Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
<th>South Norfolk Independent Grp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Mooney</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
<td>Mr J Herbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Blake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr N Legg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pool of Substitutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr L Dale</th>
<th>Mrs V Bell</th>
<th>Mr K Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Foulger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Riches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Savage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Walden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 15 October 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.

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

07/10/2014
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

The Council has a duty to prepare Local Plan Documents to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The Development Plan for South Norfolk currently consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The Strategy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance and was adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011 (with amendments to the JCS being adopted in January 2014). It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it is adopted, policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**THEREFORE we will:**

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

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

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

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

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

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

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 7)

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 17 September 2014;
   (attached – page 9)

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>2014/0993/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/0994/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014/0562/F</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Land South Of Hall Farm Bungay Road Tasburgh</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014/0981/O</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue Trowse</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/0935/H</td>
<td>SHELFANGER</td>
<td>The Barn High London Farm High London Lane Shelfanger</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014/1305/O</td>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST MARY</td>
<td>Land South East Of Shangri-la The Street Tivetshall St Mary</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2014/1396/O</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Land South Of Petersfield Farm Valley Farm Lane Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2014/1507/RVC</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>4 Mill Road Loddon</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2014/1566/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Poringland Village Hall, 65 The Street, Poringland,</td>
<td>79</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 85)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  
   (attached – page 90)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Friday 14 November 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.

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

Members of the public and press are permitted to film or record meetings to which they are permitted access in a non-disruptive manner and only from areas designated for the public. No prior permission is required, however the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting will ask if anyone present wishes to record proceedings. We will ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to the public and press to assist filming or recording of meetings.

The use of digital and social media recording tools, for example Twitter, blogging or audio recording is allowed as long as it is carried out in a non-disruptive manner.
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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.

Does the interest directly:
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.

Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 17 September 2014 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), D Blake, F Ellis, C Gould, J Herbert, L Hornby, C Kemp and N Legg, L Neal

Apologies: Councillors Y Bendle, M Gray

Substitute Members: Councillors B Riches (for Y Bendle) and T Lewis (for M Gray)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Planning Decisions and Enforcement Team Leader (C Trett) the Senior Planning Officer (C Raine) and the Planning Officer – Major Projects (H Bowman).

Also in Attendance: A Jacklin, Norfolk County Council Highways

(the press and 27 members of the public were in attendance)

160. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 20 August 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

161. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interest in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/0411/F</td>
<td>YELVERTON</td>
<td>All members (except B Riches and J Herbert)</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by applicant and objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1535/H</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is member's daughter. Member left the meeting for the item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1469/RVC</td>
<td>MORNINGTHORPE AND FRITTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is a member of SNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0856/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0993/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0994/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by objector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
162. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism. The officers presented applications listed in the report and representatives from Parish/Town Councils and members of the public addressed the Committee on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/0411/F</td>
<td>YELVERTON</td>
<td>Mr K Gotts, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R Sapey, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Sapey, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms J Gittoes, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr G Eves, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Wilby, on behalf of the Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1274/F</td>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST</td>
<td>Mr T Jollans, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>Mr A Harris, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr S Rowley, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr D Smith, Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Wilby, Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0856/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms J Hale, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr C Gould, Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0993/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0994/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0209/F</td>
<td>ALBURGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs D Gladden-Fenn, Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Beckett, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1539/CU</td>
<td>MORLEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs A Smith, Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.

163. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals Report.

(The meeting closed at 1.55pm)

_____________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No**: 2014/0411/F  
   **Parish**: YELVERTON

   **Applicants Name**: Lightsource SPV15  
   **Site Address**: Land North East Of Avenue Farm Back Road Yelverton Norfolk

   **Proposal**: Installation and operation of a solar farm and associated infrastructure, including photovoltaic panels, mounting frames, inverters, transformers, substations, communications building, fence and pole mounted security cameras, for the life of the solar farm (revised proposal)

**Decision**: Members voted 7-4 for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions
1. Temporary permission for 30 years removal of all equipment from site before expiry of time period. This is to be done in accordance with a decommissioning statement including access to be submitted and agreed by LPA not later than 6 months before the expiry date.
2. In the event they cease to generate electricity for 6 months, a decommissioning statement including access must be submitted to the LPA within the following 28 days. Upon agreement of the decommissioning statement with the LPA, all associated equipment shall be removed within 6 months of the agreement of this document.
3. In accordance with plans, landscaping FRA, fences
4. Provision of temporary construction access in accordance with plans
5. Provision of visibility splay for temporary access
6. Full details and provision of operational access to be agreed
7. Construction worker parking to be agreed
8. Construction traffic management and access route to be submitted and agreed.
9. Wheel washing to be agreed
10. No gates across construction accesses
11. Restriction on times for delivery
12. Hours of construction
13. Compliance with submitted construction management plan (noise and dust)
14. Details and provision of swales including cross section
15. Field drainage management scheme for construction phase to be agreed
16. Ecology mitigation to be agreed
17. Landscaping details in accordance with those indicated in application
18. Implementation of landscape biodiversity management plan to be agreed
19. Implementation of landscaping
20. Replacement of dead or defective landscaping within 30 year time period.
21. Retention of trees and hedges
22. No external lighting unless agreed
23. Details CCTV to be agreed
24. No loud speakers or warning devices

Members noted that the application was to be forwarded to Secretary of State to consider whether to be called in.

Updates
Replacement list of conditions
1. Temporary permission for 30 years removal of all equipment from site before expiry of time period. This is to be done in accordance with a decommissioning statement including access to be submitted and agreed by LPA not later than 6 months before the expiry date.
2. In the event they cease to generate electricity for 6 months, a decommissioning statement including access must be submitted to the LPA within the following 28 days. Upon agreement of the decommissioning statement with the LPA, all associated equipment shall be removed within 6 months of the agreement of this document.
3. In accordance with plans, landscaping FRA, fences
4. Provision of temporary construction access in accordance with plans
5. Provision of visibility splay for temporary access
6. Full details and provision of operational access to be agreed
7. Construction worker parking to be agreed
8. Construction traffic management and access route to be submitted and agreed.
9. Wheel washing to be agreed
10. No gates across construction accesses
11. Restriction on times for delivery
12. Hours of construction
13. Compliance with submitted construction management plan (noise and dust)
14. Details and provision of swales including cross section
15. Field drainage management scheme for construction phase to be agreed
16. Ecology mitigation to be agreed
17. Landscaping details in accordance with those indicated in application
18. Implementation of landscape biodiversity management plan to be agreed
19. Implementation of landscaping
20. Replacement of dead or defective landscaping within 30 year time period.
21. Retention of trees and hedges
22. No external lighting unless agreed
23. Details CCTV to be agreed
24. No loud speakers or warning devices
Concern has also been raised regarding the loss of privacy resulting from the installation of CCTV cameras around the site perimeter. The applicant has submitted a plan highlighting the position and orientation of the CCTV cameras and it is apparent that those on the northern perimeter of the site, where those properties closest to the development are located, do not overlook these properties. Whilst it may be possible for some of the CCTV cameras to pick up dwellings in some background views, these will be very long distance views. Concern in relation to loss of privacy of users of the public right of ways in the vicinity of the site is not considered to represent significant harm in planning terms, as they are public places where a person is not entitled to significant levels of privacy, unlike a private residence or garden. It should also be noted that the cameras used are typically thermal cameras which are not designed to recognise people. It is considered that such a scenario would not result in a significant loss of privacy. In order to ensure the precise number, location, orientation and type of the CCTV cameras adequately safeguard neighbour amenity, a condition will be attached to any resulting approval requiring the agreement of a detailed scheme of CCTV cameras for the site based upon the information submitted to date.

Officer: Petition against the solar farm with 206 signatures
Seven additional letter raising no new issues other than questioning the size of the site in the sequential test and validity of the agricultural classification report

2

Appl. No: 2014/1274/F
Parish: TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET
Applicants Name: Mr Don Smith
Site Address: The Maltings Moulton Road Tivetshall St. Margaret Norwich NR15 2AJ
Proposal: The proposed development is for a Warehouse facility and carparking

Decision: Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accordance with amendments
3 Details of dust silo
4 Details of access parking
5 Visibility splay, approved plan
6 External materials to be agreed
7 Renewable energy
8 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
9 Implement landscaping scheme
10 Ecology
11 Submission of noise assessment
12 Submission of dust assessment
13 Provision of fume extraction system
14 Full details of external lighting
15 Surface water drainage
16 Foul drainage to be agreed
17 Levels
18 No commencement of works until land drain consent has been given

Updates
Officer: Aslacton Parish Council – This company provides local employment for many and should be encouraged to remain on its present site
Officer: five additional letters of objection from three households
- Site resulting in people selling homes
- Not enough people consulted
- Not selling house because of application
- Need to improve current situation before expanding
- Concerned about future developments on the site
- Limited jobs created

Three letters of support from one household
- Application has not devalued my property or made it difficult to sell

Officer: Additional water vole survey submitted - no water voles found

3  Appl. No : 2014/1156
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants name : Matthew Homes Ltd
Site Address : Land South Of London Road, Chestnut Drive, Suton
Proposal : Variation of S106 agreement, to allow the removal of the education contribution if development is built out at fewer than 20 dwellings relating to permission 2012/1201 (FULL planning permission for B1, B2, B8 category office industrial units on Wymondham Business Park with OUTLINE approvals sought for residential development of approx. 20 dwellings on land adjacent to London Road and additional B1,B2,B8 category industrial use for land adjacent to Chestnut Drive to further extend Wymondham Business Park)

Decision : Members voted unanimously to endorse the proposed amendments to S106

Applications referred back to Committee

4  Appl. No : 2012/1919/F
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Ecotech Homes (East Anglia)
Site Address : Land North Of Right Up Lane Silfield Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Revision of Sec 106 Agreement to remove requirement to provide 1 affordable dwelling in development of 6 dwelling units

Decision : Members voted unanimously to approve subject to revised S106 Agreement to provide ‘clawback’ payment in event of improved profitability
Other Applications

5  
Appl. No : 2014/1535/H  
Parish : LODDON  
Applicants name : Mrs Esther Thomas  
Site Address : 2 Elm Close Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LG  
Proposal : Two storey side extension and alterations to existing windows  
Decision : Members voted 9-0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions
1  Full Planning permission time limit
2  In accordance with amendments
3  Matching Materials

Updates  
Parish Council comments received – Approved

6  
Appl. No : 2014/1469/RVC  
Parish : MORNINGTHORPE AND FRITTON  
Applicants name : Mrs Sabrina Windridge  
Site Address : Fritton Cottage The Common Fritton Norfolk NR15 2QS  
Proposal : To vary condition 4 attached to planning permission 2001/0515/H (Single storey extension and alterations to dwelling) - to permit the occupation of the annexe by a lodger or tenant, while retaining the main dwelling and annexe in common ownership  
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions
1  Approved plans
2  Annexe restricted use

7  
Appl. No : 2014/0856/F  
Parish : LODDON  
Applicants name : Mr Justin Fenwick  
Site Address : The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LX  
Proposal : Erection of one-and-a-half storey building to provide four letting rooms and associated landscaping  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL  
Refused
1  Unacceptable harm to residential amenity, contrary IMP9; DM3.14

Updates  
Environmental Services – Recommend standard conditions in respect of lighting, drainage and contamination.
8   Appl. No : 2014/0993/F
Parish : LODDON
Applicants name : Mr Justin Fenwick
Site Address : The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LX
Proposal : Demolition of existing store rooms (retrospective) and erection of replacement building to provide four letting rooms. Erection of lean-to maids store
Decision : Members voted unanimously to DEFER (to a future meeting of this Committee) for a Sites Sub-Committee visit
Note: The Committee indicated the reason for the Sites Sub-Committee visit was to assess all the issues raised concerning the application

9   Appl. No : 2014/0994/F
Parish : LODDON
Applicants name : Mr Justin Fenwick
Site Address : The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LX
Proposal : Demolition of existing store rooms (retrospective) and erection of replacement building to provide four letting rooms. Erection of lean-to maids store
Decision : Members voted unanimously to DEFER (to a future meeting of this Committee) for a Sites Sub-Committee visit
Note: The Committee indicated the reason for the Sites Sub-Committee visit was to assess all the issues raised concerning the application

10  Appl. No : 2014/0209/F
Parish : ALBURGH
Applicants name : Mr Nigel Bond
Site Address : South Farm Tunbeck Road Alburgh Norfolk IP20 0BS
Proposal : Continued use of the property for: (i) wood processing, storage and creation of wood products and sales of finished products online or by telephone but excluding wood planing of a continuous nature (blue on plan) (ii) food preparation and creation (purple on plan) (iii) long-term storage and occasional movement of stored items (green on plan)
Decision : Members voted 8-3 for APPROVAL
Approved with conditions
1  In accordance with amendments
2  Specific Uses
3  Implementation of noise report
4  Limited Hours of Use
5  Boundary noise level
Updates

Local Member

- Note previous unauthorised developments/retrospective applications. Letter to applicant?
- No problem with items (ii) and (iii) but the wood processing (i) has been very noisy and has disturbed residents for several months.
- Wood planing caused high pitched screaming noise, this has now stopped but could resume, hence need for noise level condition.
- However, agree with objectors, this would be better located on industrial estate rather than in quiet rural area.
- Recommend part (i) of the application is refused unless the Committee feels that the noise can be controlled adequately and the conditions enforced in a timely manner to avoid protracted disturbance to residents who have already suffered enough.

NCC: Highways
No objections

11
Appl. No : 2011/1539/CU
Parish : MORLEY

Applicants name : Mrs Annie Smith
Site Address : Primrose Paddocks Low Road Morley St Botolph NR18 9BU
Proposal : Use of land to stand 2 static caravans and 1 touring caravan for occupation by a single family

Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Occupation by Gypsies and Travellers only
2. Maximum 3 caravans (2 static, 1 tourer)
3. No caravans permitted in Flood Zone 3
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Applications Referred to Site Inspection

1. **Appl. No**: 2014/0993/F  
   **Parish**: LODDON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr Justin Fenwick  
   **Site Address**: The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LX  
   **Proposal**: Demolition of existing store rooms (retrospective) and erection of replacement building to provide four letting rooms. Erection of lean-to maids store  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions
   - 1 Full Planning permission time limit
   - 2 In accord with submitted drawings
   - 3 Accommodation ancillary to PH
   - 4 Specific details to be agreed

2. **Appl. No**: 2014/0994/F  
   **Parish**: LODDON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr Justin Fenwick  
   **Site Address**: The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon Norfolk NR14 6LX  
   **Proposal**: Demolition of existing store rooms (retrospective) and erection of replacement building to provide four letting rooms. Erection of lean-to maids store  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions
   - 1 Full Planning permission time limit
   - 2 In accord with submitted drawings
   - 3 Accommodation ancillary to PH
   - 4 Specific details to be agreed

Site Panel Visit

Members present: Mr J Mooney (Chairman); Mr D Blake; Mrs Y Bendle; Mr C Gould; Mr L Hornby; Dr C Kemp; Dr N Legg.

Members viewed the building subject of the application, which was nearing completion with tiles and windows installed. The building was viewed from the car park in the context of the listed building and adjacent buildings. The difference between the footprint of the original building and its replacement was noted by reference to the submitted plan. The relationship to the adjoining residential building (converted barn to the south) was also noted as well as the position of a proposed lean-to at the western end of the building (not yet constructed but slab in place).
Members then visited the adjoining residential property to the south and noted the connections and relationship of the application building with the converted barn and its single storey wing. The curtilage of the dwelling was noted including the raised ground level in the southern portion.

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  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 12: Redevelopment following demolition of Listed Buildings  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
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  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

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 2013/1640  
Conversion of existing store rooms and alteration of cloakrooms to allow for the creation of dining area (minor alterations to approved permission 2013/0528/F & 2013/0529/LB)  
Approved
2.2 2013/1643 Conversion of existing store rooms and change of use to provide four letting rooms (minor alterations to approved permission 2013/0527/F & 2013/0526/LB) Approved

2.3 2013/1745 Retention of alterations to public house garden (including erection of a brick wall) and the proposed erection of a bin store Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommend refusal; roofline is higher, not in keeping with the main building and old bricks should have been used. The Council would support a one and a half storey building with dormers.

3.2 District Member No objections received under 2014/0993 but under 2014/0994 there are concerns relating to the design of the new build and parking provision for the various users of the courtyard.

3.3 NCC Highways No highway objections.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No adverse comments.

3.5 Representations Concerns have been expressed about the enlarged footprint and higher ridge and choice of bricks, combining to be not in keeping with the surrounding properties.

4. Assessment

4.1 The Swan is an impressive grade 2 listed building in brick and pantile in a prominent position in the conservation area. Its principle elevation faces the street being part of an historic group of buildings that form the west side of Church Plain. To the rear of the building the Swan has been extended on both sides to form a "U" shape with the southern wing continuing as single storey range which forms the boundary with the neighbouring property. A major scheme of refurbishment has been completed on the main building and has continued in part of this range which has been improved and converted to a dining room.

4.2 This proposal involves the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a larger building to accommodate 4 letting rooms and a maid's store, in association with the Swan public house. The building work involved has been commenced so the application is for the most part retrospective. The consideration of the application raised issues on the merits of the demolition; the design of the replacement; effect on neighbour amenity, parking provision and viability of the public house.

Demolition:

4.3 In 2013 consent was granted to convert the western most building to 4 letting rooms (2013/1643). This range was single storey with attic space above, part brick and boarded with a pantiled roof. It was intended to convert this building, adding dormers and other openings to service the letting rooms, two on the ground floor with a new stair to provide two above. By virtue of the building being attached to the Swan it is considered to be a listed structure.
4.4 On commencing this scheme, the condition of the building was found to be unstable, the construction sub-standard, and the decision was taken by the owners to demolish the building. As the approved scheme could not be implemented, these applications were submitted. It was found, prior to demolition, that the approved scheme would not provide sufficient headroom or disabled facilities, and discussions had been held to look at the prospects of revising and enlarging the layout which would have included raising the ridge height. As the demolition work has been completed and work has continued with the rebuilding, the application is in part retrospective.

4.5 In terms of the significance of the building, it did form part of the listed complex although clearly a later addition and one that had been modified and altered in the past. The building would not have merited listing in its own right. It did make a contribution to the courtyard of buildings at the rear of the Swan, combined with the former town hall and three new houses recently completed. It was not visible from the street, so its contribution to the conservation area was not significant.

4.6 Under the NPPF, paragraph 133, the loss of a heritage asset should not be approved unless it can be shown that the harm was necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that would outweigh that harm. The building was a modest part of the Swan Inn, found to be in a poor condition not capable of sustaining its approved new use without substantial works. No objections have been raised over the demolition. In the light of the above it is felt that the scheme met the criteria in Local Plan policies IMP 15, 16 and 18.

Design of the new build.

4.7 In terms of the replacement building, concerns have been expressed over the higher ridge, enlarged footprint and the design, particularly the use of new bricks as opposed to reusing those salvaged from the original building.

4.8 The new ridge height would be 1.1 metres above the previous. This is proposed to accommodate the headroom at first floor while the enlarged footprint is needed to firstly provide for a disabled room on the ground floor, but also to provide a store room to service the new use. The ridge height is lower than a converted barn immediately to the south and the principle building of the Swan. It is felt that the building would still read as an ancillary building and not be out of scale in the courtyard.

4.9 The intention was to reuse the bricks but these were too damaged or fragile to be usable so new bricks were sourced which match those on the new houses opposite. These are to a good standard and with arched heads to the openings would match the converted dining room building adjacent.

4.10 It is felt that the design and quality of the replacement building would enhance the setting of the listed building and conservation area and comply with Local Plan policies IMP 15 and 18 and be in accord with paragraph 136 and 138 of the NPPF which seeks to encourage new development to proceed following demolition and to support schemes that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset.

Neighbour amenity.

4.11 The enlarged roof structure would impact upon the neighbour to the south but would not cause any overshadowing. It does fit in well with the roof scape from this view point and would help reduce the disturbance from the public house and these have been acknowledged by the neighbour. I am satisfied the proposal does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the neighbour and meets the criteria in Local Plan policy IMP 9.
Parking provision

4.12 The local member is concerned about the impact of the scheme on the provision of car parking in the courtyard. This does provide spaces for the public house, while 8 spaces have been shown as priority for the letting rooms. The highway officer has no objections to the car parking arrangements and provision. I do not feel the scheme conflicts with Local Plan policy IMP 8. There is car parking available in Church Plain to the east of the Swan.

4.13 In terms of viability, the agents have advised that the letting rooms for this application and the ones proposed under 2014/0856 are needed to ensure the viability of the public house. Prior to these applications there was no provision for accommodation at the public house, space on the first and second floors of the public house are needed as function rooms and kitchen facilities. Considerable improvements have been made to the premises funded by the three new houses built on the west part of the site. At present the public house is operating at a loss.

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 In view of the above, the new building would make a positive contribution to the courtyard, enhance the conservation area and would have benefits to the business and the public that would justify the proposal. It is felt that it meets the criteria set under sections 66(1) and 72 of the Listed buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3. **Appl. No**: 2014/0562/F  
   **Parish**: TASBURGH

   **Applicants Name**: Mr Mark Dickinson  
   **Site Address**: Land South Of Hall Farm Bungay Road Tasburgh Norfolk  
   **Proposal**: Installation of a solar PV array plus ancillary development.

   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

   1. Temporary permission for 30 years removal of all equipment from site before expiry of time period. Not less than 12 months prior to the expiry or within 3 months of the cessation of electricity production a decommissioning plan shall be submitted. Decommissioning shall be in accordance with a decommissioning statement.
   2. In accordance with plans
   3. Construction worker parking to be agreed
   4. Construction traffic management and access route to be submitted and agreed.
   5. Wheel washing to be agreed
   6. Hours of construction
   7. Submission of construction management plan (noise and dust)
   8. Details and provision of swales including cross section and submission of a management plan
   9. Ecology mitigation to be agreed
   10. Landscaping details to be agreed
   11. Submission of landscape biodiversity management plan to be agreed
   12. Implementation of landscaping
   13. Replacement of dead or defective landscaping within 30 year time period.
   14. Retention of trees and hedges
   15. No external lighting unless agreed
   16. Details CCTV to be agreed
   17. No loud speakers or warning devices
   18. Scheme of archaeological work
   19. Tree protection

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
      NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
      NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
      NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
      NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
      NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

   1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
      ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
      ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
      ENV 14: Habitat protection
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 spring 2015. 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
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

Planning History

2013/0542 Screening Opinion for a proposed solar photovoltaic development Environmental statement not required

2010/1310 Erection of 16,000 bird Free Range Egg Unit, 3 x feed silos, Access Way and Hard Standing, Underground Tank Approved

Consultations

Long Stratton Parish Council
No objections
- Permanent screening to the northern and eastern boundaries to be natural indigenous quick growing hedging.
- Vehicular access to the site should be via the A140 and not via the villages of Tharston, Hapton and Tasburgh.
- Should be temporary permission

Tasburgh Parish Council
Original Information
Approve

Tharston and Hapton Parish Council
Original information
Refuse
- More information required about the effect of glare from panels impacting residential properties.
• More details are required about drainage and surface water runoff from the site. Already an existing problem and this will make it worse
• Concerns about the environmental impact of the loss of farm land and extensive lighting on the site
• Additional traffic including construction traffic will be placed on declassified roads through the village of Hapton.
• Not all effected properties were consulted about the application

3.2 District Members: Original information
  - Cllr Florence Ellis Can be delegated
  - Cllr Terry Blowfield To be reported if appropriate
  - Cllr Andrew Pond To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environment Agency Original information
  No objection
  • Site is within flood zone 1 and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted
  • Flood Risk Assessment has not been reviewed in detail and Council should be satisfied that it sufficiently addresses the points below
  • Solar farm should not have a significant increase in run-off generally as they only result in small increase across the site.
  • If land is bare they could result in erosion at the base, use of localised infiltration trenches should be considered
  • If panels do not follow the contours of the site run-off into small channels can occur and a buffer strip or swale will be required to intercept flows
  • Compaction should be avoided in construction
  • Need to ensure that existing ditches and watercourses are maintained

3.4 NCC Highways Support with conditions
  - Parking for construction workers and delivery vehicles
  - Construction Traffic Management Plan including routing
  - Wheel cleaning facilities

3.5 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer No objection
  • 12 hectares of the site is identified as mineral resource (sand and gravel).
  • No objection if the use of the site is for temporary development up to a 35 year development life and conditioned to this time period OR objection to the proposal if a permanent use unless (1) the applicant carries out an investigation to identify if the resource is viable for mineral extraction and (2) If mineral extraction is viable the applicant should consider if it could be extracted economically prior to development taking place.

3.6 Historic Environment Service Original proposal
  • Desk based assessment concludes that the site has high potential for archaeological remains
3.7 English Heritage

Response to additional photomontages of landscape

- Known crop marking have are not part of development
- Request a geophysical survey of the site

Additional information does not address concerns

We are not sure whether to conclude that this would harm the significance to the church but we must maintain our express of concern.

Original application
Raised concerns

- No harmful impact on the heritage assets in Tasburgh
- When approaching church from south along the main path the application site will flank views of the church on the eastern side, when standing at the western end of the churchyard the hillside containing the application site will be clearly visible.
- Acknowledgement that the solar farm will be visible from outside the churchyard but views within churchyard are generally blocked by trees. English Heritage consider that there are clear views across the site from within the churchyard
- Concerned that the screening would not be adequate and the development would impact on the quality of the landscape and result in harm to the significance of the church.
- Request further information to assess the impact and effectiveness of the screening.
- If minded to approve the public benefits need to be carefully considered and must be demonstrated to outweigh the harms to the setting of the church.

3.8 Ecologist

Support with conditions on habitat management plan

3.9 Landscape Officer

Responses to additional information

- Further clarification needed on landscaping and management which can be conditioned.
- Clarification needed on whether landscaping can be secured by condition.
- New planting along B1135 and South West corner of site required

Original application

- Do not dispute the findings of Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, some potential to mitigate with additional planting along the southwest corner and western boundary
- Chestnut trees have been removed along B1135 which have altered views need further information on the impact from point and whether additional planting is required
- Further information is required on existing and proposed landscaping and the management of this.

3.10 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection.

- Due to the relationship of the plant and machinery and surrounding dwellings no significant impact
• Potential for noise and dust during construction
• Conditions required on a dust and noise management plan
• Location of plant and machinery must not change.

3.11 Flood Defence Officer
• Supports the principle of swales to attenuate surface water
• Further information required on management of swales.

3.12 Representations
5 Letters of support -
• Contribution to green energy targets and tackle climate change
• Location ideal as well screened, only viewed by a few households
• Will improve biodiversity with wildflower meadow and hedgerow planting

14 letters of objection from 15 households-
• Water runoff from the site will impact Hall Farm, Tharston adjacent to the site and at a lower level.
• Loss of countryside and unsightly appearance
• Loss of agricultural land for food production
• Devaluation of property
• Possible noise issues in inclement weather
• Removal of 30 mature trees on the road frontage which leaves the whole field open to view, landscape appraisal based on the trees being there.
• Minimal and unspecific ecological enhancement, need biodiversity management plan
• Adversely affect tourism and local businesses.
• Possibility of the site being abandoned if subsidies are reduced.
• Solar farm should be on flat, previously developed land
• Exact grade of agricultural land is not known, mostly used for growing crops
• View point should have been taken from houses in Tharston
• Visual impact of solar farm would be greater in the winter months
• Permissive path along the west of the site would be affected
• Fences CCTV and panels would adversely affect the landscape.
• Fences could channel deer onto roads
• Scale of the installation, glare and light pollution from the site
• Slope of the site makes installation visible locally and cannot be adequately screened
• Proposal would have an adverse effect on the local landscape the character and the amenities of countryside users
• Concerns relating to privacy and proposed CCTV cameras

4 Assessment

Site

4.1 The site is approximately 30 hectares of agricultural land which is currently used for grazing and arable crops. The site contains grade 2, 3a and 3b agricultural land and forms part of a larger agricultural holding.
4.2 The site consists of four fields to the south west of Tasburgh and north of Long Stratton and Thurston. The buildings which form Hall Farm Tasburgh are to the North of the site. There are pockets of woodland to the north east, west and the south and east. The site is bounded by mature hedgerows and hedgebanks. Trees have been removed along the B1135 in the early part of the year under a separate felling licence from the Forestry Commission, replacements have already been planted.

4.3 A tributary to the river Tas runs to the west of the site. The site slopes in a south westerly direction.

4.4 There is a County Wildlife Site to the north west of the site. To the west of the site there are footpaths FP16, FP17 and FP18 running from Tharston towards Tasburgh. The Boudicca’s Way long distance path runs the other side of the A140.

4.5 Surrounding dwellings potentially affected by the proposal are The Spinney which is located approximately 140 metres north of the site; this is owned by the landowner for this application. Hall Farmhouse and Tasburgh Hall are located to the north west and north of the site respectively. Cluster of dwellings in Tharston including Hall Farm and Church Farm Tharston and dwellings on the junction of Parkes Lane and Hall Lane located approximately 440 metres to 700 metres to the south west of the site. The Cedars on the A140 and The Vicarage and residential properties on Church Hill Tasburgh.

4.6 Tharston Church which is grade I listed and is located to the south west of the site.

4.7 The site lies within the Tas Tributary Farmland Character area defined by the Landscape Character Assessment Landscape Character Areas of the Rural Policy Area (2006 updated in 2012).

Proposal

4.8 The application is for the installation of a solar farm on a site of approximately 30 hectares. It is proposed that the development would produce 15 MW of electricity and this is estimated to be capable of providing power for approximately 4242 homes. The application is a temporary permission for 30 years. Access is proposed via the existing farm access on to the B1135.

4.9 The panels are proposed in lines facing south. The maximum height of the panels would be 2.31 metres and they would be angled at 20 degrees. The minimum height above ground is 0.9 metres. The panels do not have slab foundations, but are piled into the ground at a depth of approximately 1.5 meters.

4.10 The development will also involve the erection of a number of small buildings to the north west of the site including a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) substation 4.55 x 2.92 x 2.85 metres high, switch gear building 5.33 x 6.98 x 4.88 metres high and storage room 2.5 x 6.5 x 2.9 metres high. There are also 8 inverters located around the site away from the boundaries, the inverters are 6.7 x 1.75 x 2.9 metres high.

4.11 A two meter timber post and wire fence is proposed around the perimeter of the site and security cameras are proposed to be located around the boundaries.

4.12 The proposal includes mitigation in the form of additional planting to close up gaps in existing hedgerows and planting a new hedge along the B1135 frontage and some planting in the south west corner.
The National Planning Policy Framework

4.13 In line with the Climate Change Act 2008 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies the Core Planning Principles these include supporting the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate including encouraging the use of renewable resources as well as the need to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

4.14 Paragraphs 93-98 of the NPPF set out the government’s planning policy on renewable energy.

4.15 Paragraph 93 makes it clear that it plays a key role in the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy which is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

4.16 Paragraphs 97 and 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework are supportive of renewable energy subject to the impacts being acceptable; it states “that local planning authorities should recognise all communities should contribute to energy generation from renewable energy or low carbon sources”. It does not require a need to be demonstrated for the energy they propose to generate. It also states that all applications should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise if the impacts are or can be made acceptable.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)

4.17 The publication of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in March 2014 gave further guidance on renewable energy and solar farm projects. Paragraph ID: 5-003 states “The National Planning Policy Framework explains that all communities have a responsibility to help increase the use and supply of green energy, but this does not mean that the need for renewable energy automatically overrides environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities. As with other types of development, it is important that the planning concerns of local communities are properly heard in matters that directly affect them.”

4.18 The PPG acknowledges that large scale solar farms can have a negative impact on rural landscapes particularly undulating landscapes, but also acknowledges well planned and well screened sites can have an acceptable impact on the landscape. It identifies a need to use previously developed and non-agricultural land where possible and if a proposal involves greenfield land, whether (i) the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary and poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land; and (ii) the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays.

4.19 The PPG also emphasises that the need for low carbon energy does not override environmental protections and consideration needs to be given to cumulative impacts of renewable energy development, there is also a need to consider local topography, protection of heritage assets, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as amenity.

4.20 Furthermore, the PPG emphasises that the need to address all planning considerations and stresses the need for renewable energy does not override environmental protection and concerns of local people need to be properly heard. It acknowledges well planned and screened solar farms can be acceptable provided the landscape impact can be addressed. It looks to provide solar farms on previously developed land where possible then lower grade agricultural land before higher grade agricultural land.
Other National Guidance/Advice

4.21 Solar energy remains a key component of the Government Strategy to produce renewable energy. The Department of Energy and Climate Change Solar PV Strategy Part 1 published in October 2013 sets out 4 guiding principles for solar PV, particularly relevant to planning is principle 3 which states that “solar PV should be appropriately sited with proper weight being given to environmental considerations such as landscape and visual impact.

4.22 The Department of Energy and Climate Change Solar PV Strategy Part 2 April 2014 states that solar energy is the most supported renewable energy, that there is a move towards commercial roof space installations and that it should be well sited and designed. The key principles of solar energy are to appropriately site them, give proper weight to environment considerations such as landscape and visual impact, heritage and local amenity and provide opportunities for local communities to influence decisions that affect them and gain some community benefit.

4.23 In an oral Statement to House of Commons Planning Minister Nick Bowles stated that “the policies in the national planning policy framework are clear that there is no excuse for putting solar farms in the wrong places. The framework is clear that applications for renewable energy development, such as solar farms, should be approved only if the impact on the landscape – the visual and the cumulative impact – is or can be made acceptable. This is a very high test”.

Local policy

4.24 At a local level policy ULT13 in the South Norfolk Local Plan deals with renewable energy. This policy is generally consistent with the NPPF, but it does not provide a positive strategy and support for community led schemes as promoted by the NPPF. The key planning considerations relevant to the proposal include visual impact, pollution, highways, protection of heritage assets and other designations. For the purposes of considering this application the policy can be given substantial weight.

4.25 The emerging development management policy DM4.2 also takes a positive approach to renewable energy projects as long as the adverse impacts do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the benefits. This policy however, is not yet part of the Development Plan. It has been afforded little weight in making this recommendation.

4.26 The policy position is therefore generally supportive of renewable energy provision subject to the key issues being fully addressed.

4.27 In this instance the key consideration in determining the planning application are as follows:

- whether it is appropriate to provide this development on agricultural land including an assessment on agricultural grades,
- impact on local landscape,
- impact on residential amenity,
- impact on heritage assets,
- impact on drainage; and
- impact on the biodiversity of the site.

Development in open countryside and loss of agricultural land

4.28 Paragraph 111 in the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing brownfield land provided that it is not of high environmental quality, paragraph 112 in the NPPF states “that Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality”. Paragraph 013 ID:5-013-
2040306 in the National Planning Policy Guidance states “where a proposal involves greenfield land, whether (i) the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary and poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land and (ii) the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and/ or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays. This was reinforced in Greg Barker’s speech on 25th April 2013. Policy ENV21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan also prevents development on best and most versatile agricultural land unless it cannot be accommodated within development limits, previously developed land or poorer quality agricultural land or the need for the development outweigh the agricultural consideration.

4.29 Firstly, the size of this development is considered to be significant. Where this is the case, the PPG sets out a requirement that a sequential test is carried out to demonstrate why, firstly, previously developed land cannot be used and secondly lower grade agricultural land sites have been discounted.

4.30 With regard to the previously developed land, a sequential test has been submitted which looks at alternative locations for the development on previously developed land within a 5km radius of the available grid connection. No suitable available sites were identified. The sequential test did not cover the whole of South Norfolk or rooftops of existing buildings, but the recent reports submitted with the Yelverton solar farm application (2014/0411) heard at last month’s Development Management Committee should be taken into consideration which demonstrated that there were no suitable sites in South Norfolk or South Norwich on previously developed land or existing rooftops. It can, therefore, be concluded that there are not presently any suitable sites within the vicinity of a grid connection that are available and free from planning constraints such flooding or schedule monuments.

4.31 With regard to agricultural land, an agricultural assessment including sampling has been carried out by Kernon Countryside Consultants which identifies the site as being 32% grade 2 (very good agricultural land), 24% grade 3a (Good) and 44% grade 3b (Moderate).

4.32 Best and most versatile land is defined in the NPPF as Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. Therefore grades 3b, 4 and 5 are considered to be the poorer grades of land by default. The assessment shows that 56% of the site is Best and Most Versatile Land as a result there is a need to look at alternative sites.

4.33 The Natural England Land Classification Maps provide a broad indication of land classification grade, but are not based on individual site assessments. The maps do not differentiate between classes 3a and 3b. The application site is identified on the Natural England maps as being grade 3, but is actually a mixture of grade 2, 3a and 3b. The majority of the land in South Norfolk is identified as grade 3. In order to consider whether land is grade 3a or 3b, all grade 3 land would have to be tested on site which would not be practical or reasonable. It has therefore been agreed that the sequential test should only include grade 4 land within 10 km of the grid connection (there is no grade 5 land in South Norfolk). No viable alternative sites have been identified. By reference to other cases the methodology used in this sequential test has been accepted by Planning Inspectors’ at appeal.

4.34 Permission is proposed for a temporary period of 30 years: Because this is proposed to be a temporary rather than a permanent permission, the land will not gain brownfield status after decommissioning.

4.35 It should also be noted that it is intended that the site will be used for the grazing of sheep which will allow some continued agricultural use and the proposal will result in the biodiversity of the site being enhanced.
4.36 In accordance with the guidance in the PPG we are satisfied that an adequate assessment of previously developed land and lower grade agricultural land has been carried out and there are no suitable alternative sites available.

4.37 Twelve hectares of the site has been identified as a potential mineral resource (sand and gravel) which should be protected. The County Council however raise no objection as the proposal is for a temporary permission and would not sterilise the site on a permanent basis.

Landscape

4.38 Government guidance in the NPPF and policy 2 in the Joint Core Strategy place a strong emphasis on the protection of the landscape and the countryside. In addition to the renewable energy policies, paragraph 17 of the NPPF, requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and paragraph 109 seeks to protect enhance valued landscapes.

4.39 In the Natural England (formerly Countryside Agency) Countryside Character Assessment (1999) the site falls within national Character Area 83 South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands.

4.40 More locally the site lies within the Tas Tributary Farmland Character area defined by the Landscape Character Assessment Landscape Character Areas of the Rural Policy Area (2006 and updated in 2012). This area is characterised by gently undulating, with large arable fields and shallow valleys. Pockets of woodland are scattered across the area field boundaries mainly consist of fragmented hedgerows and tree belts.

4.41 A key consideration with this application is the impact the solar panels and associated infrastructure will have on the character and appearance of this character type and also the wider landscape.

4.42 A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been carried out which has assessed the impact from various viewpoints, the Landscape Officer agrees with the conclusions of this. Additional views have been submitted from the B1135 and St Mary’s church in Tharston.

4.43 The key views are view point 5 and 6 at Hall Lane and Parkes Lane, it will be possible to see the solar farm from these points. Although there would be some adverse impact on the landscape the panels would not break the horizon and on balance their impact is considered acceptable. New planting between fields 1 and 3 as well as a small copse in the South west corner of the site will help to reduce the impact of the development on the landscape. It is not possible to screen these views further due to the topography.

4.44 Officers requested further information on the impact from the B1135. The road is at a lower level to the application site and there will be glimpsed views from vehicle users which will reduce as proposed hedge matures along this boundary. Views from viewpoint one will largely be obscured by existing hedging which it is proposed to enhance further.

4.45 There is the possibility of glimpsed views from A140 and from public rights of ways; these are not considered to have a significant impact on the landscape.

4.46 In terms of cumulative impacts there are no planning permissions or applications for large scale solar farms in South Norfolk which would cause any cumulative impacts with this proposal.
In terms of glint and glare, solar panels are now designed to absorb as much light as possible as this increases the amount of electricity generated. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant loss of amenity or significantly effect on the landscape in terms of glint and glare.

On balance with the proposed mitigation planting it is considered that the proposed impact on the landscape is considered to be acceptable. Conditions have been recommended to ensure the landscaping is retained and maintained for the 30 year duration of the development.

Residential amenity

The site is located some distance from residential properties and therefore the main issue is loss of view or outlook.

The Spinney is located on the Bungay Road would be approximately 140 metres from site. This property is in the same ownership of the application site, there would be some views from the rear which would be partially obstructed by vegetation and topography. Apart from trees the site boundary is open to the fields. A traditional boundary treatment if desired could reduce the impact further, such a decision is at the discretion of the landowner.

Hall Farm Farmhouse which is in separate ownership is located to the north west of the site and Tasburgh Hall to the North. Views from these properties will be obscured by the change in level and existing vegetation. The impact from these properties is considered acceptable.

There is a group of 6 dwellings adjacent to Hall Farm as well Church Meadow and Parkes Lodge which form part of a small cluster of dwellings on the junction of Parkes Lane/Hall Lane in Tharston. These are orientated towards the site and have open views of the landscape. The solar farm will be visible from these properties as they are at a higher level. These properties are located approximately between 440 metres and 700 metres from the site, so although the solar farm will be visible, it is not considered to be have an over bearing impact.

Part of the solar farm may also be visible from oblique views from the first floor windows of The Cedars which is located on the A140, but there would be no significantly harm to amenities.

There may also be some glimpsed views of the solar farm from properties located in Church Hill in Tasburgh, but will not be seen from the majority of the properties in Tasburgh, Tharston or Long Stratton.

It should be noted in planning terms there is no to right to a view and it is not considered that the development would not be over bearing to the properties and result in any significant harm to their amenities in planning terms.

CCTV cameras are proposed around the perimeter of the site, but given the distance from residential properties it's not considered that they would result in any significant loss of residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy.

The construction phase will last 2 to 3 months, this will result in some noise disturbance and there is also potential to generate dust albeit for a temporary period. It is considered that subject to restricted working hours and agreement of a dust and noise management plan the impacts will be adequately controlled by condition.
4.58 In terms any noise associated with the operation of the solar farm, this will be limited. The plant and machinery which does generate some noise is located away from residential properties, it is not considered the solar farm would generate a level of noise which would cause significant disturbance to the residential properties. There have been instances of the use of loud speakers on other solar farms in the county and therefore a condition has been imposed specifically restricting this.

4.59 In conclusion it is considered that the proposed development would not result in the amenity of residents being substantially reduced and therefore the proposal would be in accordance with local plan policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Public Rights of Way

4.60 There is public Right of Way FT16 of the west of the site but view of the site will be obscured by vegetation. There is a permissive path to the west of the site which is at a lower level which would not have significant views of the development. There would be no significant impact on views from FT17 and FT18 or the long distance Boudicca Way footpath. The development will not affect any public right of ways.

Impact on Heritage Assets

4.61 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states: ‘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’.

4.62 The NPPF goes further stating that ‘when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset the greater the weight should be.

4.63 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.

4.64 Policy IMP 15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan refers to the importance of setting and states: ‘When considering proposals for development within the setting of listed buildings special attention will be given to the design, scale and impact of the proposals.

4.65 English Heritage provides important guidance on the setting of heritage assets. Key to being able to quantify the impact of any proposed development on a heritage asset is an assessment of its setting and the contribution this makes to its significance. The setting of a heritage asset can often extend some considerable distance beyond the immediate curtilage and in some cases can include much of the surrounding wider landscape. Many churches in the South Norfolk district are situated in a relatively flat open landscape, their setting extending some considerable distance away into the wider landscape. To what extent this contributes to the significance of a heritage asset will be different in each case.

4.66 English Heritage recommends the following approach to an assessment of setting:

- Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;
- Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the asset(s);
- Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance;
- Explore maximising enhancement and avoiding or minimising harm;
4.67 If the effect is “harmful” the harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal as outlined in paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF.

4.68 The NPPF provides a useful definition of “setting” in Annex 2: “The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral”.

4.69 The applicant has submitted a report into the impact on designated heritage assets and concluded that the setting of the surrounding heritage assets including Tasburgh Church (grade I) Rectory grade II Tharston Hall (grade II*) Camp in Village Scheduled Monument would not harmed to any extent by the proposed development. This view is supported by English Heritage and the Conservation Officer.

4.70 However, the proposed solar panels are situated on land directly to the northeast of the St Mary’s Church, Tharston, which is grade I listed. The area of open agricultural land that extends north-eastwards towards the proposed site for the solar farm slopes downwards towards a shallow valley. The solar panels are positioned on land to the opposite side of this valley and will be visible from the church site and as a result a detailed assessment into the impact of the development on the setting of the church has been made.

4.71 Firstly, looking at the longer views of St Mary’s Church from the north going southwards along Parkes Lane, due to the location of existing mature vegetation on the approach and around the church site, the church itself does not noticeably stand out and is not central to views of the wider landscape that include the proposed site for the solar panels. Looking east from Parkes Lane, due to natural topography and the location of the church in relation to existing mature vegetation, the wider setting of the church to the east side does not extend much beyond the field boundaries immediately to the east of Hall Farm. The proposed site for the solar farm is beyond these boundaries. Thirdly, views of the church site from the south and west side are blocked off by existing mature trees and the topography.

4.72 Therefore, looking at these wider landscape views from the south along Parkes Lane that include the church, whilst the panels will clearly be visible to the far-east side, they would only have a minimal level of adverse impact on the significance of the church site.

4.73 English Heritage has raised concerns that the solar farm will be visible in views from the west side of the churchyard area. These views are, however, looking away from the church building and therefore whilst the panels will clearly appear as an alien feature in the more distant landscape, they will not impact on any important views that include the church building and its setting. Any adverse impact on views of the landscape looking away from the church building does not, in the Conservation Officer’s view, result in any adverse impact on a part of the landscape that makes a positive contribution to the heritage asset or better reveals its significance and therefore this aspect of scheme is not contrary to paragraph 137 of the NPPF.

4.74 The solar panels will, however, be part visible in views looking towards and beyond the east end of the church from the rear churchyard area. This view of the solar panels is concentrated between a large evergreen tree and the church building. Trees at the front boundary of the churchyard with the road and also on the opposite side of the road also provide some degree of screening but less so in the winter months.
4.75 As the solar panels will be visible in distant views from the rear churchyard area this will have some adverse impact on the setting of the church to the rear, although this is not a substantial level of harm. This impact is not in accordance to policy guidance in paragraph 137 of the NPPF. There is difficulty in providing additional planting along the boundary of the proposed site to reduce the level of harm because of the slope of the land and the required height of the planting to provide proper screening.

4.76 Whilst the level of harm to longer views of the church from the north side and from the rear churchyard area is not substantial, under the requirements of Section 66 of the Act this still does provide justification for the proposal not being acceptable unless it can be shown that there are other benefits of the proposed scheme that help to outweigh the level of adverse impact caused. Policy guidance in the NPPF states, ‘Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be outweighed against the public benefits of the proposal.’

4.77 In this case the proposal provides a renewable energy resource which would be in place for a period of 30 years only. Considering this against the less substantial level of harm to views of St Mary’s Church from the rear churchyard area and from longer views of the site from the north side, I consider that the level of harm is sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of the scheme as a temporary installation for a period of 30 years and therefore, on balance, consider the proposal acceptable.

Archaeology

4.78 The site has potential to be of archaeological importance as identified in the originally submitted desk top study which led to the known cropmarks never forming part of the development. A geophysical survey of the site has now been submitted and also although the Historic Environment Services have verbally confirmed that they will not be raising an objection to the application, they will be providing further comments on any further archaeological investigation which will need to be conditioned. This will be updated to Members at Development Management Committee. The development therefore accords with local plan policy ENV9.

Surface Water drainage

4.79 Concern has been raised regarding potential flooding issues resulting from the solar panels. The site is within flood zone 1 (low risk) but a flood risk assessment of the site has been submitted. The Environment Agency has provided comments regarding solar farms stating that the Flood Risk Assessment should demonstrate that the surface water run-off generated up and including the 1:100 year critical storm will not exceed the run-off from an undeveloped site in a corresponding rainfall event. Also this response notes solar panels should not significantly affect run off volumes, but could cause some erosion and formation of some channels, and in light of this localised infiltration trenches should be considered. The panels are perpendicular to the contours so there is potential for concentrated surface water pathways to form which could lead to localised flood and erosion risk. Swales have been proposed along the contours of the site to intercept any over land flows and attenuate them. The applicant has agreed this approach with the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board. The Flood Defence Officer supports this approach as along as the management of the swales is by an agreed management scheme to ensure they are effective in the long term which can be secured by condition. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy 3 in the JCS and paragraph 103 in the NPPF.
Ecology

4.81 A satisfactory ecology report has been submitted with the application. There is a County Wildlife Site. Pecks Plantations which would not be affected by the proposed development. The ecological value of the application site is largely in the existing hedgerows and trees around the site which would not be affected by the development. Subject to appropriate mitigation through condition the proposal would not affect any protected species such as bats and nesting birds. The gapping up and planting of new hedgerows and wild flowers meadows between the panels will help to enhance the biodiversity of the site.

4.82 In conclusion the development would result in an enhancement to the biodiversity of the site in accordance with local plan policy ENV15.

Highways

4.83 The proposed access for the construction, decommissioning and operation of the solar farm is the existing farm entrance onto Bungay Road. The Highway Officer raises no objection to this, but has requested a number of conditions including a traffic management which will include details of a routeing agreement. The proposal is, therefore, in accordance with local plan policy IMP8.

Employment

4.84 The construction of the site will result in employment opportunities including some for local people, but given the contracts will be for relatively short term periods, little positive benefit can be afforded to this when making the decision.

Financial considerations

4.85 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances, through the potential generation of money from business rates from central government. The solar farm would generate business rates for the council. This is a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above must be fully considered.

Other matters raised in letters of representation

4.86 The devaluation of property has been raised as an issue in letters of representation. The planning case law on this matter is clear that this is not a material planning consideration in itself. The impacts for example to residential amenity which may be attributed to the perceived loss in value of a property is a material consideration which has been given due consideration above.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

5.1 The solar farm would have a 15MW capacity which is estimated will provide power for approximately 4242 homes. This will make a positive contribution towards achieving green energy targets, tackling the challenges of climate change, lessening the dependency on fossil fuels and benefiting from energy security, which will adhere with the NPPF in terms of paragraph 17 core principles, paragraph 93 which indicates that the delivery of renewable low carbon energy is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and paragraph 97 that communities have a responsibly to contribute to the
provision of renewable energy. Considerable weight can be afforded to this. It is evident that the scheme has due regard to reducing the impact on the local landscape, residential amenity, highway safety, surface water drainage and biodiversity. There will be some limited harm to the setting of the grade I St Marys Church at Tharston however, on balance given the benefits of the generation of renewable energy and the temporary nature of the installation it is considered that the scheme is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and is therefore recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 015088 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No** : 2014/0981/O  
**Parish** : TROWSE WITH NEWTON

**Applicants Name** : Trustees Of The Arminghall Settlement  
**Site Address** : Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue Trowse Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas (with an area of land set aside for future primary school use). Demolition of all buildings on the site.

**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. Time limit  
2. Submitted plans  
3. Full details of roads, footways, cycleways, drainage and access to western boundary to be agreed  
4. Agree and deliver provision of continuous 1.5m wide footpath on south side of Hudson Avenue  
5. Foul and surface water drainage details to be agreed including future management arrangements  
6. Submit and agree updated design code  
7. 10% renewable energy on-site  
8. Water efficiency standard to be met  
9. Landscaping to be agreed  
10. Tree and hedgerow protection  
11. Ecological mitigation measures to be implemented  
12. Positions of fire hydrants to be agreed  
13. Gas membrane to be agreed  
14. Any topsoil brought in for garden areas must be tested and results agreed with SNC  
15. Noise control measures to be agreed  
16. Air quality testing to be undertaken and measures for safeguarding air quality to be agreed.  
17. Contamination found during ground works  

Note S106 for affordable housing, open space, land for new primary school

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes  
Policy 20: Implementation  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 3: River valleys
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes

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 Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the 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
DM3.1 Housing Quality
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
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.7 Landscape Setting of Norwich
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
TROW1 Land off White Horse Lane, rear of Charolais Close & Devon Way

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0167 Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.
Appeal lodged against non-determination. This has now been withdrawn.

3. Appeal History

3.1 13/00043/AGNDET Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.
Withdrawn see above explanation in planning history.
4. **Consultations**

4.1 **Parish Council**

Comments are awaited to current revised proposal and will be reported in due course.

Objection to the previous scheme on the following grounds:

Insufficient justification for loss of the YMCA Sports Hall, questionnaire from agent is flawed, Hudson Avenue should not provide access to the whole of the development as well as through the Norfolk Homes site, with no agreement between developers about access, there are concerns regarding traffic levels and the implications for Martineau Lane roundabout. The S106 from the Hopkin Homes scheme has not been fully acknowledged. Alternative provision of facilities are required if the existing facility was lost.

4.2 **District Member**

Comments on most recent scheme (including retention of the existing sports hall):

Object.
TROW 1 is contrary to policies ENV 3 and ENV 6, and their disapplication should await the Examination in Public of the Local Plan.
TROW 1 requires a masterplan for the whole site, that submitted is inadequate. This must include the area of open land which is protected by the Hopkins Homes S 106 and out of the applicants' control. It is doubted that both a new MUGA and the current size of the open space are both needed. The application site and the adjoining Norfolk Homes site will also contain the open space in which the school is set, and I would have thought that it would have been in the interests of the applicants to get together with Hopkins Homes in particular (as well as with Norfolk Homes) to come up with a thought-through masterplan. The MUGA on the indicative plan backing onto Barn Meadow properties could without information on hours of operation and whether floodlighting will be employed, could be unacceptable.
The application remains based on road access via Hudson Avenue as well as through the Norfolk Homes site. All the arguments against the Hudson Avenue road access, as previously expressed by many who have commented on the application, remain valid. This Council believed it was a significant reason for the recommendation of the refusal of the previous application. There may be a case for the separate redevelopment of the YMCA site for housing, with access off Hudson Avenue, but that would not require road access to or from the main part of the site – pedestrian access would be sufficient. I believe that the existing length of Hudson Avenue leading at present to the YMCA building is not up to the standard required for an estate road serving a larger site. Previously, the applicants were canvassing seven options. Now, in a complete volte face they are proposing to retain the sports hall - an option which a month ago was stated to be undeliverable given the condition and design of the property. There is a clear credibility issue related to this, and this only reinforces the need for a masterplan.
The possibility of an enlarged hall at the new primary school via a developer contribution, which could also be used by the local community should be explored further. This was clearly identified as a desirable option only a few weeks ago. (The school governors are understood to be concerned about this idea because of the financial liability of maintaining an building larger than required for the school’s own needs. This could possibly be addressed via commuted sums or possibly by underwriting by South Norfolk Council – it should not be ruled out. It would be odd to have two halls suitable for sports use (one new, one refurbished) within a few metres of each other.

If SNC were intending to recommend refusal, the latest proposals from the applicants do nothing to justify acceptance instead. If SNC were intending to recommend acceptance, the latest proposals give rise to issues which would make acceptance at the best premature.

| 4.3 | Flood Defence Officer | No objection subject to conditions. |
| 4.4 | Environmental Services (Protection) | No objection subject to conditions relating to details of gas membranes, testing of topsoil used in gardens, noise control measures, air quality, surface water and a precautionary condition in relation to contamination. |
| 4.5 | Natural England | No objection |
| 4.6 | Norfolk Fire Service | No objection subject to a condition relating to a scheme of fire hydrants being agreed. |
| 4.7 | Highways Agency | No objection |
| 4.8 | Historic Environment Service | No objection subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work. |
| 4.9 | Anglian Water Services Ltd | No comments received |
| 4.10 | Design Officer | No objection subject to a condition regarding the need to agree an updated Design Code prior to any reserved matters application. |
| 4.11 | Ecologist | No objection subject to conditions relating to the incorporation of areas of native wildflowers and nectar-rich flowers within a detailed landscaping plan and 20 bird boxes and 10 bat boxes, built-in bricks or external boxes within the scheme. These being based upon the recommendations of the submitted ecology report. |
| 4.12 | Environment Agency | No objection subject to a condition relating to flood risk. |
| 4.13 | NCC Highways | No objection subject to conditions relating to the agreement of details relating to roads, footways (including a 1.5m wide footpath to the south side of Hudson Avenue), cycleways, foul and surface water drainage, access arrangements to the western site boundary. The Highway Authority has also confirmed their wishes to see the majority of the site served from White Horse Lane to the west. |
4.14 Housing Strategy Manager  
No objection subject to a S106 legal agreement securing the delivery of 33% affordable housing.

4.15 Landscape Officer  
No objection subject to conditions.

4.16 NCC- Planning Obligations  
No objection subject to transfer of land for new primary school to be secured by a S106 legal agreement.

4.17 Play and Amenities Manager  
No objection subject to agreement of future management through a S106 legal agreement.

4.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
No comments received

4.19 Conservation Officer  
No objection

4.20 Representations  
11 objections have been received in respect of the most recent revised scheme (including the retention of the YMCA Sports Hall). A summary of these is as follows:

- Unhappy at the lack of time allowed for a proper consultation on these amended proposals. The short timescale is compounded by SNC’s inability to send out update information in a timely manner. Written correspondence is always received between 7-10 days after the date on the letters.

- The changes to the application are of such scale that the proposals should be dealt with by a fresh planning application

- Highways impact is still unacceptable because it relies on access from Hudson Avenue which is substandard because of restricted visibility, limited width of carriageway and lack of pedestrian walkway, dangerous for children, traffic congestion concerns. Concerned at the Council treating access as a reserved matter by way of condition on an outline permission.

- Hudson Avenue is simply not fit for this purpose; I do not understand why an access cannot be taken through White Horse Lane given that both La Ronde and Norfolk Homes have been at great pains to tell us in the public meetings held that they have been talking about how the two developments will be working together?

- The planning committee should visit the site to see first hand the shortcomings of The Street/Hudson Avenue as a principal access to the proposed development.

- The amended Application does not change the fact that development within TROW 1 is contrary to policies ENV 3 and ENV 6, and any development in these zones should await the Examination in

- The fact that outline permission has been granted for the adjacent Norfolk Homes site within TROW 1 makes it even more impossible to countenance further development in a heritage village that had already had a site for 700 dwellings approved.

- It would be wholly unacceptable to rely on reserved matters to resolve these significant issues. The recommendation must be for refusal.
- Did not receive direct notification of the amended/additional information.
- The present application appears to be based on trying to avoid having to negotiate access via the Norfolk Homes land.
- The present scheme also falls foul of the Council’s expressed requirement for the Norfolk Homes/Arminghall land to be subject to, and developed in accordance with, an approved master plan.
- Controversial Planning applications that are passed under the present system will have a lasting legacy on our heritage, and the harm done will be irreversible. Strong levels of community opposition and objections based on sound arguments should be listened to and not ignored.
- Pleased to see retention of YMCA Sports Hall.

Original proposal.

34 objections received from 28 households. A summary of the concerns raised is as follows:

- loss of sports hall and MUGA is unacceptable without suitable equivalent alternative provision being provided, which must be agreed at this time. Both of these facilities are well used by the local community.
- The questionnaire presented to the local community was flawed.
- Highway related concerns in respect of the ability of the local highway network to cope with the development, Hudson Avenue is unsuitable to serve this development, further dwellings accessed off White Horse Lane is unacceptable, unacceptable increase in traffic locally.
- The scheme does not conform with national and local planning policy.
- The scheme would compromise the Conservation Area and Heritage Assets.
- Cumulative effects of development locally, including the Norfolk Homes site and the Deal site are unacceptable.
- The YMCA is not covered within TROW1.
- The YMCA should not be demolished.
- The existing open space is not under the applicants control (Hopkin Homes), this should not be set aside lightly.
- Access should not be via White Horse Lane.
- The site is in the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.
- Floodlit MUGA would be inappropriate.
- The new MUGA would be better located on the new school site.
- The scheme does not take account of concerns raised in officers letter in respect of access via Hudson Avenue, open space, separation distances and parking issues.
- SNC should stick by their previous decisions on the site.
- Noise and pollution for adjacent bypass would affect future occupants.
- The scheme would cause significant issues for the primary school.
- Drainage and flood related concerns for existing residents.
- Arminghall Trust and Norfolk Homes need to communicate with one another.
- Premature given TROW1 is not adopted.
- Concern about access to new primary school.
- There must be a footpath on White Horse Lane.
- Who will maintain the open space.
- There are red kites and bats present locally.
- Architecture proposed is substandard when seen against the adjacent Hopkin Homes development and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.
- Detailed house designs should be provided to ensure harmony with model village and Conservation Area.
- Overlooking of Barn Meadow.
- YMCA is protected by S106 legal agreement.
- The need for a type 3 Estate Road from Hudson Avenue would necessitate the removal of tree planting secured under previous approval.
- Insufficient facilities locally (doctors, post office etc) to cope with further development.

4 Assessment

4.1 Site description and proposal

The application seeks outline planning permission for a residential development with associated works. The application seeks to deal with “access”, with all other matters reserved for consideration, however, an indicative scheme has been provided.

4.2 The scheme proposes up to 75 dwellings, of which 33% would be affordable units, and the scheme proposes two vehicular accesses into the site. One access would be via Hudson Avenue which would necessitate the removal of the multi-use games area (MUGA) and creation of a new MUGA in an alternative location. The existing sports hall would be retained on-site. The other access would be via the adjacent site to the west which benefit from a consented scheme for 99 dwellings which has a specific condition requiring the provision of an access link which abuts this site. The site also proposes areas of open space and 0.4ha of land to facilitate in part a new primary school. This 0.4ha is in the western part of the site so as to adjoin 1ha of land secured under planning approval for a new primary school on the adjacent site, thus creating a single site of 1.4ha.

4.3 The application has been accompanied by a number of supporting documentation, including a Design Code.

4.4 The site lies on the southern perimeter of Trowse and consists of 4.9ha of land, with the majority presently being agricultural land. The northern most strip of land is presently a Sports Hall, MUGA and associated car park.

4.5 To the north of the application site are existing residential properties, to the east are existing allotments, to the south is the A47 dual carriageway and A146 (Loddon Road) and associated earth bunding, and to the west is a consented residential site (outline permission for 99 dwellings and new primary school) and further allotments. The site generally falls in level from the north-west to the south-east.
4.6 It should be noted that this site was the subject of an appeal against non-determination, however, this has recently been withdrawn at the appellants request. Following this appeal being lodged, officers presented a report to the Planning Committee on the 5th February 2014 which set out 7 reasons why the scheme was considered unacceptable at that time.

4.7 These issues will be duly considered in the following assessment.

Assessment

4.8 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in determining planning decisions. With regard to the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 215 states that where a plan is adopted pre 2004, such as is the case here, decision makers should give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF. By way of clarification the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS) was adopted in March 2011 and amendments in 2014, and as such paragraph 215 of Annex A of the NPPF as above is not applicable to the JCS.

4.9 Paragraph 216 goes onto address the weight attributable to emerging Plans, in this case we have the Development Management Policies Document (DMPD), depending on the stage of preparation of said documents, extent of unresolved objections to policies within the said documents and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.

4.10 Firstly, the site lies outside of the development limit for Trowse and as such is contrary to Policy ENV8 of the SNLP.

4.11 This policy excludes new residential development within the open countryside unless specific criterion are met. In this case none are met. On this basis the proposed dwellings would not accord with this policy.

4.12 In acknowledging that the scheme fails to comply with the requirements of Policy ENV8, it is necessary to consider the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. This makes it clear that where a Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, its policies related to housing should not be considered up-to-date. In the Norwich Policy Area, the Council is working towards a five year land supply and whilst very close to this, at present cannot demonstrate this. Therefore, policy ENV8 would be out of date and paragraph 49 should be engaged.

4.13 Paragraph 49 also stresses that applications for residential development should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental, and defines these as the economic, social and environmental roles. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development.

4.14 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF stresses that proposals must be approved where they accord with the development plan or where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date grant permission unless one of the following occurs: Adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole, or, specific policies of the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

4.15 With this in mind, the following issues are considered to be of particular relevance in planning terms, and include issues raised through the consultation process and those highlighted in the committee report linked to the previous application on the site, which was
the subject of an appeal against non-determination, this has now been withdrawn by the appellant:

- Policy TROW1 in emerging Site Specific Allocations
- Traffic and highway safety implications
- Sport and recreation provision
- Affordable housing
- Character and appearance of the locality, including the Trowse Conservation Area
- Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone
- Drainage and flood risk
- Neighbour amenities
- Other issues

Policy TROW1 in emerging Site Specific Allocations. For clarification purposes, it is evident that TROW1 has been challenged and is due to be heard by the Planning Inspectorate in due course. On this basis, TROW1 is afforded little weight in the determination of this application.

Traffic and Highway Safety impacts

4.16 Significant concern has been expressed at the vehicle movements associated with this scheme and the problems this would cause to the local highway network, including congestion within the locality, and the committee report (reason 5) associated with the recent appeal on the this site expressed concern at the failure to provide a primary access to the development via Whitehorse Lane with a pedestrian link to Hudson Avenue. It is evident that the Highway Authority (NCC) has confirmed that they have no objection subject to conditions. This position acknowledges that the application seeks to deal with only “access” at this time. The consideration of “layout”, amongst other things at reserved matters stage, will allow for the assessment of vehicular movements in greater detail and the Highway Authority would seek at this time to ensure that the “primary” access would be via the adjacent site (Norfolk Homes) which in turn links into White Horse Lane with a “secondary” access via Hudson Avenue. Furthermore, it would seek for there not to be a through road between this site and the adjacent Norfolk Homes site thus avoiding connection between White Horse Lane and Hudson Avenue for vehicles. It should be noted that this scenario would not undermine the delivery of a pedestrian and cycle route between White Horse Lane and Hudson Avenue as highlighted in emerging policy TROW1 from the emerging Site Specifics Document. The proposed development is therefore considered to accord with Local Plan Policy IMP8 in relation to the safe and free flow of traffic.

Sport and Recreation provision

4.17 A number of consultations have focused on the proposed loss of the existing facility (Sports hall and MUGA), which was secured under a S106 legal agreement linked to an earlier approval for housing on the adjacent site (Hopkin Homes). Reason 2 of the previous committee report for this site also made reference to the failure to provide alternative provision or adequate justification for not providing any alternative facilities. In response to concerns raised at the proposed loss of existing facility, the applicant has revised their position so as to propose the retention of the existing sports hall and the replacement of the MUGA into an alternative position.

4.18 Paragraph 74 on the NPPF makes it clear that sport and recreational buildings or land should not be built on unless there is either a surplus of provision, the loss is replaced with equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision where the needs clearly outweigh the loss. Policy LEI8 of the SNLP also prevents the loss of recreational land
unless stated criteria are met, these are based on preventing any significant harm to the function of the facility.

4.19 It is considered that the proposal to keep the sports hall and replace the MUGA in a revised position (it should be noted that this is highlighted on the masterplan drawing, however, given that this application does not seek to agree layout, this shall only be used for indicative purposes) does comply with the relevant policy requirements.

4.20 It is considered that reason 2 from the previous committee report relating to replacement sport and recreation facilities has been addressed in this submission.

Affordable housing

4.21 Policy 4 of the JCS requires affordable housing to be delivered, on-site of this size a development should provide 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meet local need. The Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal in respect of what is proposed in this application. In this respect, It is evident that reason no. 3 from the previous committee report has been addressed in the current application.

Character and appearance of the locality, including the Trowse Conservation Area

4.22 Reason 1 from the previous committee report highlighted that insufficient information has been submitted in support of the application to demonstrate that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and that the design and layout would comply with the design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

4.23 In response to this the current application is accompanied by a Design Code and Design and Access Statement which gives greater clarity as to the architectural and design direction of the scheme. This is heavily influenced by the existing residential development (Hopkin Homes). It is considered that such an approach is appropriate to the area and adequately respects the character and appearance of the locality, including the Conservation Area. A planning condition would be required to agree a further design code prior to the submission of any reserved matters application. The rationale for this being the likely need to take account of a detailed scheme for the adjacent Norfolk Homes site in such a document. This approach is endorsed by the Council’s Design Officer.

4.24 With regard to the Conservation Area, it is apparent that the previously proposal for the site proposed the demolition of the existing sports hall which lies within the Conservation Area, whereas the majority of the site lies outside of the Conservation Area. Given that this application proposes the retention of the Sports Hall, there would be little change to the Conservation Area and in this respect it is considered that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved and the proposed development accords with Local Plan policy IMP18 and Policy 2 of the JCS , and has due regard for the provisions of S72 of the Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas Act 1990.

Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone

4.25 A number of objections have been received in respect of the site being located within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. Policy ENV6 of the SNLP seeks to prevent “inappropriate development” (the definition of this means that residential development is such) and any other development within this zone where it would undermine the landscape quality and openness of the zone or lead to the bypass becoming the outer development boundary of the city. Reason 6 from the previous committee report highlighted the Council’s concerns in respect of this. Whilst this adopted policy continues to carry weight in the decision-making process, and the scheme conflicts with this policy, a Local Planning Authority is required to accord with the Governments presumption in favour
of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. With this in mind, it is considered that the conflict with this policy would not represent significant or demonstrable harm when considered against the benefits of the scheme, primarily the provision of new housing. It should be noted that conditions are recommended or the protection of trees and hedgerows and landscaping plans to be agreed.

Drainage and flood risk

4.26 Significant objection has been raised in relation to the drainage and flood risk implications of the scheme. Consultations have been undertaken with the relevant technical specialists, namely the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the Council’s Flood Officer and they have had access to all application documentation including the Flood Risk Assessment for the scheme. All have concluded that they have no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions in relation to foul and surface water details being agreed. The development is therefore considered to accord with Policy 1 of the JCS and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Neighbour amenities

4.27 The scheme is in outline form, with amongst other matters, “layout” and “appearance” reserved for consideration. In this respect it is not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the scheme in respect of the relationship with neighbouring dwellings in terms of impacts upon privacy, light and outlook. However, it is apparent from the submitted indicative layout plan that a scheme can be achieved on-site which retains adequate degrees of separation to neighbouring properties so as to safeguard amenity levels. The proposed development is therefore considered to accord with Policy IMP9 of the Local Plan.

4.28 Given the close proximity of the roads to the site, the applicant has submitted a noise assessment in support of their application. This highlights that the majority of the site falls within an area where noise levels will require the imposition of conditions to safeguard amenity. In particular, in order to safeguard acceptable internal noise levels, having regard to (World health Organisation) WHO and BS8233, acoustically attenuated ventilators will be required to provide suitable ventilation without the need to open windows. It is considered that this scenario is not a preferred scenario, however, the technical solution of the issue of noise results in there not being a level of significant harm in terms of the amenities of any future occupants on the site.

4.29 With regard to the outdoor spaces associated with the dwellings, it is evident that the noise levels are likely to exceed the level recommended by the WHO by upto 5dBA. It is evident that fencing, buildings etc associated with the development is unlikely to have any significant positive impact on this issue. It is considered that 5dBA above recommended guidelines for private outdoor spaces is not sufficiently high to warrant a refusal on noise grounds.

4.30 Concern has been expressed at the position of the new MUGA, in an alternative location to the existing facility, and, the possible negative impacts of floodlighting being installed on the MUGA. Firstly, as the scheme does not propose to agree “layout”, the final position of the MUGA can be agreed at reserved matters stage. On this basis the Local Planning Authority, can ensure at that stage that the agreed location does have adequate regard for neighbour amenity, equally, it can ensure that floodlighting is not agreed if it is considered to have an unacceptable negative impact upon the amenities of local residents. The indicative layout plan submitted in support of the application, suggests a location further north than the existing MUGA, however, it is evident that this could be moved further south into a similar position to the existing MUGA without any significant difficulty.
Education issues

4.31 Reason 4 from previous report highlights the need for the applicant to provide a suitably sized, located and shaped parcel of land to facilitate in part the creation of a new primary school within Trowse. It has been identified by NCC that a school site of 1.4ha is required for a new school in Trowse initially to be built as a 1FE (210 place) school which could be expanded to at least 1.5FE (315 place) in the future. A site of 1ha has already been secured through a S106 agreement with Norfolk Homes, so a further 0.4ha would be required from this application to facilitate this project. The applicant has provided an area of 0.4ha immediately adjacent to that secured under the Norfolk Homes approval in such a way as to satisfy the requirements of NCC. Consequently, they have no objection subject to a S106 legal agreement being entered into by the applicant to secure this. The applicant has no objection to this request.

Other issues

4.32 The 7th suggested reason for refusal in the previous committee report expressed concern at the lack of a cohesive approach across this site and the adjoining site (Norfolk Homes) with particular reference to the linking of highways and provision of 1.4ha of land for a school site and acknowledging that the two sites referred to largely reflected the proposed allocation TROW1. It is evident that since this committee report was considered in February 2014, the adjacent site (Norfolk Homes) has received outline planning permission. This having been granted on the 29th March 2014, and conditional of this, is the need to provide a type 2 estate road to join the eastern boundary of the site (condition 20 of 2013/0463). This approval highlights a commitment to the site being developed for residential development but also puts in place a mechanism to ensure a cohesive development in relation to highway matters. As set out above, the Highway Authority has no objection to the scheme subject to the reserved matters application ensuring the layout satisfactorily links into the adjacent Norfolk Homes site, thus ensuring a cohesive development in highway terms.

4.33 With regard to the primary school related concerns set out in reason 7, it is clear that the outline approval for the Norfolk Homes site has secured 1ha of land for the new primary school, and this was to the full satisfaction of NCC, and as stated above, the 0.4ha of land on this site required by NCC has been provide to their satisfaction. Therefore the scheme does represent a cohesive solution to education related matters. In the broadest sense, it is considered that the outline approval on the adjacent site and the condition attached to it, coupled with the recommended condition here, would enable reserved matters schemes to be secured which do create a cohesive development across the two parcels of land. Open space is to be provided at a level which complies with Council guidance. The S106 legal agreement will ensure that this will be appropriately maintained.

4.34 The agent has confirmed their commitment to providing sources of “decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy to cover at least 10% of the schemes expected energy requirements and meeting the water efficiency requirements as required by Policy 3 of the JCS.

4.35 The Council’s Ecologist has assessed the submitted ecology report and agrees with the suggested measures set out in the document. These measures will be delivered via suitably worded planning conditions.

4.36 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but CIL will only be collected at the reserved matter stage.
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The scheme would assist in delivering housing which represents a significant benefit in planning terms. The scheme would also, in part, assist with the delivery of a new primary school and also provides policy compliant levels of affordable housing and open space provision. The scheme does conflict with Policy ENV6 of the SNLP in respect of resulting in the loss of part of the Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone, however, this is not considered to represent significant and demonstrable harm in planning terms when seen in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

5.2 On balance, the scheme is considered to represent a sustainable development where no significant harm would demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 legal agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

5. **Appl. No**: 2014/0935/H  
**Parish**: SHELFANGER

Applicants Name: Mr Andrew Corbyn  
Site Address: The Barn High London Farm High London Lane Shelfanger Norfolk IP22 2EG

Proposal: Erection of two storey extension to existing dwelling

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
  1 Full Planning permission time limit  
  2 In accord with submitted amended drawings

The application is brought before Committee at the request of the District Member.

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  
HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
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 Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM3.7 House extensions and replacement dwellings within the Countryside  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Recommend approval but will add to traffic on an already bad road surface.

3.2 District Member  
Can be delegated only if officers are minded to refuse. Neither design (originally submitted or amendment) reflects the traditional form taken by barns in East Anglia.

3.3 Representations  
1 letter of support.  

No representations received following consultation on amendments.
4 Assessment

4.1 The application site comprises a converted barn in an isolated location outside of any development boundaries. It is sited on a narrow rural lane and is remote from the main roads. To the west of the barn is High London Farmhouse which is in separate occupation. This application seeks permission for a two storey extension to the converted barn. The original scheme proposed a two storey extension on the north eastern gable elevation with a footprint of 9 metres x 5.1 metres. Following officers’ concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the form, massing and character of the barn, the applicant has now submitted amended plans for a two storey extension on the south eastern elevation. The proposed extension has the same footprint of 9 metres x 5.1 metres and is designed to match the ridge and eaves height of the existing barn.

4.2 The application is assessed against policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and saved policies HOU 14 and IMP 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Consideration is also given to policy DM 3.7 and DM 3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan submission document 2014. These policies seek to ensure that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its landscape setting and does not cause material harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan and emerging policies referred to above because these remain consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The proposed extension would now be sited centrally in the rear elevation and is designed as a continuation of the existing projecting gable on the front elevation. As a result, the form and massing of the existing barn would remain intact and it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on its character and appearance. It is proposed to use external materials to match the finish of the existing barn and, while this would be a substantial addition, its appearance would reflect the character of the existing barn and it would not have any adverse impact on the wider countryside setting.

4.4 The nearest residential properties are High London Farm to the west and Swiss Cottage to the south east. The proposed extension would be well separated from both properties and as a result, it would not have any adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenities. Parking and circulation areas within the application site would be unaffected by this proposal.

4.5 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the floor area does not exceed 100 square metres.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the proposed development accords with the principles of the adopted and emerging policies as set out above and is therefore recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985 bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
**Parish** : TIVETSHALL ST MARY  

**Applicants Name** : Mr John Peacock  
**Site Address** : Land South East Of Shangri-la The Street Tivetshall St Mary Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Outline application for the erection of 2 No. 3 or 4 bedroom dwellings  
**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 16 : Other Villages

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

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 Spring 2015. 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  
DM 1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM 3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

Site Specific Allocations and Policies

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document – South Norfolk Place Making Guide
2. **Planning History**

2.1 No planning history.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council 
Object - Proposed site is outside of development boundary, application is premature, impact on character of area, concern at density, impact on dwelling to the north, loss of hedgerow, highway impact from parking on The Street.

3.2 District Member 
Request for application to be determined at committee because the site is not within any development boundary, and the impact on nearby residents, especially Shangri-La.

3.3 NCC Highways 
No objections subject to conditions.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) 
No objections subject to conditions.

3.5 Flood Defence Officer 
No objections.

3.6 Representations 
11 letters of objection received from neighbouring occupiers. Reasons for objection as follows:

- Site is outside of current development boundary
- Concern that site is too small to accommodate 2 dwellings
- Loss of hedgerow
- Impact on bungalow to the north, 'Shangri-La' due to overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of view, overbearing form of development
- Loss of agricultural land/greenfield site
- Lack of a Flood Risk Assessment
- Development may lead to increased parking on The Street
- Application is premature.
- Part of site is outside of proposed new development boundary

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is an outline planning application for the erection of 2 no. 2 storey dwellings on land at The Street, Tivetshall St. Mary. The application site forms part of an agricultural field, to the south of an existing dwelling named 'Shangri-La' and to the north of a recent Saffron Housing development of four houses. All matters are reserved, and therefore the application seeks to establish only the principle of development at this stage.

4.2 The main considerations are the principle of development, impact on neighbouring occupiers, impact on the character of the area, highway considerations, and impact on trees and ecology.

**Principle of Development**

4.3 Guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 49 states that "Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development." The site lies outside of a development boundary as designated by the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) (SNLP). However the majority of the site is proposed to be included within the new development boundary for Tivetshall St. Mary, as designated within the submission version of Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document. The development boundary is being amended to accommodate limited 'infill' development to assist in meeting housing needs.
Because no objections were received to the change to this part of the development boundary during the formal pre-submission stage consultation, weight can be attached to the emerging designation of the land. As a result, and in light of the aforementioned guidance within the NPPF, it is considered that the principle of new residential development on the site is acceptable, and in accordance with policy DM 1.3 of the submission version of the Development Management Policies Document, which when adopted, will form part of the Local Plan for South Norfolk. It is also compliant with policies 4 and 16 of the JCS in terms of delivering new housing within an identified 'Other Village'.

Although some concern has been raised regarding a strip of land next to the affordable housing that remains outside of the proposed development boundary in the emerging local plan, it is considered that no material harm would be caused by the development of this narrow strip.

Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

A number of objections have been received from neighbouring occupiers, including from the occupant of the dwelling immediately to the north, 'Shangri-La'. Concerns are raised at the potential for the proposal to cause overshadowing, loss of privacy and overlooking, as well as concerns at the potential for the development to be overbearing. Concerns are also raised at the impact on the view; however this is not a material planning consideration.

The application is in outline so detailed elevation drawings have not been submitted at this stage. However it is considered that the site is large enough to accommodate two detached dwellings without causing materially harmful amenity impacts on the existing dwellings, including the bungalow to the north. It would be possible to design the nearest dwelling to the bungalow in such a way that would ensure there would be no directly facing windows, and therefore no loss of privacy. In addition the applicant has stated they are willing to accept a condition requiring the dwelling closest to 'Shangri-La' to be no higher than 1.5 storeys. It is considered that the proposal complies with policy IMP 9 of the SNLP with regard to impact on residential amenity.

Impact on the Character of the Area

Concern has been raised at the development of a greenfield site. However the proposal would continue the existing pattern of development along The Street, which contains a mixture of single-storey and two storey dwellings of different designs. The detailed design is a reserved matter but it is considered that it would be possible to ensure the design and appearance compliments the existing street scene. Concern has also been raised at the density of the development proposed, however the plot sizes would be similar to many of the existing dwellings in the street. Taking these matters into account, there is no conflict with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy in terms of design and impact on the character of the area.

Highway impact

The indicative layout plan shows two parking spaces for each of the proposed dwellings, with the access from the existing affordable houses to the South. The County Highway Authority is satisfied with the access arrangements and parking provision and raises no objection. Concern has been raised that the proposal would lead to an increase in on-street parking, however this is considered unlikely given the provision of two spaces for each dwelling. The proposal complies with policy IMP 8 of the SNLP.

4.10 The existing use of the site is agricultural land and there is an existing hedgerow which is understood to be an important hedgerow. There are no trees on site. The indicative proposal illustrated would retain the hedge. Conditions are recommended ensuring the retention of the hedge and for an Arboricultural Survey to be carried out and necessary hedgerow protection measures to be implemented during construction. A further condition is recommended requiring the submission of an ecological survey and the implementation of any necessary mitigation measures.

Flood risk

4.11 The site is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore is not an area of high flood risk. Concern has been raised regarding surface water drainage problems in The Street. It is understood that the problem may be due to the lack of maintenance of the downstream watercourse causing water to build up in the ditch then flow out over low lying land. The Council’s Flood Defence Officer has addressed the issue by asking the Water Management Team at Norfolk County Council to investigate and if necessary require those responsible to carry out maintenance. The proposed development would not in itself cause a flooding problem and no objections are raised by the Flood Defence Officer.

4.12 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but CIL will only be collected at the reserved matters stage.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Whilst the proposed development site is outside of a development boundary within the current South Norfolk Local Plan, the majority of the site is due to be incorporated within the new development boundary for Tivetshall St. Mary within the emerging Site Allocations and Policies Document, and this is considered to be a material consideration in the determination of the application. The outline proposal is acceptable in all other respects, and would contribute two new dwellings which would assist in meeting local housing needs, in accordance with local and national planning policy. It is considered no material planning harm would be caused by the proposal, and the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS  

Applicants Name : Ms S Butters  
Site Address : Land South Of Petersfield Farm Valley Farm Lane Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, two storey, four bedroom self-build dwelling.  

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring reserved matters  
3. In accord with submitted drawings  
4. Surface Water drainage detail  
5. Foul drainage to main sewer  
6. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
7. Retention trees and hedges  
8. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
9. Tree protection  
10. External materials to be agreed  
11. Water Efficiency standard to be met  
12. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
13. New Access Construction over verge  
14. Visibility splay, approved plan  
15. Provision of parking, not on plan  
16. Access Gates – Configuration  

(subject to deletion of reference to ‘two storey’ from the description)

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 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
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 Spring 2015. 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
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

2. Planning History

2.1 No history

3. Appeal History

3.1 No history

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council

Objects:
- Outside existing and proposed development limits for the village.
- Wrong to consider a site well away from the village facilities and local bus routes with no existing drainage and poor access to local road network.
- Valley Farm Lane does not lend itself to yet another access
- Site does not meet the sustainability test of the NPPF.
- Approval of the site would set a precedent for numerous similar sites outside established settlements.
- A single dwelling will make no discernibly difference to the lack of a 5 year land supply.

4.2 District Member

To be determined by Committee, sufficiently contrary to policy as to require determination by Committee

4.3 NCC Highways

This site is clearly outside of any development boundary and the sustainability of the location in transport terms is questionable. However based on the Inspectors decisions in allowing the recent Appeals for residential properties along Chandler Road, it is considered that we are not in a position to oppose this proposal on sustainability grounds.

Conditionally support: subject to visibility splays, gates being set back, parking space being made available and turning areas.

4.4 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objections subject to conditions - contamination of land during construction to be reported.

4.5 Flood Defence Officer

No objections subject to conditions.
Surface water drainage.
Foul sewage to main sewer.

4.6 Ecologist

No comments received

4.7 Representations

2 Letter of objection
- Disappointing an application with such little detail has been submitted as it is therefore difficult to judge the full visual impact on the area. Details should be included to show the impact on the surrounding countryside.
• In a countryside location contrary to policy.
• Excessive in size and height.
• Aware of recent appeal to allow two dwellings close to the site, this scheme will increase the existing number of dwellings to around 20-25% on the existing number of dwellings.
• This scheme is only for one dwelling therefore makes little impact on the overall shortfall of the 5 year land supply.
• Plots allowed on appeal were more closely integrated to the dwellings near them and were more infill than this proposal.
• Detrimental impact on surrounding area with no justification.
• Additional traffic on a narrow road.
• Although the property is for Valley Farm Lane, the traffic will be on Chandler Road.

5. Assessment

5.1 The scheme seeks outline permission for a detached two storey dwelling with a new access off Valley Farm Lane.

5.2 The site lies outside of a development boundary for Stoke Holy Cross, however the site is within the Norwich Policy Area, where there is currently a shortfall in the supply of housing land. The Council is working towards having a five year supply and whilst the Council is very close to demonstrating a five year supply at present, there is not one in the Norwich Policy Area. In such circumstances Government advice within the NPPF states that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is therefore necessary to assess whether the harm caused by the proposal would outweigh the benefits of delivering a new dwelling in this instance.

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

Character of area

5.4 The character of the area comprises detached dwellings of various scales some of which are converted farm buildings, many of which are well screened behind well-established trees and hedgerows. The frontage of the application site is a mix of mature hedging and trees, much of which will be retained with the exception of the area of hedging to be removed to form the new access. The site is elevated from Valley Farm Lane. The nearest properties are situated to the north of the site Petersfield Farm, to the east Vaunoo Lodge. Vaunoo Lodge is glimpsed through the hedge along Valley Farm Lane and is set behind high gates. Other properties near the site are situated on Chandler Road to the south and south east and comprise a mix of two storey detached dwellings and hipped roof semi-detached properties, further to the west along Chandler Road are set single storey properties in large established plots. Views across the site from Chandler Lane afford a view of the site, currently grazing land, with a tree lined roadside boundary.

Location

5.5 The site is situated away from the main village centre where a limited range of services are available. Unlit public footpaths across several hundred metres of undulating fields would mean that occupants are largely dependent on the private car to reach these limited services. The point of sustainable location was addressed in an appeal decision which is attached as Appendix 1, where the Inspector states at Paragraph 7, “the site would not generate the significant movements that would cause the scheme to conflict with the aim to minimise the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable transport, as described in
NPPF paragraph 34. In accordance with the first part of NPPF paragraph 55, to a very limited extent it could help to enhance or maintain the vitality of nearby rural communities". The sustainable aspect of the site is also considered by the Highways Authority their comments are reported in section 3 above.

Landscape impact

5.6 The construction of a property in the proposed location will be easily visible given the open nature of the grazing land on which it will be situated, however, the boundary of the site which comprises a range of mature and semi-mature trees along the road side boundary of Valley Farm Lane are to be retained. While I accept the new dwelling will be visible, consideration is given to the scattering of properties around the site and to the appeal decision further along Chandler Road which was allowed in December 2013. There will be some loss of rural character from the proposed development, however, the development of the plot for one dwelling would not cause such harm that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting permission in accordance with Paragraph 49 of the NPPF given the lack of a 5 year land supply.

Scale of development

5.7 The original application proposes one, two storey dwelling. The scheme is outline with all matters reserved therefore no design of the proposal is available at this stage, a concern which has been raised by neighbours to the lack of detail available. Given the openness of the site when viewed from Chandler Road, a lower profile dwelling would be more appropriate in this rural location and would significantly reduce the visual impact on the surrounding landscape. The applicant has consequently been requested to delete specific reference to a two storey dwelling from the application description so that this can be considered further when details are submitted.

Highways

5.8 The new access to the site will require the removal of a section of hedge and the reduction in the width of the hedge to the south of the proposed access. However, subject to this the scheme meets with the requirements of the Highways Authority. The loss of the hedge will be mitigated by the proposed landscaping which forms part of the condition above.

Neighbours

5.9 The nearest neighbour to the site apart from Petersfield Farm lies to the west of the site (Birchwood) which is a single storey dwelling. The proposed dwelling will be clearly visible from this dwelling, however, due to the distance, any loss of privacy will be minimal and does not justify refusal.

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but CIL will only be collected at the reserved matters stage.

6. Conclusion

6.1 The site lies outside of a development boundary for Stoke Holy Cross where the development would normally be contrary to policy and would not be supported. However the site is within the Norwich Policy Area, where there is currently a shortfall in the supply of housing land. In such circumstances Government advice within the NPPF states that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The scheme is therefore considered against Paragraph 14 and Section 6 of the NPPF in this respect.
6.2 The development of the plot for one dwelling (as conditioned) does not result in such significant harm to the overall character of the area, the neighbouring properties, or the safe and free flow of traffic as to outweigh the presumption in favour of development set out in the NPPF. The application should consequently be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jJackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2013

by Stuart Hall BA(Hons) DipTP FRTP MCIHT
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 December 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/13/2202187
Land north of Whiteford Hall Farm, Chandler Road, Stoke Holy Cross, Norfolk NR14 8RQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Terry Humphrey against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2013/0211/O, dated 1 February 2013, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2013.
- The development proposed is a detached three bedroom bungalow with garage and garden.

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached three bedroom bungalow with garage and garden at Land north of Whiteford Hall Farm, Chandler Road, Stoke Holy Cross, Norfolk NR14 8RQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2013/0211/O, dated 1 February 2013, subject to the conditions in the Schedule attached to this decision.

Main Issues

3. The outline application reserves all matters of detail for future consideration. The main issues in this appeal are the effects that the principle of allowing a bungalow on the appeal site would have on the interests of sustainable development and the character and appearance of its surroundings, having regard to local and national policies in relation to the supply and location of housing.

Reasons

4. The open appeal site is within a small cluster of development, with dwellings on each side of a narrow rural lane, surrounded by undulating countryside. With reference to the Council’s reasons for refusal, saved Policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, adopted in 2003, seeks to prevent development in locations such as this, subject to exception criteria that it is not contended apply to this
scheme. Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (CS) permits only affordable housing to meet a specific local need, and then only in locations adjacent to villages. The scheme conflicts with both these development plan policies.

5. However, the development plan does not identify sufficient deliverable land within the Norwich Policy Area to meet the requirement, set out in paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), to maintain a 5 year supply of housing land plus a minimum buffer of 5%. Whilst recent permissions on unallocated sites have reduced the shortfall, and its current size is disputed, it is common ground that it still exists. Accordingly, referring to NPPF paragraph 49, relevant policies for the supply of housing are not up to date.

6. Saved Policy ENV 8 and CS Policy 17 apply constraint to, and so form part of, the Council’s strategic approach to housing land supply. Therefore, I find that they too are relevant, and not up to date, in terms of paragraph 49. This weighs in favour of a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. In this context, whether or not the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development should apply as a starting point is not conclusive. In either event, it follows from the final bullet point of NPPF paragraph 14 that the appeal should be allowed unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, or unless specific NPPF policies (of which none appears relevant) indicate otherwise.

7. Unlit public footpaths across several hundred metres of undulating fields would not render occupants other than largely dependent on the private car to reach limited local services. Even so, the site would not generate the significant movements that would cause the scheme to conflict with the aim to minimise the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable transport, as described in NPPF paragraph 34. In accordance with the first part of NPPF paragraph 55, to a very limited extent it could help to enhance or maintain the vitality of nearby rural communities. In terms of its location, and having regard to its scale, I conclude that the scheme would not have a significant impact on the interests of sustainability as expressed in the NPPF.

8. Given the local housing supply position, loss of countryside appears to be inevitable. Whilst in quantitative terms a single dwelling on this 0.08 hectare site would represent a disproportionate loss, more intensive development would have a greater visual impact. The site lies between an access to a group of buildings set back but clearly visible from the lane and a prominent dwelling that has been redeveloped recently. A single storey dwelling set back from the lane would be barely visible from it above dense boundary hedging. Walkers on the public footpath close to the western edge of the site will be well aware of the cluster of buildings whether or not this site is developed. It is large enough to ensure that the existing relationship of buildings to space within the cluster would not be unduly disturbed.

9. In this setting, taking account of other substantial but less visible dwellings nearby and subject to appropriate control of details, I conclude that the scheme would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of its surroundings. Account is taken of submissions, including those from local residents, that the scheme could set a precedent for development that could have a cumulative harmful impact. However, no specific and fully comparable
sites at such risk are drawn to my attention. Further, the issue of precedence will not arise once the Council can demonstrate that an adequate supply of deliverable housing sites exists, as the final bullet point of NPPF paragraph 14 will then no longer apply. Therefore, those submissions carry little weight.

10. Other appeal decisions referred to in submissions are not fully comparable with the scheme before me, and so do not fetter my decision. Whilst other housing permissions at countryside locations have made a significant impact on the supply deficit, it seems likely that they also have a commensurate impact on that countryside. Those other decisions do not bear on whether any adverse impacts of the appeal scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh its very limited benefit to the supply position when assessed against NPPF policies taken as a whole. The above considerations lead me to conclude that they do not. It follows that the appeal should succeed.

11. That being so, regard is had to conditions suggested by the Council, in addition to those relating to reserved matters, taking into account advice in Circular 11/95 The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions. Further conditions requiring details of external materials, levels, access and related arrangements are not necessary in light of the encompassing nature of condition 1). The removal of any trees or hedges could occur unrelated to the development, and the consequences could be addressed in the consideration of landscaping proposals submitted pursuant to that condition. Conditions relating to sustainable design and archaeological investigation, whilst justified by the evidence, can be expressed more simply in accordance with published advice, bearing in mind the appellant's awareness of the Council's detailed requirements in each case.

Stuart Hall
INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

3) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans notated: Whiteford Hall Farm Location Plan Site 2 scale 1/1250, & Whiteford Hall Farm Site Plan Site 2 scale 1/500.
5) The dwelling hereby approved shall achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes in relation to water usage and shall not be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that Code Level 4 has been achieved in that respect. Water conservation measures identified in order to obtain that Certificate shall be permanently retained thereafter.

6) No development shall take place within the site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation and reporting that shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

End of schedule of conditions.
8. **Appl. No**: 2014/1507/RVC  
**Parish**: LODDON

 Applicants Name : Dawson Brown  
 Site Address : 4 Mill Road Loddon Norfolk NR14 6DR  
 Proposal : Variation of Condition 2, approved plans, of permission 2011/0886/F - Redevelopment of site with 3 houses and garages and ancillary works. Revised plan changes permeable paved driveways to traditional block sets, and for the retention of the 1.8 timber fence on the west and south boundaries of the site.

**Recommendation** : Approval with conditions

1. In accordance with amendments  
2. External materials to be agreed  
3. No additional windows at first floor  
4. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
5. No alterations to lose garage  
6. Tree protection  
7. Implement boundary treatment  
8. Water Efficiency standard to be met  
9. Windows to be obscure glazed  
10. Vehicular access  
11. Vehicle and pedestrian access  
12. Visibility splays  
13. Provision of parking, service  
14. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and implemented next planting season  
15. Retention trees and hedges

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
HOU 5: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns (Part Consistent)  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
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 Spring 2015. 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
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.6 Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Settlements
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM4.2 Renewable Energy

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/2093 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/0886/F - To transfer a small piece of land on the Northern boundary to 6 Mill Road. Approve

2.2 2011/0886 Redevelopment of site with 3 houses and garages and ancillary works Approve

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve

3.2 District Member There was an appeal against the refusal of a 1.8 mts fence adjacent to the highway at Norton Road, Lodden which was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. I feel that this is a similar application and there is the appeal precedent which must be considered. There is a natural tree lined frontage to the site which gives a fair degree of privacy and I consider the introduction of this fence to be alien to the area. The frontage to the properties along Norton Road are predominately shrub and trees with the occasional low brick wall or open. I feel that this proposal may be contrary to IMP 2 & 4 of the SNLP 2003 and consequently if the Planning Service are minded to recommend approval I request that it be put before the D.M.C. for decision.

3.3 Conservation Officer No objections.

3.4 NCC Highways No objections

3.5 Representations 2 letters of objection
- Fence is out of keeping with the remainder of the rural fringe street scape.
- Existing area comprises with a mix of open aspects and garden perimeters semi-enclosed by soft landscaped screening of reasonable height - affording view and providing a sense of community, assume that the dwellings were designed and approved with this context in mind. The erection of the fence creates an anti-social barricaded frontage. Excessive height and continuous nature of the fencing would be a disincentive to reasonable maintenance of the hedgerow and undergrowth on the roadside bank. Developers should be required to revert to the original approved plan or something reasonable close to it in spirit and scale.

2 letters neither supporting or objecting - but:
- require the approved visibility splay to be maintained to a height not exceeding 600mm.
• Application states that the existing hedge will be replaced - but this should not provide the opportunity to cut down more trees.
• Who will be responsible for maintaining the new hedge - this should be resolved before consent is given.
• Remaining trees should be protected as they are an important feature but are not protected as they are outside the conservation area.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is to vary the condition imposed on the 2011/0886 permission changing the materials for the driveways from the permeable finish to traditional block work finish, and for the retention of the 1.8 metre close board fence along the south (Norton Road) and west (Mill Road). Permission for the development was granted under reference 2011/0886/F on the 25 October 2011. Work has already commenced on site.

4.2 The proposal raises one main issue with local residents which relates to the 1.8 metre close board fence which has already been erected on the south and west boundaries of the site.

Background

4.3 A previous issue arose with the retention of a 2 metre fence on the boundary of 3 Norton Road has generated. This property is to the south of the application site and falls within the Conservation Area. An application was submitted for the retention of the fence which is situated on the boundary of a prominent junction opposite existing properties. The fence was deemed to be out of character and to have an adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The application was refused at Planning Committee on the 1 June 2011. The decision was appealed, and the appeal dismissed on the 24 October 2011.

4.4 An Enforcement Notice was issues to request the removal of the fence, however, the fence was reduced in height, but remained above the permitted 1 metre, a further report was referred to the Planning Committee on the 24 April 2013 where decision of No Further Action was agreed. To date the fence remains at its reduced height which has no adverse visual impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

Visual appearance

4.5 With regard to the current scheme for the retention of the close board fence, while this is not what was originally approved, consideration has to be given to the visual appearance of the fence as now in situ. The site is outside the Conservation Area, and the fence is located behind existing hedging and trees, albeit these are sparse in some areas as shown on the plan submitted with the scheme. Notwithstanding the fact that the fence is visible, and indeed will be more so during the winter months, as constructed the fence does not result in such harm to the site and surrounding street scene, or impact on the neighbouring properties to such a degree to be contrary to policy. I accept that it does completely enclose two boundaries of the site, however, the visual appearance will be mitigated by the proposed hedging which will be planted at a later date, and once this hedge is established, the fence will be less visible even in the winter months. I also accept that works carried out not in accordance with the approved plan should not be encouraged, however in this instance, there is insufficient justification to require the reduction in height or indeed the removal of the fence, therefore subject to the planting scheme being carried out within the next planting season (November 2014 to March 2015), the revised boundary treatment is acceptable.
Change in driveway surfaces

4.6 No objections have been raised to the change in driveway surface from the approved permeable finish, to traditional block. However consideration has been given to the disposal of the surface water from the site. The surface water drainage from the driveways will be disposed of via the soakaways for each of the dwellings, therefore will not result in surface water issues for the surrounding locality. The scheme as revised is acceptable.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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 HOU4, IMP2, 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 change in driveway surface does not result in harm to the surface water disposal from the site, and the retention of the close board fence on the west and south boundary does not result in significant harm to the overall character of the area, therefore the scheme accords with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : PORINGLAND

Applicants Name : Trustees Of Poringland Village Hall
Site Address : Poringland Village Hall, 65 The Street, Poringland, Norfolk NR14 7RE
Proposal : Demolition of existing village hall. Erection of new All Saints Centre, incorporating a dedicated nursery unit, car parking, soft and hard landscaping and all associated works.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

   1. Full Planning permission time limit
   2. In accord with submitted drawings
   3. External materials to be agreed
   4. Surface Water to be carried out in accordance with submitted details
   5. Full details of external lighting to be agreed
   6. Slab level to be agreed
   7. Demolish existing buildings on site before commencement
   8. Boundary treatment to be agreed
   9. Reporting of unexpected contamination
  10. Limited Hours of use
  11. New Access Construction over verge
  12. Provision of parking and turning area
  13. Highway Improvements - Offsite
  14. Noise level restriction
  15. No provision of generators, air handling plant without written agreement
  16. Provision of a bat box
  17. Retention of existing trees and hedging
  18. Landscaping scheme to be agreed

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 5: The Economy
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   Policy 7: Supporting Communities
   Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 10: Noise
   IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
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 Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM2.1 Employment and business development
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/1970
Demolition of the existing village hall. Erection of a new All Saints Centre, Incorporating a dedicated Nursery unit, car parking, soft and hard landscaping and all associated works. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
- Building is an industrial commercial form of development, totally out of keeping with the surrounding domestic properties and would dominate a central area of this rapidly growing village
- Concerns re parking situation in The Footpath, not only for users of the building but also the residents and Primary School
- Concerns about drainage, more information is needed in order to be satisfied that correct measures are in place to alleviate any potential flooding
- Question as to whether there is a requirement for an Equality Statement to be included as part of the application

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee:
- Due to the concerns raised with me regarding the design of the building and the car parking for the building

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)
No objections subject to conditions

3.4 Flood Defence Officer
No objections subject to conditions

3.5 Ecologist
No objections subject to conditions

3.6 Landscape Officer
To be reported
3.7 Design Officer

Approve
- Well thought out scheme that satisfies Policy 2 of the JCS.

3.8 NCC Highways

No objections subject to conditions

3.9 Representations

3 letters of support
- Well designed
- Soft and hard landscaping will enhance the overall appearance of the area
- Much needed facility for a growing village
- Will enrich the lives of the local community as it will provide up to date modern facilities
- Current hall is too hot in summer and too cold in winter
- Storage space for the nursery and other users of the hall is poor
- Kitchen and toilet areas are not fit for purpose as they are difficult to keep clean
- New building will provide greater functionality and usage to the community

6 letters of objection
- No provision for rainwater drainage
- Too big for the site
- Not in line with the rest of the bungalows on this side of the road
- Too dominant on the street scene
- Out of keeping with the character of the street scene
- Already parking problems with the school being at the end of the road
- Increase in parking and parking facilities too small for this large building
- Double yellow lines on both sides of The Footpath would help
- Noise and disturbance
- Re-submission and there appears to be no difference
- Area delineated for parking could well cause drainage and flooding problems
- Loss of light
- Agree that the hall has seen better days and would accept a new hall, the same size and on the same footprint, brick built to blend in with surrounding bungalows, with car park at the rear screened by hedging

4 Assessment

4.1 This full application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing village hall and the erection of a new All Saints Centre, which incorporates a dedicated Nursery unit, car parking, soft and hard landscaping and all associated works. The site is a prominent corner plot, located to the south of The Footpath with residential properties located to the north, east, south and southwest. The site is within the development boundary for Poringland.

4.2 The main issues in this case are: the use; the design; the impact on the character and appearance of the area; highway safety; residential amenity and drainage.

The proposed use

4.3 On the site presently sits 'The Tin Hut' a corrugated iron single storey structure which is believed to have been erected on the site at the end of World War 1 and is currently used for a variety of uses such as pre-school playgroup, after school group, baby and toddlers,
Church ‘get-togethers’, jumble sales, fundraisers, yoga classes. The New Centre will provide a main hall, cafe and reading area to give better facilities to the existing users of the present hall and expand the services that can be provided. The proposal also incorporates a purpose built nursery for the Poringland Playgroup and After School club to enable them to expand their child care provision. The application site is within the development boundary and the use is assessed in relation to the NPPF, policy LEI 2 of the South Norfolk local Plan, Policy 7, Policy 8 and Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy. A statement has also been provided by the applicants explaining how they consider the proposal will enhance the quality of life and well-being of the community, as well as promoting equality and diversity in accordance with Policy 7. In terms of its use the proposal accords with policy.

Design, layout and impact on the character of the area

4.4 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, which is seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The design approach is contemporary with mono-pitch roofs, cladding and glazing. It has taken into account the form and height of its surrounds (which are predominately bungalows) and represents a well thought out proposal which responds successfully to the site context and immediate surroundings. The supporting information demonstrates how the scheme successfully addresses the relevant design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place-making Guide by providing evidence to show the proposal makes a positive contribution to this part of Poringland. The scheme therefore satisfies Policy 2 of the JCS. The site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed building and its parking, turning and associate spaces.

Highway safety

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

4.6 Local residents and the Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the increase traffic, insufficient parking provision and the existing parking problems created by people parking on both sides of the road in connection with the school and play fields which are located at the end of The Footpath. However, notwithstanding these concerns, the Highways Authority has assessed the proposal, and subject to the imposition of conditions, particularly in respect of onsite and offsite highway improvement works, have raised no objection to the proposed development.

Residential amenity

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

4.8 The scheme has been carefully designed and sited so as not to cause detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. The highest part of the development is separated from the neighbour to the east by a single storey store, existing vegetation and the neighbour’s drive. The residents opposite have raised concerns at loss of light to their living room window; however, given the separation distances I do not consider the proposal would give rise to a situation so detrimental to their amenities as to warrant refusal on this ground. Concerns have also been raised regarding noise and disturbance from the activities within the building. An acoustic report has been submitted with the application and the environmental protection officer has requested that conditions are imposed limiting the noise emissions from the building. The existing village hall does not have any restrictions
on its hours, but in view of the increase in size and the nature of uses that can be carried out in the new hall, a condition limiting its hours of use should be imposed to protect the amenities of the adjacent residential properties (further details or the suggested hours restriction will be available at the meeting following ongoing discussions with the agent). The scheme has been carefully designed not to give rise to a situation unduly detrimental to amenities and it is not considered that the impact would be at a level which would unacceptably impact on residential amenity in the circumstances of this site. The proposal would comply with Policy IMP9.

Drainage

4.9 There are known problems with flooding and drainage issues in this area. To minimise the possibilities of flooding, a condition should be applied requiring the surface water drainage to be carried out in accordance with the details submitted. The flood defence officer has commented that the proposals will have a positive impact on the downstream foul sewer by removing the existing surface water drainage connection. Anglian Water has agreed a controlled discharge of 5 l/sec into the adopted surface water sewer. Attenuation will be achieved with the use of rainwater harvesting and underground storage tanks which provide a positive contribution to water conservation and rainwater re-use. Permeable surfacing will be used for parking areas. In view of the above, the Flood Defence Officer has raised no objections to the proposal.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The appearance, scale, landscaping, and layout of the development are considered appropriate for its context and are of a high standard of design. The development will not adversely affect the character of the area; will not give rise to flooding and will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties or highway safety. As such the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP.

5.2 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), however a request for charitable relief is being considered.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with, new breach ongoing investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeces Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road</td>
<td></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 Compliance date 31/07/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Compliance date 12/12/10 Application for revised scheme approved, date given for works to be carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Mere Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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>YELVERTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Temporary Stop Notice and Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice served&lt;br&gt;Compliance date 24.07.11&lt;br&gt;Appeal dismissed – Enforcement Notice partially complied with&lt;br&gt;Further enquiries ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served&lt;br&gt;Appeal submitted and allowed for four year temporary permission&lt;br&gt;Compliance date 11/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served&lt;br&gt;Compliance date 29.12.11&lt;br&gt;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&lt;br&gt;Compliance date of 20/06/12&lt;br&gt;Ongoing prosecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Standing of a caravan</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served&lt;br&gt;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       | Formation of Access                          | 16/11/11                   | Enforcement Notice served
Compliance date 27/10/13
Owner unable to comply at present due to personal circumstances
Ongoing monitoring |
| Land adjacent to  |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| The Drift         |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| Crownthorpe Road  |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| 2011/8025         |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| ASLACTON          | Erection of buildings not connected to         | 21/12/11                   | Enforcement Notice served
Compliance date 31/07/15 |
| Land off Grays    | agricultural use                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| Lane 2008/8368    |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| WYMONDHAM         | Unauthorised works to Listed Building (Insertion | 02/05/12                   | Enforcement Notice complied with NFA                                                                  |
| 70 Damgate Street | of UPVC windows)                              |                            |                                                                                                         |
| 2011/8281         |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| GREAT MOULTON     | Change of Use of Land for the standing of a   | 18/07/12                   | Enforcement Notice served
Compliance date 30/01/18 |
| Haulage Yard      | residential caravan                           |                            |                                                                                                         |
| Broadgate Lane    |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| 2012/8018         |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| SAXLINGHAM        | Storage of a caravan                          | 27/02/13                   | Enforcement Notice served and appealed
Appeal ongoing with change of procedure |
<p>| THORPE            |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| Land on the North |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| side of Windy Lane|                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |
| 2013/8069         |                                               |                            |                                                                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOPCROFT Land South side of Wooden Bungalow Topcroft Street 2012/8299</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the stationing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>27/03/13</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM New Covert Cavick Road 2011/8033</td>
<td>Change of use of woodland</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Appeal upheld, Enforcement Notice quashed NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSHALL Land west of South View Harleston Road 2013/8147</td>
<td>Breach of Condition</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAXTON Butterfly Barn Church Lane 2013/8087</td>
<td>Change of use of stable to residential dwelling</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 19/03/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISS Two Oaks Skelton Road 2013/8099</td>
<td>Erection of Fencing</td>
<td>06/11/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served and appealed Appeal ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULBARTON Trevannon The Common 2013/8217</td>
<td>Untidy land</td>
<td>05/02/14</td>
<td>Notice served Compliance date 14/06/14 Ongoing monitoring and clearance is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENF-PROC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 5 September 2014 to 2 October 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2192</td>
<td>Shelton Land Between Corner Farm And Ash Lodge The Street Hardwick Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Owen-Jackson</td>
<td>Outline Planning Permission for a Detached Two Storey New Home and a Detached Single Storey Garage (Revised Proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0171</td>
<td>Costessey 48 Grove Avenue Costessey Norfolk NR5 0HW</td>
<td>Mr A Byford</td>
<td>Demolition of 1 bungalow and replace with 2 bungalows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0288</td>
<td>Shelton Land At Cricket Field Alburgh Road Shelton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J Groen</td>
<td>Proposed family house at Cricket Field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0446</td>
<td>Mulbarton Subdivision Of Garden Of 86 Cuckoofield Lane Mulbarton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr P Freeman</td>
<td>Erection of a new dwelling and garage; and new access to existing dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0836</td>
<td>Morley Land East Of Brecon Lodge, Home Farm Lane Golf Links Road Morley St Peter Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Alan Tubby</td>
<td>Erection of two detached dwellings and cart lodge garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0167</td>
<td>Trowse With Newton Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue Trowse Norfolk</td>
<td>Trustess Of The Arminghall Settlement</td>
<td>Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/0811</td>
<td>Thurlton Land South Of Manor Farm Low Road Thurlton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr William Morgan</td>
<td>Change of use of land for private site for 1no traveller residential pitch, including the siting of 1 'Log cabin' style Mobile Home, 1 touring caravan, 1 'log cabin style' day room, parking for 2 vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/1957</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>
<tr>
<td>2014/0374</td>
<td>Shotesham Sub Division Of Garden South Of Green Hill The Common Shotesham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Dennis Jewell</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>