is a history of the road flooding in this location.

4.3 Part of the site to the north of the railway bridge lies within the designated Wymondham Conservation Area and the closest listed building to the site is the group of listed structures at the railway station.
The application

4.4 The application seeks to gain planning permission for a new pedestrian and cycle subway under the railway bridge and associated works to the highway to widen the carriageway. The planning policy context and planning history which has led to this application is set out below.

Planning policy context and planning history

4.5 The Joint Core Strategy sets out a spatial strategy for housing growth within the policy area. JCS Policy 10 identifies Wymondham for growth of at least 2,200 new houses within the plan period. It also provides clear guidance on the location of growth in the town focusing development away from the gap between Wymondham and Hethersett and to areas that will not affect the setting of the abbey. JCS Policy 10 also requires a major shift away from car dependency and for new development to be designed around walking and cycling for local journeys and public transport for longer journeys. It indicates that detailed proposals for that growth will be developed through the preparation of an Area Action Plan.

4.6 The Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) has therefore been prepared in response to the amount of new development that will take place in the town between 2008 and 2026 (at least 2,200 new homes, 20 hectares of employment land, expansion of the town centre, enhanced public transport and education provision).

4.7 The Action Plan designates areas of land for particular uses, most notably housing. A number of areas around Wymondham have therefore been allocated to deliver this required housing growth. Policy WYM3 allocates large scale growth of 1230 dwellings to land to the south of Wymondham.

4.8 The Action Plan sets out the Councils expectations for the development of the 67 Hectares for housing and associated infrastructure on this site. Historically the area to the south of Wymondham town centre has been perceived as being disconnected from the town centre by the railway line and B1172 road. A co-ordinated approach was considered necessary to ensure that the allocated land is developed in a way which will benefit the town and strengthen both new and existing communities as part of a joined up strategy. A key element of achieving this joined up strategy is improving accessibility to and from Wymondham. Policy WYM3 therefore requires, pertinent to this planning application, the developer to agree to provide a subway under the railbridge; improved pedestrian and cycle links to the railway station and town centre; and access and flooding issues under the railway bridge to be resolved.

4.9 The Action Plan document is still at submission stage and as such is not yet adopted and cannot be given full weight. However, it has been submitted for examination and will be considered by the Inspector later this year. Notwithstanding the still emerging status of this site allocation policy, outline planning permission has now been granted on the two sites in question which form this allocation. These are outline consent 2011/0505 for 500 dwellings and 2012/0371 for 730 dwellings, both together with associated infrastructure to create a new neighbourhood to the South of Wymondham.

4.10 Those planning permissions were subject to comprehensive conditions and a S106 legal agreement which included matters to address the issues identified in WYM3 regarding the widening of the vehicular access under the bridge, the requirement for a pedestrian subway and drainage issues under the railbridge.
4.11 In respect of the improvements required for vehicles and pedestrians under the bridge, two options were secured by the S106. There is an either or option to:

1. Widen the bridge (the bridge scheme), or
2. Create a new pedestrian subway to allow carriageway width to be widened (the tunnelling scheme)

4.12 This application seeks to approve the ‘tunnelling scheme’.

4.13 In terms of the timing of this planning application, the S106 requires that Planning permission be granted for the subway (tunnelling scheme) prior to the commencement of development on either site. The subway (or the bridge scheme) is then to be implemented and completed prior to the 750\textsuperscript{th} dwelling. The application now submitted is therefore integral to the ability of the developers to progress the residential permissions.

4.14 In respect of highway surface water drainage, conditions imposed on both residential permissions require no works to commence on site until a detailed scheme for off-site improvement of the highway drainage from Station Road railway bridge to the River Tiffey has been agreed. The approved highway drainage scheme is to be completed prior to the first occupation of the first dwelling.

The application

4.15 This application seeks to gain full planning permission for the new subway and associated works to the highway (the ‘tunnelling scheme’) to provide a sustainable connection to the town as required by the S106 for the two outline consents and in accordance with the requirements of the Wymondham Area Action Plan as set out above.

4.16 The proposal for the new subway comprises the following:

- An 18m subway underneath the railway
- A new footway/cycleway linking the subway to Silfield Road and Station Road
- Cutting and associated embankments
- Removal of the existing footway under the rail bridge and widening of the existing highway under the bridge.

4.17 Whilst the conditions relating to resolving the existing issues with surface water flooding under the railway bridge are relevant to this application, approval of this detailed highway drainage scheme will be subject to separate consideration with the discharge of that condition. Amended plans have however been submitted for this subway application which clarify that drainage for the proposal will be connected into that improved surface water drainage system. The drainage issues are considered in detail later in the report.

4.18 As detailed above, the ‘bridge scheme’ could be brought forward and approved as an alternative solution which could replace the requirement for this work. However, given that the proposal for consideration under this application is for the re-modelling, until such time as a ‘bridge scheme’ is submitted, it must be assumed that the scheme to be secured under this application would be the scheme that is implemented.

Key issues for consideration

4.19 Key issues for consideration of this application are highway issues including safety and drainage; design and impact on heritage assets; and landscaping.
Principle

4.20 As set out above the principle and the need for the proposed subway is established through the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan and the planning obligations secured in the two outline planning consents for new residential development to the south of Wymondham (this responded to Policy 10 of the JCS). The delivery of this pedestrian subway is a key factor in unlocking the delivery of the residential permissions and the planned growth for Wymondham.

Highway – safety and drainage

4.21 The need for and approval of the principle of the subway has been established in consideration of the two outline planning permissions for residential development.

4.22 The Highway Authority has confirmed that all the supporting information has been assessed and is considered acceptable and recommends approval of the application subject to conditions.

4.23 The safety benefits of the re-located pedestrian route are two fold:

- There will be clear pedestrian safety improvements as the footpath will be located away from vehicles; and
- The re-location of the footpath away from the carriageway will facilitate the widening of the road for vehicles.

4.24 Therefore in respect of the safe and free flow of traffic and of pedestrian safety the proposal would bring significant improvements and would accord with saved local plan policies IMP8, TRA1 and TRA3 and Policy 6 of the JCS.

4.25 In respect of highways drainage issues at the site, regard in this planning application needs to be had to ensure that the proposed pedestrian subway does not worsen the existing surface water flooding issues. It is not however a requirement of this application to design a scheme to address the existing drainage problems since this is secured under a separate planning condition on the residential permissions.

4.26 As such, whilst the conditions relating to resolving the existing issues with surface water flooding under the railway bridge are relevant to this application, approval of this detailed scheme will be subject to separate consideration with the discharge of that condition. That condition specifically requires a detailed scheme for the off-site improvements of the highway drainage from Station road railway Bridge to the River Tiffey to be submitted, approved, implemented and completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.

4.27 Work is currently being undertaken by the developer and the County Highway Authority in designing this highway drainage improvement scheme. Formal approval of that scheme will need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to satisfy the requirements of the condition.

4.28 It is proposed to connect the drainage from the subway and approach footways/cycleways into the improved highway drainage system of Station Road which, as detailed above is currently being designed by Norfolk County Council. Critically highways have confirmed that the new drainage system will be able to accommodate this additional drainage requirement.
4.29 Therefore subject to a condition requiring the highways surface water drainage improvements to be implemented prior to the construction of the underpass, the proposed subway is not considered to adversely impact on the highway drainage issues and would accord with saved Local Plan policies IMP8 and TRA17.

4.30 Members will be updated at Committee or by the updates report on comments received by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer as these are awaited at the time of writing the report.

**Design and impact on heritage assets**

**Design**

4.31 The subway will be created within the existing western railway embankment. The actual internal subway structure will be faced with concrete. This will be sat within a surrounding retaining structure. This will include concrete piles which will be clad with red brick externally to respond to the existing brick walls of the railway bridge.

4.32 The length of the covered subway section is 18m and this has been designed to be straight and have good sight lines with good levels of lighting to promote a sense of personal security. It is therefore considered that the design of the proposal has had appropriate regard to the need for designing out crime of Policy 2 of the JCS.

4.33 As such it is considered that the proposal is appropriately designed for both its purpose and context and would accord with policy 2 of the JCS (promoting good design) and the aims of NPPF Section 7 (requiring good design).

**Heritage assets**

4.34 The design of the scheme is appropriate for its function whilst also respecting its setting within the Conservation Area by the use of red brick on the external retaining walls. The proposal is therefore considered to integrate well into and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy IMP2 and the statutory duties of the Authority under Section 72(I) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) and the aims of Section 12 of the NPPF (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment).

**Landscaping**

4.35 A number of mature trees and planting will be required to be removed to facilitate the new subway and this is unavoidable. The tree survey, arboricultural report and method statement submitted with the application highlight that this will affect mainly poor quality trees which have been managed as coppice on the southern embankment and poor scrub growth on the northern embankment. The proposals include the re-planting of the re-modelled banks.

4.36 The Council’s Landscape Officer has raised no objection to the application and it is considered that subject to a condition to secure replacement planting that the proposal would be acceptable in this regard and would accord with saved Local Plan policy IMP2, landscaping and the aims of Policy 2 of the JCS (promoting good design).

**EIA**

4.37 As the requirement for the proposed subway has arisen as a result of the consented residential development led permissions (outline permissions 2011/0505 and 2012/0371), consideration should be had for the need for EIA under a screening opinion. This requires consideration as to whether the development as changed or extended (in this case amplified
by details of the required subway scheme) may have significant adverse effects on the environment. The details proposed are not considered to lead to other significant adverse effects and it is therefore considered that an EIA is not required for the proposed subway.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 The works sought by this application for a subway will remedy the existing constraint and inconvenience experienced by people approaching or leaving Wymondham to the south by improving its capacity, will improve access to the railway station, will make the pedestrian/cycle route much more attractive and convenient, and critically and as required by the two residential outline planning permissions, will provide a sustainable link between the development and the rail station and the Town’s other facilities.

5.2 Members will note that approval of a ‘tunnelling scheme’ which is required prior to the commencement of the residential development is key to unlocking the delivery of the approved 1230 homes for Wymondham.

5.3 The scheme as proposed and subject to the imposition of conditions is considered to comply with Development Plan policies and approval is therefore recommended.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tracy Lincoln
and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

11.  
   **Appl. No**: 2014/0204/F  
   **Parish**: BROOKE  

   Applicants Name: Brooke House Care Home  
   Site Address: Brooke House Brooke Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1JH  
   Proposal: Erection of building to house Biomass boiler and hopper fuel supply  

   Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. Boiler specification to be in accordance with submitted details

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise  
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
   DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety  
   DM4.11 Heritage Assets  
   DM4.2 Renewable Energy

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2007/2615 Proposed extensions of existing EMI unit Refused  
2.2 2007/1967 Proposed patio and paving Approved  
2.3 2005/0336 Proposed modification of condition 7no of previous consent 1999/1807 to allow for an increase in residential rooms from 32no to 36no. Approved  
2.4 2004/2096 Proposed extension to previous approved extension to increase communal area Approved  
2.5 2001/0954 Change of use from Nursing Home to single dwelling Approved
2.6 1999/1807  Extension to nursing home  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Refuse:
- based on the details in the application, the proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the nearby dwellings

3.2 District Member  To Committee:
- concerned about an intensification of use of the back drive to Brooke House by heavy vehicles
- the application is vague about how deliveries will be made and by what sort of vehicle
- applicant will need to demonstrate how the back drive is substantial enough to take heavy vehicles and, in any event, a maximum weight condition may be required
- the back drive also passes very close to neighbouring residential properties. It will be necessary to demonstrate that any deliveries, if permitted, can be made by vehicles always travelling in forward gear.
- care should be taken to ensure the application specifies adequate surfacing, turning circles and an implementation of the 2005 conditions if approval is being considered

3.3 NCC Highways  No objections

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objection provided boiler is as per submitted details

3.5 Conservation Officer  No objections
- The proposal will not adversely impact any important views of the conservation area.

3.6 English Heritage  The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

3.7 Garden History Society  No comments received

3.8 Historic Environment Service  No implications for the historic environment and we would not make any recommendations for archaeological work

3.9 Norfolk Gardens Trust  No comments received

3.10 Representations  1 letter of objection from Brooke Gardens Management Limited
- the details outlined in the application concerning the boiler installation are minimal - is there an installation locally we could view
- the environmental impact from fumes and noise will cause loss of amenity to neighbours. The height of the chimney is 5.6 metres which will discharge at the height of neighbouring first floor windows. What noise will be involved give it will presumably be operational 24 hours a day?
- concern of the size, weight and frequency of delivery vehicles
• concern over where fuel will be stalled and means of transfer of the fuel from the containers into the hopper
• concern over the quality of the fuel used
• what arrangements have been made for the disposal of ash
• access is to be via the rear private access drive which is a lane without any firm foundations and of minimal width
• the design of the building is very different to existing buildings and will not compliment them
• concern about the protection for existing trees, including those in neighbouring private gardens, during construction
• there are also a number of inaccuracies in the application including when the building was extended and the number of parking spaces

1 further letter of objection from Brooke Gardens Management Limited to the additional information submitted
• is it the intention that the oil burners will both be retained as back up? If this is the case then the calculation of the number and weight of deliveries will need to be revised
• under planning approval 2005/0336, condition 4 made it very clear that use of the rear access drive was to be minimised as it was unsuitable both in terms of traffic safety and in the interests of the amenities of neighbouring residents.
• at present the LPG deliveries are made via the main drive. As it is probable that the LPG storage tank would need to be either re-sited or deliveries would have be re-routed using the rear access drive which would again increase use of this access.
• we are not satisfied or convinced about the explanations concerning the potential environmental impact from fumes and noise generated by the proposed plant including the height of the proposed chimney which will have a significant detrimental effect on the neighbouring private houses
• it is still not clear how much fuel will be delivered at any one time nor whether the hopper is sufficient storage for each load and the reference to shipping containers for storage
• no details about the disposal of ash waste
• nothing has been stated about the method of delivery of the biomass boiler and its weight as we consider that in all probability the rear access drive is not suitable for this.

8 letters of objection from local residents
• lack of information in the application in regard to quantity and type of fuel to be used, and where it is to be stored and also disposal of ash
• reference to shipping containers in application but no details as to where they would be sited. These would be unacceptable in a conservation area.
• the prevailing wind will blow all emissions and smoke into adjoining houses resulting in a severe loss of amenity
• the building is also proposed to be in the lee of Brooke House which could also result in reduced wind speeds and emissions that hang in the air over all the properties in Brooke Gardens
• how has the height of the flue being calculated and is the local authority satisfied that the Guidelines on Discharge Stack Heights for Polluting Emissions have been followed_
• good ventilation is necessary to prevent the build-up of condensation which can cause a serious health hazard
• no information on what cooling method is to be used. Both augers and fans create noise  
• we are not confident that a wooden building will be sufficient to prevent noise being a nuisance to neighbours  
• potential for dust pollution from delivery of fuel  
• the proposed boiler is industrial in size at 220kW and is likely to be heavily used.  
• no room for vehicles to pass on narrow single track without foundations, utterly unsuitable for heavy vehicles. Even refuse lorries are not allowed to use it  
• deliveries likely to involve 6 or 8 wheel purpose built pneumatic lorries  
• inappropriate use of a private drive, not owned by the applicant, which already has conditions on its use from a previous planning consent  
• this is a quiet area in which the only sound normally is a bird song  
• assume boiler would need to run 24/7  
• the application mentions that the style would be similar to the garages for the Coach House properties, but these are red brick where as the proposal is for black shiplap boarding  
• how could an industrial building like this be considered in a conservation area and parkland  
• visual intrusion of the boiler house and fuel store  
• the questionable overall impact on CO2 emissions of a development of this type, the wood pellets may be sourced elsewhere in the UK or imported, adding to overall co2 emissions.  
• there is also concern about the protection for existing trees, including those in neighbouring private gardens, during construction  

5 further letters of objection following receipt of additional information  
• remain concerned about pollution from chimney given prevailing wind  
• emission data provided relates only to fuel pellets. The specification of the boiler clearly shows that wood chips and wood waste may also be used as fuel. This is a point raised by the Environmental Services officer - is this a factor that has been considered?  
• all the evidence shows that deliveries would be by larger vehicles than the small oil tankers that currently use the private rear drive. There is insufficient turning space for such vehicles.  
• will increase use of rear access is oil and LPG tanks are be maintained  
• we would question that assumption about the frequency of the vehicles which will surely depend on the size of the storage silo which the applicant has not specified.  
• construction vehicles would also need to use the rear access drive  
• still not clear how and where fuel will be stored or the reference to shipping containers clarified  
• we question the carbon savings quoted, such as the costs of harvesting and transporting the base fuel (in some instances North America and Eastern Europe), the manufacturing of the fuel pellets and the overall sustainability of biomass fuel.  
• at present there is no noise from the current oil fired installation so any noise from the Biomass boiler would be to the detriment of the residents of Brooke Gardens  
• our original objections and concerns remain.
4. Assessment

4.1 The proposed development is the erection of a building to house a biomass boiler with hopper fuel supply at the existing care home known as Brooke House. This will then provide the main heating for the care home, with the existing oil boilers to be retained as a safety backup system necessary due to the vulnerable nature of the residents. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.2 Brooke House is accessed by a private drive which also serves a number of private dwellings. The main drive provides access to parking at the front of Brooke House, but a secondary, narrower access goes to the rear of Brooke House which provides service access. It is this drive that vehicles supplying fuel for the boiler would need to use and to which a number of objections relate. It is accepted that the use of the driveway is not ideal both in terms of its width and proximity to the private amenity space of a number of private dwellings. However this arrangement is established and in use by a number of vehicles serving Brooke House including oil deliveries which can be expected to be reduced in frequency when the biomass boiler is operational. The applicant has stated that there are only anticipated to be 6 deliveries each year. It is not therefore considered, given the existing nature and use of the access and the very infrequent number of deliveries, that an objection could be sustained in terms of the access arrangements.

4.3 Concerns have also been raised about the impact on neighbouring properties from emissions from the boiler. Environmental Services have sought and obtained further information to address their concerns regarding this issue. Following receipt of further information including confirmation that emissions from the boiler meet the relevant environmental legislation they are now satisfied that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact with regard to noise, odour or other environmental impacts and therefore raise no objection to the proposal subject to the specification of the boiler being in accordance with the details submitted through the application process.

4.4 The site falls within Brooke Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal as it is not located in a prominent position within the site and is largely screened from views of Brooke House either from the main approach to the front or in public views from the south by its position and established planting on the site. The building would be visible from some of the immediately adjoining properties, but would not be overbearing in its presence.

4.5 It is not therefore considered that there will be an unacceptable impact with regard to the impact on the character of the site or the amenities of local residents. The building will provide a renewable source of energy for the care home and therefore the proposal is recommended for approval.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 It has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of adjoining residents from noise or emissions from the boiler, whilst the building sits comfortably within the site without resulting in an adverse impact on the conservation area or parkland associated with Brooke House.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533801 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish: LODDON  
Applicants Name: Mr Peter Sheppard  
Site Address: Hales Hall  Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW  
Proposal: Retrospective permission for new gabled windows, new chimneys, windows to north and south elevations, new handrails to internal stairs, removal of internal doors and replacement with internal window, installation of CCTV cameras. In addition proposed works to include new 5-bar gate to main entrance, new LPG and treatment plant, new well head and new weathervane to gate house  
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Historic Building Recording  
4. All new works to match existing

Parish: LODDON  
Applicants Name: Mr Peter Sheppard  
Site Address: Hales Hall  Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW  
Proposal: Retrospective permission for new gabled windows, new chimneys, windows to north and south elevations, new handrails to internal stairs, removal of internal doors and replacement with internal window, installation of CCTV cameras. In addition proposed works to include new 5-bar gate to main entrance, new LPG and treatment plant, new well head and new weathervane to gate house  
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Historic Building Recording  
4. All new works to match existing

Parish: LODDON  
Applicants Name: Mr Peter Sheppard  
Site Address: Hales Hall  Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW  
Proposal: Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission - 2012/1249/H - details of a) the new dormer windows and all new windows and doors, c) rebuilding of chimney stack, d) gable finials.
Recommendation : Approval with no Conditions

1 Condition 3 – the information letter, photographs and drawings of the dormer windows, windows and doors, and the rebuilt chimneys and gable finial received on the 25th April and the 6th May 2014 are sufficient to discharge parts a, c and d of condition 3.

Parish : LODDON
Applicants Name : Mr Peter Sheppard
Site Address : Hales Hall Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW
Proposal : Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission - 2012/1249/H - details of a) the new dormer windows and all new windows and doors, c) rebuilding of chimney stack, d) gable finials.

Recommendation : Approval

1 Condition 3 – the information letter, photographs and drawings of the dormer windows, windows and doors, and the rebuilt chimneys and gable finial received on the 25th April and the 6th May 2014 are sufficient to discharge parts a, c and d of condition 3.

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and setting of Listed Buildings:

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

The Court of Appeal in Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC [2014] has held that this means that considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. Furthermore, less than substantial harm having been identified does not amount to a less than substantial objection to the grant of planning permission.
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/1766  Retrospective application for the installation of an extractor fan on the southern elevation. Proposed erection of chimney, and conversion of outbuilding to form Guest accommodation. Installation of disabled ramp and steps to barn entrance. Installation of air source heat exchangers. New electricity operated 5 bar gate. Replacement of mobile home by storage facility. **Withdrawn**

2.2 2013/1769  Retrospective application of 13 gabled dormer windows and 1 bathroom window. **Withdrawn**

2.3 2013/1770  Retrospective application of 13 gabled dormer windows and 1 bathroom window. **Withdrawn**

2.4 2012/1395  Works to Hales Hall Barn to install glazed covers for windows, new oak flooring with under floor heating, new internal doorway, creation of inner lobby and further sound proofing measures. Conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. Creation of new drive way to access proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn. Provision to host 48 events per annum (D2 use class) in the barn. **Approved**

2.5 2012/1251  Provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms in attic storey on second floor. Continuation of existing staircase to second floor. New dormer windows to match existing on second floor. Replacement of 1970s chimney stack with chimneys to match original. New front door in new location. Reopening of bricked up original windows. **Approved**

2.6 2012/1249  Provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms in attic storey on second floor. Continuation of existing staircase to second floor. New dormer windows to match existing on second floor. Replacement of 1970s chimney stack with chimneys to match original. New front door in new location. Reopening of bricked up original windows. **Approved**

2.7 2011/1166  Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/1029/CU - to allow use of barn for civil weddings and private functions for up to an additional 45 occasions in any calendar year in addition to the general functions currently permitted. **Refused**
2.8 2011/0299  Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/1029/CU - to allow additional functions (civil weddings & other functions) on the site, up to a maximum of 75 per calendar year. Withdrawn

2.9 2005/1029  Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions  Approved

2.10 2002/2085  Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions  Approved

2.11 2002/0126  Alterations to restore original features of door in stable, windows in East gable, stairs to first floor and bridge to meadow  Approved

2.12 1996/0268  Remove corrugated sheeting from barn roof and replace with reed thatch  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council While the Council does not like to see retrospective applications, and will leave any issues to the appropriate authorities, it has some sympathy with the applicant whose project continues to evolve. Some members had made a site visit and confirmed the works continue to be carried out to a high standard and in sympathy with the existing structure.

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 English Heritage Assess that the proposals are in line with the NPPF and English Heritage guidance and do not feel the proposals would cause harm to the heritage asset. In terms of the CCTV cameras and storage tanks, these should be discretely sited so as not to affect views of the hall.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  To be reported if appropriate

3.5 NCC Highways  The only comment relates to the proposal for a five bar gate at the main entrance. This is a public bridleway and under section 137 of the Highways Act a gate would be considered an obstruction contrary to the Act.

3.6 Historic Environment Service  The HES asks for a Heritage Statement to be submitted prior to the determination of the planning application given the significance of the site.

3.7 Representations Objections (2 letters) have been received primarily relating to the introduction of dormers on both sides of the roof, and the rebuilding of the chimneys and their consequent impact on the significance of the hall. Concerns have been made at the lack of action by the Council to stop the work and enforce against works carried out without due consent.

Three letters of support have also been received.
4  **Assessment**

4.1 Hales hall is of considerable architectural, historic and archaeological significance. The present hall was originally a service wing to a much larger complex built in the 15th century by Sir James Hobart. While the present hall and barn survived, the principle Hall was lost in the early 18th century and only its associated moats remain above ground. The site is nonetheless a scheduled monument while both the current hall and barn are listed grade 1. Together with a Bothy and east boundary wall, both listed grade 2 star, the site is one of the most important in South Norfolk.

4.2 The two main buildings were nevertheless in a dilapidated condition in the mid 20th century before being saved by the previous owners who carried out considerable works to the hall, the barn and the grounds. The hall was made weather-tight but the owners were not able to restore the complete interior and the attic space remained largely unused and in poor condition.

4.3 The current owners acquired the site in December 2011 and in discussions with English Heritage (EH) the Historic Environment Service (HES) and the Council, developed a scheme to restore the hall, improve the facilities and bring the attic space into use. Without the attic space, which was originally in domestic use, the level of accommodation in the hall was insufficient. There was pressure to subdivide the principle rooms on the first floor but the reuse of the attic space reduced the demand.

4.4 Much of the discussion focussed on the provision of access, light and ventilation to the attic space which until that time was served by two small stairs, and three wedge shaped dormers on the south elevation. The scheme originally was for an additional 5 dormers on the south side, re-open a gable window at the east end, and 8 dormers on the north side, together with an improved stair at the east end and a new internal stair following on from the one inserted up to first floor level by the previous owners in the 1970s.

4.5 This raised concerns from EH who, while not objecting to the re-use of the attic space as such, felt the introduction of the number of dormers proposed "would be a major change, especially on the outer side of the hall, and would significantly affect the building's character, and so needs justification prior to the principle being accepted. The exact position of any former openings and the impact on the roof structure, should first be established." On the basis of the submitted information, EH felt in July 2012, that the scheme did not accord with paragraph 128 of the NPPF.

4.6 At a meeting in September, attended by EH and HES, it was agreed that the internal stairs could be supported, although there would be a loss of four floor joists, but the benefits of using the attic space and avoiding sub division of two main rooms on the first floor, was felt to be sufficient justification. From what could be seen at the time, there was evidence in the attic roof space of former dormers in the roof on both sides, and it was felt that an additional 4 dormers on the south side could be acceptable and three on the north which could be incorporated without harm to the significance of the building. EH agreed with this assessment. Revised plans were submitted on the 24th September and approved in October. (2012/1249 and 1251).

4.7 Consent had also been granted to re-tile the roof and rebuild two chimneys that had been reconstructed in the 1970s to a plain detail. The aim was also to harmonise the choice of roof tiles (a large area of pantiles had been replaced following storm damage in 1987 but with a poor match). Work began on the south side of the roof early in 2013. Re-roofing nearly 60 metres of roof was a considerable undertaking which needed to be completed by May before the first wedding booking at the barn.
4.8 As the roof materials were removed, it became clear that there was evidence for further dormers on the north side in addition to the ones already approved. Further detailed examination by EH and HES concluded that the dormers would have been gabled in design rather than the wedge shaped inserted in the 1970s. A design was informally agreed with the officers but it was made clear that the alterations in the design would need further approvals. It was felt that given the exposure of the roof and the time of year; the absence of any near neighbours, and the acceptance of the impact of the changes on the significance of the building, enforcement proceedings were not justifiable to require the work to cease while applications were submitted and formally considered. In addition, the quality of the work and the choice of detailing and materials were exceptional and befitting the status of the building.

4.9 Other works were being carried out to the hall with the same high standards. In respect of the rebuilt chimneys, the details were agreed with EH and the HES and have transformed the appearance of the hall adding a suitable prominence to the roof scape.

4.10 Work then switched to the north elevation where the additional dormer positions had been identified. The design and details matched those on the south side, but at this point, September 2013, no new applications had been submitted. While this side of the roof was exposed the owners felt the existing chimneys near the west end should be raised to match the other main stacks. There was no objection to this. The works to the north side above first floor level have been completed.

4.11 These applications are for retrospective consent for the dormers, the rebuilt chimneys, and additional windows together with various works to both interior and exterior yet to be completed. There are also two applications for discharge of conditions relating to the details of the dormers, windows and doors and chimneys which were conditions of the 2012 applications.

4.12 In respect of the comments made by the Historic Environment Service in respect of the need for a heritage statement, one was provided for the 2012 applications and a condition was imposed requiring an historic building survey. A brief has been approved but the work is yet to be carried out. It is felt that there is no justification for requiring a further statement for works which are, for the most part, the same as the previous approval.

4.13 Consideration has been given to the objections raised by some local residents, including strong criticism of the retrospective nature of the applications. It is most unfortunate that applications which reflect the works already carried out were not submitted sooner, and indeed details provided to discharge the conditions on the previous consents. However, the owners have proceeded with the full knowledge of English Heritage and the Norfolk Historic Environment Service, and this Council. Despite objections to the nature of the works from some local residents, it is felt that the evidence provided by the opening up of the building, the high quality of the works, the design and materials have led to an exemplary restoration and improvement of this grade 1 listed building which while changing the appearance of the building, has preserved it and its setting as required by section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.

4.14 It is also felt that the works have caused less than substantial harm to the significance of the building which is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal and the optimum use of the hall as stated in paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 It is unfortunate that applications to reflect the works already undertaken were not submitted much sooner, and this has been reflected in the concerns expressed by neighbours and the parish council. The prospect for taking action was seriously considered, especially given the importance of the building, but with the support of English Heritage and the Norfolk Historic Environment Service, it was felt that the works were not harmful to the significance of the listed building. The frequent discussions with the owners, helped ensure that the works were carried out in ways that have preserved and enhanced the special interest of the hall and help to secure its future. The applications seek to secure retrospective consent but also cover works still outstanding.

5.2 The applications are recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|16.| 2014/0345/F | LODDON     | Mr Peter Sheppard           | Hales Hall Barn Hales Green Lodden Norfolk NR14 6QW | Retrospective planning permission for access ramp to north elevation of barn, installation of kitchen to barn, extractor fan to south elevation. Additional proposed works to include new glazed oak frame doors to north elevation, new chimney to east gable end, new gates, new storage building to south of barn and 2 no CCTV cameras (1 to barn and 1 to outbuilding) | Approval with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Specific details to be agreed  
4. Retention trees and hedges |
|17.| 2014/0346/LB| LODDON     | Mr Peter Sheppard           | Hales Hall Barn Hales Green Lodden Norfolk NR14 6QW | Retrospective planning permission for access ramp to north elevation of barn, installation of kitchen to barn, extractor fan to south elevation. Additional proposed works to include new glazed oak frame doors to north elevation, new chimney to east gable end, new gates, new storage building to south of barn and 2 no CCTV cameras (1 to barn and 1 to outbuilding) | Approval with Conditions  
1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Specific details to be agreed |
|18.| 2014/0824/DC| LODDON     | Mr Peter Sheppard           | Hales Hall  Hales Green Loddon Norwich NR14 6QW | discharge of conditions 5 and 6 to planning permission 2012/1395 - installation of acoustic curtains details and details of the location fixings and specification of a noise warning device. | 1. The applicants no longer intend to retain the acoustic curtains as noted in condition 5, but replace them with glazed screens to an agreed detail as noted in 2014/0345. The applicants need to apply to vary the condition accordingly.  
2. Condition 6 - Await advice from environmental protection officer. |
19. **Appl. No**: 2014/0825/DC  
**Parish**: LODDON

**Applicants Name**: Mr Peter Sheppard  
**Site Address**: Hales Hall  Hales Green  Loddon  Norwich NR14 6QW  
**Proposal**: Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 14, 15 and 16 for planning permission 2012/1394/F - condition 3 - materials for doors, window frames, flooring, glazing, driveway and parking area. condition 5 - details of fitting of acoustic curtains. condition 14 - details of sound system. condition 15 - stage area, condition 16 - location, fixings and specification of noise warning device.

**Recommendation**:  
1. Condition 3- the information provided is sufficient to discharge condition 3 except for the driveway and parking.  
2. Condition 5 as per 1 above (2014/0824)  
3. Conditions 14,15 and 16 – DGL authorised to approve subject to advice from environmental protection.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises

1.4 **Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan**  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 **Development Management Policies**  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets  
DM2.2 Protection of employment sites

1.6 **Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and setting of Listed Buildings:**

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”
The Court of Appeal in Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC [2014] has held that this means that considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. Furthermore, less than substantial harm having been identified does not amount to a less than substantial objection to the grant of planning permission.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/1766  
Retrospective application for the installation of an extractor fan on the southern elevation. Proposed erection of chimney, and conversion of outbuilding to form Guest accommodation. Installation of disabled ramp and steps to barn entrance. Installation of air source heat exchangers. New electricity operated 5 bar gate. Replacement of mobile home by storage facility.  
Withdrawn

2.2 2013/1769  
Retrospective application of 13 gabled dormer windows and 1 bathroom window.  
Withdrawn

2.3 2013/1770  
Retrospective application of 13 gabled dormer windows and 1 bathroom window.  
Withdrawn

2.4 2012/1395  
Works to Hales Hall Barn to install glazed covers for windows, new oak flooring with under floor heating, new internal doorway, creation of inner lobby and further sound proofing measures. Conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. Creation of new drive way to access proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn. Provision to host 48 events per annum (D2 use class) in the barn.  
Approved

2.5 2012/1251  
Provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms in attic storey on second floor. Continuation of existing staircase to second floor. New dormer windows to match existing on second floor. Replacement of 1970s chimney stack with chimneys to match original. New front door in new location. Reopening of bricked up original windows.  
Approved

2.6 2012/1249  
Provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms in attic storey on second floor. Continuation of existing staircase to second floor. New dormer windows to match existing on second floor. Replacement of 1970s chimney stack with chimneys to match original. New front door in new location. Reopening of bricked up original windows.  
Approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2011/1166</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/1029/CU - to allow use of barn for civil weddings and private functions for up to an additional 45 occasions in any calendar year in addition to the general functions currently permitted.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2011/0299</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/1029/CU - to allow additional functions (civil weddings &amp; other functions) on the site, up to a maximum of 75 per calendar year.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2005/1029</td>
<td>Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2002/2085</td>
<td>Change of use from agricultural barn to civic reception building for civil weddings and other functions</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2002/0126</td>
<td>Alterations to restore original features of door in stable, windows in East gable, stairs to first floor and bridge to meadow</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1996/0268</td>
<td>Remove corrugated sheeting from barn roof and replace with reed thatch</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2013/1766</td>
<td>Retrospective application for the installation of an extractor fan on the southern elevation. Proposed erection of chimney, and conversion of outbuilding to form Guest accommodation. Installation of disabled ramp and steps to barn entrance. Installation of air source heat exchangers. New electricity operated 5 bar gate. Replacement of mobile home by storage facility.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2013/1767</td>
<td>Retrospective application for the installation of a kitchen within the barn and an extraction fan on the southern elevation. Proposed erection of a chimney. Conversion of outbuilding to form guest accommodation. Installation of disabled ramp. Installation of 2 air source heat exchangers. New electricity operated 5 bar gate.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2012/1394</td>
<td>Works to Hales Hall Barn to install glazed covers for windows, new oak flooring with under floor heating, new internal doorway, creation of inner lobby and further sound proofing measures. Conversion of two outbuildings to provide for guest accommodation, toilet facilities and catering facilities. Creation of new drive way to access proposed additional car parking area to the south of the barn. Provision to host 48 events per annum (D2 use class) in the barn.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council While the Council does not like to see retrospective applications, and will leave any issues to the appropriate authorities, it has some sympathy with the applicant whose project continues to evolve. Some members had made a site visit and confirmed the works continue to be carried out to a high standard and in sympathy with the existing structure.

Only concerns relate to the sound insulation of the barn where there is still capacity for sound to escape through the barn doors and affect neighbouring properties.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Historic Environment Service Recommends that a Heritage Statement is submitted prior to the application being determined, and that English Heritage be consulted.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) To be reported if appropriate

3.5 English Heritage Much of the works have been approved under previous applications. Do not object to the glazed screens subject to detail and the retention of the outer barn doors. Not object to the installation of the kitchen in what is a less important space, but noting that the structure is demountable and can be removed without having caused any permanent damage to the historic fabric.

However the extract flue required for the kitchen has a harmful impact and questions whether any less damaging solution is possible. As submitted EH are unable to support the kitchen flue.

3.6 NCC Highways No highway objections.

3.7 Estates Officer No comments received

3.8 Representations Objections (2 letters) have been expressed about the works being carried out without a valid consent; the impact of the glazed screens and rebuilding the chimney, as well as the measures taken and proposed to ease the noise impact during functions.

Four letters of support have also been received.

4 Assessment

4.1 Hales Hall barn is of considerable significance, listed grade 1 and part of an historic group arguably one of the most important in South Norfolk. The site is also a scheduled monument. The barn is brick and thatched and the longest in the district if not the county. The barn was in poor condition in the mid 20th century until the previous owners acquired the site in the 1970s. They were responsible for saving the building, and re-thatching the roof. For some time the barn served as a storage building until 2005 when consent was granted to use the building for weddings and other functions. This has ensured the future of this building whilst largely retaining its internal and external character whilst making it accessible to the public. It also provides a valuable employment source for the area.
The current owners secured permission, under 2012/1394, to extend the number of events held at the barn to 48 per annum and combined this with various works to improve the facilities at the venue and to improve the sound proofing of the barn. Some of the works have been carried out: the new oak flooring, the inner sound lobby; the provision of a kitchen; the conversion of an outbuilding to provide toilet facilities; the glazing of the slit windows; and the fitting of acoustic curtains to the main barn door openings. Some of the original plans have been amended to meet other regulations or to improve the access and use of the building. While, as for the hall, these issues were discussed with officers from English Heritage (EH) the Norfolk Historic Environment Service (HES) and this Council, prior to works proceeding, no revised applications were made or conditions formally discharged.

These applications seek to secure retrospective consent for works carried out, discharge any associated conditions and obtain consent for further works to complete the project.

In terms of the works carried out to the barn, very little has changed to the exterior. An access ramp has been added to the north side but this has been built in brick with limestone pavings and has little impact on the setting of the building. The outbuilding close to the north east end of the barn has been converted to toilet store and a proposed studio rather than to a kitchen which has now been installed in the main barn. This arrangement is much more suited for service to functions in the main barn. The kitchen has been designed to be reversible and the original brick and timber structure of the room has not been permanently affected. The only issue is the extractor fan which has an impact on the south side of the building, and to which EH objects.

The numerous slit windows have been glazed and bedded with lime mortar and held in place by lead straps. These are set in the depth of the brick wall and are hardly noticeable. They replaced crude loose fitting plastic windows installed by the previous owners. This is part of the sound improvements specified under the previous consent. A sound lobby has been installed linking the main hall to the door served by the access ramp so that the main doors need not be opened during a function. Acoustic curtains have been hung over the main barn doors.

Concerns have been expressed about the glazed screens. These were shown to be fixed on the two south facing barn doors subject to details, but have not been carried out. Initially EH objected to these but thought they would be a glazed lobby that would impact on the internal space of the barn, but they were intended to be confined to within the width of the wall. The applicants wish these to be installed on the north side doors as well, again subject to detail, and EH are now in support of this improvement. It would also be a better choice to reduce noise levels than the acoustic curtains.

There is a chimney at the east end of the barn which serves an existing fire on the ground floor. The chimney has been cut short and the proposal is to heighten it to reflect the works done to the Hall chimneys. It is felt that the principle is acceptable, subject to detail. It may be that a simpler design, like the octagonal shafts over the gatehouse, would be more appropriate.

Some further alterations are proposed to the outbuilding forming the north courtyard, but with ancillary uses to the main barn providing a studio and garaging. A new proposal is for a storage building sited to the south west of the barn behind some high yew hedges. It is to be used for household storage, garden machinery and tables and chairs used for the functions. It would be single storey and replace an existing mobile home.

In terms of the comments made, there is concern, as with the works to the hall, that works have been carried out without valid consents and that is regrettable, but the owners have proceeded with the full knowledge of English Heritage, and the Norfolk Historic
Environment Service. Indeed EH’s only concern is the impact of the extractor fan. Much of the other comments relate to the noise generated by the functions at the barn and what works have been carried out and how effective these have been. I am awaiting a response from the environmental protection manager who has been to site to look at the provisions and taken noise reading at a recent venue.

4.10 From an historic building aspect the alterations carried out and proposed have respected the special significance of this building and its associated outbuildings bearing in mind its commercial use. The applicants intend to carry out further works as described to improve the facilities at Hales and reduce the noise impact still further. The quality of the work and attention to detail is as high as for the hall.

4.11 The HES has asked for a Heritage Statement, but these works are supplemental to the approval granted in 2012 when an historic building record condition was imposed. A brief has been agreed but the survey has yet to be carried out. It is felt that a further statement is unjustified.

4.12 EH has objected to the extractor fan which projects on the south side of the barn. It has been threaded through an existing mullioned window so no historic fabric has been lost. The applicants have looked at other options but there are no reasonable alternatives and the kitchen cannot operate without it. It is accepted that the fan does cause harm to the significance of the listed building, but it is on the less public side of the barn, and it is felt that as its presence is necessary to support the commercial use of the building, the public benefits to this viable use of the building are sufficient to outweigh the harm as required under paragraph 134 of the NPPF. The applicant is however, receptive to exploring other options by way of a condition.

4.13 The works are also deemed to preserve the building and its setting as required by section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 These applications seek to regulate detailed works that have been carried out to the listed building without the benefit of a valid consent, but which were within the overall scheme of enhancement and improvements approved in 2012. Only the extractor fan has been acknowledged as having a harmful impact on the listed building, but this can be accepted when seen in the wider context and weighing the benefits to the economic use of the building. The concerns about noise levels have been eased with the works carried out so far, and would be further reduced with the proposed additional works.

The applications are recommended for approval, subject to the use of appropriate conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
20. **Appl. No**: 2014/0430/F  
**Parish**: THARSTON AND HAPTON

Applicants Name: Ben & Luke Todd  
**Site Address**: Blyth Green Park Stratton Road Wacton Norfolk NR15 2UB  
**Proposal**: Erection of 2 bay storage building for the keeping of hay and feed for horses; domestic storage; and secure storage of equipment for the applicants landscape business.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy  
Planning Policy for traveller Sites

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 2: Landscaping

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

Development Management Policies  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.4 Gypsy and Travellers sites

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/0044**  
Change of use of land for private site for 2 no. traveller residential pitches, including the siting of 2 no. mobile homes, erection of 2 no. day room buildings, erection of 2 no. stable buildings and siting of 2 no. touring caravans. (Re-submission of application 2010/0051/F) (amended proposal)  
Approved
2.2 2010/0051  Change of use of land for private site for 2 no. traveller residential pitches, including the siting of 2 no. mobile homes, erection of 2 no. day room buildings, erection of 2 no. stable buildings and siting of 4 no. touring caravans. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Wacton Parish Council Refuse

- Increased traffic that could be generated by the change of use could be a danger to other road users due to location of site

Comments relevant to consideration of the application:

- Conditions placed on the original state site should be used only for domestic, not commercial
- Since site occupied already been increasing amount of commercial equipment stored, in contravention of these conditions
- Both private and commercial vehicles being offered for sale
- Number of caravans using the site has been contravened
- Original field entrance has not been removed

Tharston and Hapton Parish Council No comments

Long Stratton Parish Council Refuse

- Would like to see original conditions relating to 2011/0044 enforced, specifically condition 5, that no commercial activities shall take place on the land, including storage of materials
- Original concerns relating to access, water, sewerage and impact on nearby properties still stand

3.2 District Members:

Cllr Terry Blowfield To be determined by committee

- To allow for a fair and open debate on this application, as this application is at odds with the original decision by the Development management committee which conditioned (condition 5, also storage of materials) that the applicants should not operate their business from this site. Storing equipment, which is part of this new application on this site, would give them permission to operate their business from this site

Cllr Andrew Pond To be determined by committee

- A condition of the original application was that the applicant was not to carry out his business from the premises

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections

3.4 NCC Highways No objections
3.5 Representations

1 letter of objection:
- Consider that it will be turned into residential accommodation in a few years’ time
- The site is now getting overdeveloped

1 letter of support

4 Assessment

4.1 This planning application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a timber storage building, at Blyth Green Park, Stratton Road, Tharston. Tharston Industrial estate is located to the north, residential properties are located to the south on the opposite side of Stratton Road.

4.2 The application site is a permanent travellers site for 2 pitches given consent under 2011/0044. 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. Notably it supports the provision of traveller sites for mixed residential and business uses, having due regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.

4.3 Consent is sought for the erection of a timber clad building 8.8m by 8.5m for the keeping of hay and feed for horses; storage for children’s play things, bikes and domestic storage; and secure storage of equipment etc. used by the applicants in respect of their landscape business. Under the 2011/0044 conditions were imposed requiring further planning permission for the erection of buildings and any commercial related uses, to ensure that in terms of visual impact, traffic generation and disturbance from noise, the visual and residential amenities of the area would be protected.

4.4 The main issues raised are the impact of the proposal in terms of visual amenities, residential amenity and highway safety.

4.5 The site is presently clearly visible from the highway when viewed from the Stratton Road, however to the east the site is well screened by existing vegetation. Due to the size and scale of the building, its location to the northeast corner of the site and the present mobile homes, stables etc. on the site, the building will be read with the existing complex and therefore will not give rise to a situation so detrimental to visual amenities to warrant refusal on this ground. The building has been designed to fit in with the existing complex and its location.

4.6 In respect of highway safety, the application does not propose any increase in the number of vehicles on the site and the building is for the storage of equipment used in connection with the applicant’s existing business. The highway officer has raised no objection to the proposal. Concerns regarding highway safety have been raised as set out above, however, I do not consider the proposal could be refused on highway safety grounds. Due to the distance of the proposal from any of the nearby residential properties, it will not give rise to detriment to their amenities via noise and disturbance such as to warrant refusal on this ground.

4.7 A number of concerns have been raised by Wacton and Long Stratton Parish Councils as set out above. Whilst the concerns are fully appreciated, the imposition of conditions on a planning permission does not prevent uses or erection of buildings, it enables the Council to control these and make sure they are appropriate. In respect of the other issues such as non-compliance with conditions and sale of vehicles, these are being dealt with separately and would not be a planning reason to refuse planning consent in this instance.
5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is considered to accord with Policy 2, IMP8 and IMP9 and the NPPF as the scale, bulk, massing and design of the building respects the character of the site and its surroundings; the amenities of the nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree; and the proposal would not give rise to a situation detrimental to highway safety.

5.2 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
21. **Appl. No**: 2014/0917/RVC  
**Parish**: CARLETON RODE

**Applicants Name**: Mr J Leveridge  
**Site Address**: Romany Meadow The Turnpike Carleton Rode Norfolk NR16 1NL  
**Proposal**: Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 2010/1203/RVC (Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2009/0086/F to allow gypsy and traveller families to occupy the approved site who are not related to the applicant) - To accommodate a revised design of the utility building to unit 2 to include a study room.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. As detailed plans  
2. Occupation of site limited  
3. Limited number of caravans  
4. No commercial activity on site  
5. Foul and surface water  
6. Materials  
7. External lighting  
8. Access Gates - Configuration  
9. Parking for pitches 3-6  
10. Ecology enhancement

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM3.4 Gypsy and Travellers sites  
DM3.9 Design Principles

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0010  
Non material amendment to planning permission 2009/0086/F - Revision to design of block B building for storage of horse drawn touring caravans  
Approval with no conditions
2.2 2014/0069 Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 2010/1203/F - that the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans 08/190/PL01J and 08/190/PL04 (Revised layout of plot 2 and increased size of amenity block on plot 2) Approved

2.3 2010/1806 Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2009/0086/F to allow gypsy and traveller families to occupy the approved site who are not related to the applicant. Varied condition to read 'The site shall not be occupied by any person other than a single group of a family and their relations who are also gypsies or travellers as defined in paragraph 15 of ODPM Circular 01/2006'. Refused

2.4 2010/1203 Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2009/0086/F to allow gypsy and traveller families to occupy the approved site who are not related to the applicant. Varied condition to read 'The site shall not be occupied by any person other than gypsies and travellers as defined in paragraph 15 of ODPM Circular 01/2006'. Refused

Appeal History

2.5 2010/1203 Variation of condition 2 Allowed

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No views or comments

3.2 District Member To Committee - parishioners concerned that this site will turn into a building for residential units. Parishioners to hear the officers' recommendations and thus understand the planning regulations.

3.3 NCC Highways As scheme is for revision of previous design no objections are raised.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No adverse comments to make.

3.5 Representations 8 letters of objection including one of which is from the action group.

- If granted to extend utility building would provide a mini dwelling may lead to requirements for same to other utility blocks.
- Site had permission for caravans not mini bungalows.
- Continual requests for applications on the site.
- If allowed to sell plots off the site will become a business which the Council should oppose.
- Children should be able to study in existing established caravan.
- Size of the utility block already increased.
- Could set a precedent that SNC would find hard to refuse in the future.
- Original permission granted under the condition that the overall development and the amenity blocks in particular should sit well within the surrounding rural area, and not dominate surrounding properties and would not affect the landscape detrimentally. The condition could be compromised especially as approval has already been granted for a significant increase in the size of the storage shed.
- Any permission would make a substantial move towards the amenity block becoming a full residential property, therefore setting a precedent for the remaining block.
- Site is up for sale, why is this application necessary?
- Application should be refused and a new application submitted for the whole site including guidance for its future. A house extension nearly doubling the size would require full permission. The danger of a mere variation is that it will be determined in isolation, full consideration of all issues may not occur.
- This is an important turning point for the future of our community.

2 Letter of support
- Site is always tidy; sure the applicant will only allow likeminded families to reside on the site.
- Subject to the application being used as a study area then no objections.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the variation of a condition 1 of 2010/1203 (Appeal Decision) to increase the size of the re-located utility block on Unit 2 to include a study room. The amenity block was relocated and slightly increased in size on a previous variation of condition application 2014/0069.

History and Principle

4.2 The principle for the number of plots and caravans on the site was approved under reference 2009/0086, which was for 6 traveller pitches including 6 mobile homes, 6 amenity blocks and 2 touring caravans. Repair and part replacement and change of use of existing buildings for storage of vintage horse drawn touring caravans, materials for restoration and construction of vans, hey storage and stables. Formation of new access and construction of foul drainage system. The application was approved subject to conditions.

4.3 An application was submitted (reference 2010/1203) to remove the condition restricting the occupation of the site to the applicant, his family and relations who are also Gypsies or Travellers as defined by national policy (Annexe to CLG Planning Policy for Traveller Sites). This application was refused, but was allowed on appeal. Therefore the principle to establish the land as a Gypsy and Traveller site has already been accepted and is not the subject for consideration in the current application.

4.4 Concern has been raised regarding the need for a study room, however, throughout the district similar schemes have been approved providing study space within the utility blocks. I consider such provision to be acceptable in principle.

Visual impact

4.5 The amenity block as re-sited is behind an existing storage shed. The height of the utility block remains at 4 metres, the increase in length results in a building of 13.8 metres by 4.4 metres, which has increased the length of the previously approved revised plan by 5 metres to allow the provision of a study room.
4.6 Consideration has been given to the visual impact the extended building will have on the character of the site and the rural character of the area. The utility block for Unit 2 is screened from the wider landscape context because of the existing storage building in front of it. The utility building, as proposed to be extended, will retain its narrow width of 4.4m which will help to keep its character as an ancillary building. Overall I conclude that the impact on the built form of the site and the surrounding character of the area would not be significant or detrimental. In this instance the proposed extension to the utility block is acceptable.

Residential Amenity

4.7 The site has no near neighbours and the increase to the building will not harm the amenities of the other pitches within the site. Consequently the proposal accords with policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Highways

4.8 The highway issues were part of the original consideration to the 2009 application. The required access from the highway to the site has already been implemented. The Highways Authority raise no objections to the revision of the Utility building for plot 2. This element of the scheme therefore accords with IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Other issues

4.9 Concern has been raise by local residents regarding the potential to increase the size of the remaining utility blocks and the resulting size being more like a small bungalow rather than amenity block. The extension of any of the other utility blocks would be assessed on the merits of the particular case as submitted at the time. The other amenity buildings are potentially more visible in the landscape and approval of the current application does not necessarily establish a precedent for the others.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The increase in size of the utility block and the revised location behind the existing building and reorientation to benefit from a south facing aspect will not result in any harm to the character of the site or the surrounding landscape, the scheme accords with the above policies.

5.3 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy as the new floorspace proposed is less than 100sqm.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 j.jackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
**Application on land owned by South Norfolk Council**

22. **Appl. No**: 2014/1138/F  
    **Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
    **Applicants Name**: Mr Ray Green  
    **Site Address**: 46 - 60 Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QH  
    **Proposal**: Proposed Staff WC and Welfare block  
    **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
    1. Full Planning permission time limit  
    2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
      NPPF 07: Requiring good design

   1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
      Policy 2: Promoting good design

   1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
      EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises

   1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
      Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be at the end of 2014. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

   1.5 Development Management Policies  
      DM2.1 Employment and business development

2. **Planning History**

   2.1 2013/1785 Change of Use form Class B8 (Storage & distribution) to 'Sui Generis' classification for proposed use as a Bus & Coach Depot including Office and Maintenance Facilities  
      **Approved**

   2.2 2014/0688 Proposed overcladding of existing office building and provision of new car park.  
      **Approved**

3. **Consultations**

   3.1 Town Council No views or comments

   3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

   3.3 Head Of Environmental Services No comments received

   3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received
Development Management Committee  23 July 2014

3.5  Representations  No responses received

4  Assessment

4.1  This application has been referred to the Development Management Committee as the Council own the ground lease for the site.

4.2  The building is proposed within a site used as a bus and coach depot situated within an industrial estate in the development limits for Wymondham.

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 and emerging Development Plan Policies.

4.4  The position of the proposed building is partly dictated by the accessibility to the drainage network which is connected to an adjacent building situated to the front of the site.

4.5  There is a mixture of different style buildings and materials used within the industrial estate including steel panelling. Therefore the cladding will not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. Due to the minimal size of the building it will have no significant impact on the street scene or surrounding area.

This development is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy as it does not create more than 100sqm of new floorspace.

5  Conclusion

5.1  The proposed design of the building and the materials to be used are in keeping with the surrounding area. The development is consistent with relevant planning policies and the application should consequently be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:   Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases: July 2014

<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>TIVETSHALL ST MARY</td>
<td>Unauthorised Building</td>
<td>07.12.04</td>
<td>Complied with No Further Action (NFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardle Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectory Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/0238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use -</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with, new breach under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeches Farm</td>
<td>Breach of a condition -</td>
<td></td>
<td>investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road</td>
<td>Operational development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>24.02.09</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 31/07/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Erection of Decking</td>
<td>26/10/09</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Mere Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 12/12/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application for revised scheme received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.01.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
<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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELVERTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>Emergency Authority</td>
<td>Temporary Stop Notice and Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to Loddon</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>20.04.10</td>
<td>Compliance date 24.07.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal dismissed – Enforcement Notice partially complied with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further enquiries ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>Emergency Authority</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to Gilders</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>20.04.10</td>
<td>Appeal submitted and allowed for four year temporary permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 11/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj. to Fen Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 29.12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTON</td>
<td>Change of use of barn to residential use</td>
<td>16.02.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served Compliance date of 20/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing prosecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Standing of a caravan</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served Compliance date extended one year to 14/09/15</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>
| CROWNTHORPE  
Land adjacent to The Drift  
Crownthorpe Road  
2011/8025 | 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 |
| ASLACTON  
Land off Grays Lane  
2008/8368 | Erection of buildings not connected to agricultural use | 21/12/11 | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 31/07/15 |
| WYMONDHAM  
70 Damgate Street  
2011/8281 | Unauthorised works to Listed Building (Insertion of UPVC windows) | 02/05/12 | Enforcement Notice served  
Notice upheld on appeal and varied, compliance date 30/05/14  
Current negotiations with agent |
| GREAT MOULTON  
Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane  
2012/8018 | Change of Use of Land for the standing of a residential caravan | 18/07/12 | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 30/01/18 |
| SAXLINGHAM THORPE  
Land on the North side of Windy Lane  
2013/8069 | Storage of a caravan | 27/02/13 | Enforcement Notice served and appealed  
Appeal ongoing with change of procedure |
| TOPCROFT  
Land South side of Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street  
2012/8299 | Change of use of land for the stationing of a residential caravan | 27/03/13 | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 30/08/14 |
<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>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of woodland</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served and appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Inquiry date - 12th August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 16/02/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complied with but ongoing monitoring</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></td>
<td>residential dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 19/03/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 and appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULBARTON</td>
<td>Untidy land</td>
<td>05/02/14</td>
<td>Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 14/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigating possible direct action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enforcement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014 As of 01/07/14</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>151</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 13 June 2014 to 11 July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/1957</td>
<td>Swainsthorpe The Holdings Church Road Swainsthorpe Norfolk NR14 8PR</td>
<td>Mr H Mumford</td>
<td>New detached one bedroom bungalow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Planning Appeals

### Appeals decisions from 13 June 2014 to 11 July 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>2013/1488</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>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0360</td>
<td>Ketteringham Donway Low Street Ketteringham Norfolk NR18 9RY</td>
<td>Mr Alex Wells</td>
<td>Erection of detached double garage</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>