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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014/0799/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants Name: Wymondham Rugby Football Club (WRFC), Landstock Estates Ltd And Landowners Group Ltd

Site Address: Wymondham Rugby Club And Land West Of Elm Farm Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk

Proposal: Outline application for up to 90 dwellings at Tuttles Lane, including the demolition of existing Wymondham Rugby Club buildings and sports pitches and closure of existing access; up to 300 residential dwellings at Norwich Common with multiple access points, including the demolition of 63 Norwich Common; a replacement rugby club (use class D1) with sports pitches including an artificial pitch, floodlighting, clubhouse, car parking and accesses including an emergency only access from Melton Road; and associated works including open space, sustainable urban drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks.

Decision: Members voted 10-0 for REFUSAL

Refused
1. Outside of settlement limit for Wymondham Policy and unjustified development in the open countryside contrary to local plan policies HOU4 and ENV8.
2. Harmful to the strategic gap local plan policy ENV2.
4. Premature and highly prejudicial to the outcome of the Wymondham Area Action Plan.

Updates
Paragraph 5.8 – listed reasons for refusal should be numbered 1 to 4, not 1,3, 4 and 5. Also the first line of reason 2 should include “be” not “by”.

20 letters of support received since report published, many voicing disappointment at the recommendation.

A petition supporting the proposal has been submitted with in excess of 1000 signatures.

3 letters of concern also received, no new issues raised to those already in the published report.

Letter from agent, and forwarded at their request to Members of the Development Management Committee including the substitute pool. It confirms their disappointment at the recommendation and raises concern at a number of what they consider to be omissions, relating to housing land supply provision, benefits of the scheme, education, the strategic gap and prematurity. The letter does not change the recommendation in the published committee report.
These comments are noted but do not raise any new issues or change the recommendation as presented in the report. For clarification on education NCC Children’s Services confirmed that the content of the report reflected their current position in respect of education matters in relation to this application. Also in relation to the strategic gap, it can be confirmed that it is not recommended to refuse the application, in part, on the basis that Parcel C is within the strategic gap.

2  **Appl. No** : 2014/0889/F  
   **Parish** : MARLINGFORD AND COLTON

Applicants Name : Mr Kjetil Titelstad  
Site Address : Viking Nurseries Ltd The Old Fruit Farm High House Farm Lane Colton Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of new glasshouses.  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions

1. Full permission time limit
2. In accordance with amended plans
3. Landscaping – further information to be submitted to clarify proposed landscape plan
4. Surface water drainage strategy to be submitted and approved in line with the submitted FRA

3  **Appl. No** : 2014/1440/D  
   **Parish** : COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Bennett PLC  
Site Address : Land At Townhouse Road Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal : Application seeks Reserved Matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 62 dwellings and associated works.  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for **DEFERRAL**

Further, it was **AGREED** that the Council receive an extension of time to enable amendments to the application to be found (as a result of this meeting), with the application to be decided at the next available meeting of the Development Management Committee following resolution of the issues raised below. This approach was **AGREED** by the Applicant present at the meeting.

**Reasons for Deferral**

1. Members were concerned about the proposed location of the sewage pumping station with regard to the amenity of the neighbouring property.

2. Members sought clarification as to the requirements of Anglian Water concerning the location of the sewage pumping station.
Updates
Representation from Costessey Parish Council to the Chairman of the development management committee and 2 letters of objection have been received since the publication of the report. All issues raised have already been raised and covered in the published committee report.

Anglian Water has confirmed that it has no objection to the scheme, there is sufficient capacity in the sewerage system and at Whitlingham Water Recycling centre to deal with foul drainage flows.

Other Applications

4 Appl. No : 2014/1857/F
Parish : GREAT MOULTON
Applicants Name : Mrs Christine Wheal
Site Address : Post Office Hallowing Lane Great Moulton Norfolk NR15 2AA
Proposal : Change of use of closed shop and post office to residential dwelling with 2no garages
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL
Approved with conditions
1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings

Updates
Agent advises a further, lower offer has been received from the potential purchaser who previously withdrew.

PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS 5, 6 AND 7, members were advised by officers that Objectors had raised concerns about the timescales involved in the consultation process and were suggesting that these items should be deferred. The timescales involved were explained to members as well as details of the consultation process undertaken. Members noted that a representative from the Parish Council was present to give their updated views. The Committee AGREED that the correct consultation process had been followed and that these items should not be deferred and could be decided at the meeting.

5 Appl. No : 2014/1365/F
Parish : BRESSINGHAM
Applicants name : The Bloom Family
Site Address : Bressingham Hall Low Road Bressingham Diss IP22 2AA
Proposal : Creation of a wedding and function venue through the conversion of curtilage buildings to the rear of the Grade II listed hall, construction of a reception building, laying out of car park and access, and demolition of ancillary buildings.
Decision: Members voted unanimously for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. No live or amplified music outside buildings
4. Boundary noise level
5. Sound attenuation measures as in noise assessment
6. Detailed Management Plan to be agreed
7. No marquees or temporary buildings unless agreed
8. Contaminated land - submit scheme
9. Demolish existing buildings on site
10. Details of foul water disposal
11. Surface Water
12. Provision of parking
13. Signage around the site to approved access/exit
14. Highways - Visibility splay
15. Highways – access & surface drainage
16. Highways – Access gates
17. Highways – parking/turning
18. Ecology Mitigation
19. External materials to be agreed
20. Specific details to be agreed
21. External joinery details to be agreed
22. Details of all plant & equipment to be agreed

**Updates**

Numbers of letters of objection received from consultations:

- **First consultation 21/7/14 to 11/08/14** - 4 separate letters of objections received
- **Second consultation 20/10/14 to 03/11/14** - 22 separate letters of objection received from 19 properties
- **Third consultation 15/12/14 to 05/01/14** – 23 separate letters of objection from 15 properties

**Objections to the proposal from third consultation 15/12/14 – 05/01/15:**

- The time period for consultation is not sufficient
- Impact of noise levels on nearby residents
- Impact of overflow parking on Church Lane
- Noise levels assessed at the edge of the A1066 and ignore the fact that bedroom in adjacent buildings are shielded from the road
- The western terrace will be a constant source of noise 'break-out' late at night
- Properties outside to the area identified for the noise assessment will still be adversely affected by noise levels.
- The AJA addendum report lacks commitment and clarity in terms of measures proposed and details, such as insulation, have not been included in drawing details.
- Information provided in paragraph 4.16 of Committee Report is incorrect and is misleading
- Sound pollution would have been better addressed by original pre-application proposal.
- Second noise consultant report received in support of objections.
  - Methodology and calculations incorrect and underestimate noise levels.
  - Proposed noise levels restrictions are too high.
  - Development will result in adverse noise impact to the surrounding local residents.
A further supporting statement has been submitted by the applicant to support the proposal stating that the Blooms and their agents have complied willingly to make necessary revisions in order to address noise concerns. A reliable and sustainable business use is required on the site or the future of the gardens and family business will be under threat.

**6**  
**Appl. No :** 2014/1366/LB  
**Parish :** BRESSINGHAM  

Applicants name : The Bloom Family  
Site Address : Bressingham Hall Low Road Bressingham Diss IP22 2AA  
Proposal : Full planning application for the creation of a wedding and function venue through the conversion of curtilage buildings to the rear of the Grade II listed hall, construction of a reception building, laying out of car park and access, and demolition of ancillary buildings.

**Decision :** Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL  

Approved with conditions  

1 Listed Building Time Limit  
2 In accord with submitted drawings  
3 External materials to be agreed  
4 Specific details to be agreed  
5 External joinery details to be agreed

**Updates**

Numbers of letters of objection received from consultations:

- **First consultation 21/7/14 to 11/08/14** - 4 separate letters of objections received  
- **Second consultation 20/10/14 to 03/11/14** - 22 separate letters of objection received from 19 properties  
- **Third consultation 15/12/14 to 05/01/14** – 23 separate letters of objection from 15 properties

**Objections to the proposal from third consultation 15/12/14 – 05/01/15:**

- The time period for consultation is not sufficient  
- Impact of noise levels on nearby residents  
- Impact of overflow parking on Church Lane  
- Noise levels assessed at the edge of the A1066 and ignore the fact that bedroom in adjacent buildings are shielded from the road  
- The western terrace will be a constant source of noise 'break-out' late at night  
- Properties outside to the area identified for the noise assessment will still be adversely affected by noise levels.  
- The AJA addendum report lacks commitment and clarity in terms of measures proposed and details, such as insulation, have not been included in drawing details.  
- Information provided in paragraph 4.16 of Committee Report is incorrect and is misleading  
- Sound pollution would have been better addressed by original pre-application proposal.  
- Second noise consultant report received in support of objections.
  
  o Methodology and calculations incorrect and underestimate noise levels.  
  o Proposed noise levels restrictions are too high.  
  o Development will result in adverse noise impact to the surrounding local residents.
A further supporting statement has been submitted by the applicant to support the proposal stating that the Blooms and their agents have complied willingly to make necessary revisions in order to address noise concerns. A reliable and sustainable business use is required on the site or the future of the gardens and family business will be under threat.

7 Appl. No : 2014/2262/F
Parish : BRESSINGHAM
Applicants name : Bloom Family
Site Address : Bressingham Hall Low Road Bressingham Diss IP22 2AA
Proposal : Erection of a marquee as first phase of creation of wedding and function venue

Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Three year temporary permission
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. No live or amplified music unless agreed
4. Boundary noise levels
5. Sound system details to be agreed
6. Detailed Management Plan to be agreed
7. No other marquees or temporary buildings unless agreed
8. Details of foul water disposal
9. Signage around the site to approved access/exit
10. Phasing – access and parking before marquee use
11. Details of all plant & equipment to be agreed
12. Ecology mitigation

Updates
Numbers of letters of objection received from consultations:
- First consultation – 15 letters of objection received from 14 properties
- Second Consultation – 21 letters of objection received from 14 properties

In addition to the reasons of objection stated in the Committee Report the following should also be included from the first consultation:
- No details provided on generators in terms of locations and likely levels of noise.
- No limiting conditions regarding noise.
- Design and Access Statement uses vague phraseology with regard to exactly how the marquee would be used.
- Time frame of 3-5 years is too long considering likely levels of noise
- Incorrect methodology has been used in the acoustic report to assess noise levels

Neighbour objections from the second consultation 15/12/14 – 05/01/15:
- The time period for consultation is not sufficient
- Impact of noise levels on nearby residents.
- Applicant’s lack of funds is misleading and does not provide sufficient justification for the granting of planning permission.
- Impact of overflow parking on Church Lane
- Noise levels assessed at the edge of the A1066 and ignore the fact that bedroom in adjacent buildings are shielded from the road
- Phase 1 has no specific time limit and could be permanent.
- One of the tents positioned within fencing and a brick wall to provided limited noise buffer. No details have been provided for the new fencing and for repairs to the wall
- No details provided on generators in terms of locations and likely levels of noise.
- Information provided in paragraph 4.16 of Committee Report is incorrect and is misleading

A further supporting statement has been submitted by the applicant to support the proposal stating that the Blooms and their agents have complied willingly to make necessary revisions in order to address noise concerns. It is intended that there will be no amplified music in the marquee, and previous noise issues from a marquee erected only a few feet away from a residential property near to the Chequers Public House is not considered a fair comparison. A reliable and sustainable business use is required on the site or the future of the gardens and family business will be under threat.

8 Appl. No : 2014/2269/RVC
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants name : Miss L Tang
Site Address : 32A Mill Road Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3DP
Proposal : Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2013/1026/F (Change of use from office to cafe/tea room) - to allow cafe to remain open from 8:00am till 8:00pm, Monday to Sunday, as there is a demand for evening meals

Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL (contrary to officer recommendation)

2 year temporary permission approved with designation for conditions to be negotiated and agreed by officers

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation
1. Members considered that a temporary consent should be granted to assess how the extended hours affect the amenities of the area

Application on land owned by South Norfolk Council

9 Appl. No : 2014/2282/F
Parish : COSTESSEY

Applicants name : Ms Sally Smith
Site Address : Pitch 3 Roundwell Caravan Site Dereham Road Costessey Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of day-room extension for disabled person

Decision : Members voted 9-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1 Full permission time limit.
2 Occupancy restricted to gypsies and travellers.
3 Use incidental to pitch 3, not independent.