Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

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

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am  Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 4 February 2015

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

27/01/2015
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the meetings of the Development Management Committee held on 7 January 2015;
   (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>2014/1440/D</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land at Townhouse Road, Costessey</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/1824/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Elm Farm Norwich Common Wymondham</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014/2429/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land Between Queens Road And Jaguar Road Hethersett</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014/2642/RVC</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Land South Of Hall Farm Bungay Road Tasburgh</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/1903/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Little Dial Farm Station Road Spooner Row</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2014/2359/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Buildings At Twin Barn Farm, Ketteringham Lane, Hethersett</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2014/2378/RVC</td>
<td>FORNCETT</td>
<td>Fourways Long Stratton Road Forncett St Peter</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

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

7. Enforcement Reports
   (attached – page 109)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)
   (attached – page 112)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 4 March 2015
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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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 representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

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

YES

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?

NO

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 7 January 2015 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), Y Bendle, D Blake, C Gould, M Gray, J Herbert, L Hornby, C Kemp, N Legg and L Neal

Apologies: Councillor F Ellis

Substitute Members: Councillor C Foulger

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Place-Shaping and Major Projects Team Leader (J Hobbs), the Planning Decisions and Enforcement Team Leader (C Trett), the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and T Lincoln) and the Environmental Protection Manager (A Nicholas)

(the press and 90 members of the public were in attendance)

180. 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>Item 1 2014/0799/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by applicant and objector and received petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Mooney and L Hornby</td>
<td>Other interest - Members had attended social events and a public consultation event at Wymondham RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 2014/0889/F</td>
<td>MARLINGFORD AND COLTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3 2014/1440/D</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(pre-determined – Member considered he was predeterminated due to previous statements made in his role at Norfolk County Council. He removed himself from the Committee for the item and did not take part in the vote.)
181. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee dated 10 December 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

182. 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>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5,6,7 2014/1365/F 2014/1366/LB 2014/2262/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by applicant and objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8 2014/2269/RVC</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>J Herbert</td>
<td>Other interest – member employs the applicant’s partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D Blake</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by applicant and objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9 2014/2282/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice – Cabinet member – left the meeting for this item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 2014/0799/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Mr A Wilford, Agent for Applicant Mr P Barry, Applicant Cllr C Foulger, Local Member Cllr L Dale, Local Member for Hethersett Cllr D Bills, Local Member for Hethersett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 2014/0889/F</td>
<td>MARLINGFORD AND COLTON</td>
<td>Dr D Wildon, Parish Council Ms V Ashley, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3 2014/1440/D</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Ms H Elias, Parish Council Mr D Lister, Objector Mr N McNabb, Agent for Applicant Mr A Wisby, Agent for Applicant Cllr V Bell, Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4 2014/1857/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Mrs C Wheal, Applicant Mrs H Whittley, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 5 &amp; 6 2014/1365/F &amp; 2014/1366/LB</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Ms L Pearce, Parish Council Mr R Young, Objector Ms D Young, Objector Mr G Linfield, Agent for Applicant Mr A Bloom, Applicant Mr A James, for the Applicant Cllr K Weeks, Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7 2014/2262/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Ms L Pearce, Parish Council Mr M Lambert, Objector Ms L Holly, Objector Mr G Linfield, Agent for Applicant Mr A Bloom, Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Speaker(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8 2014/2269/RVC</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Mr D Bills, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R Headicott, for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr L Dale, Local Member</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.

183. ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS – QUARTERLY REPORT

Members noted the report of the Director of Growth and Localism.

184. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

(The meeting closed at 4.00 pm)

__________________________
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

<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014/1857/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Mrs Christine Wheal</td>
<td>Post Office Hallowing Lane Great Moulton Norfolk NR15 2AA</td>
<td>Change of use of closed shop and post office to residential dwelling with 2no garages</td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/1365/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>The Bloom Family</td>
<td>Bressingham Hall Low Road Bressingham Diss IP22 2AA</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Appliance Number : 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.
  - 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.

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
8 No other marquees or temporary buildings unless agreed
9 Details of foul water disposal
10 Signage around the site to approved access/exit
11 Phasing – access and parking before marquee use
12 Details of all plant & equipment to be agreed
13 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.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appl. No</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014/2269/RVC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td><strong>HETHERSETT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicants name</strong></td>
<td>Miss L Tang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>32A Mill Road Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3DP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL (contrary to officer recommendation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 year temporary permission approved with designation for conditions to be negotiated and agreed by officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appl. No</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014/2282/F</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td><strong>COSTESSEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicants name</strong></td>
<td>Ms Sally Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>Pitch 3 Roundwell Caravan Site Dereham Road Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td>Erection of day-room extension for disabled person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>Members voted 9-0 for APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Full permission time limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Occupancy restricted to gypsies and travellers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Use incidental to pitch 3, not independent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Applications referred back to Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014/1440/D</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Bennett PLC</td>
<td>Land at Townhouse Road, Costessey</td>
<td>Application seeks Reserved Matters approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 62 dwellings and associated works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Report: This report updates the position in respect of the location of an on-site foul water pumping station as part of the above application following deferral of the planning application by the Development Management Committee on 7th January 2015. This report updates members with additional consultations response received and considers the planning merits of the re-sited pumping station.

Recommendation: Authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to approve subject to no new material issues being raised in the remainder of the outstanding consultation period which expires on the 4th of February 2015, subject to the following conditions:

1. In accord with submitted drawings
2. Details of pumping station to be agreed
3. Landscaping scheme and external materials to be submitted as indicated
4. Boundary treatment to be agreed (including around pumping station)
5. Renewable Energy - Implementation
6. Provision of parking, service as approved
7. Tree protection as approved
8. Secure deed of variation to S106 to amend the affordable housing figure to 32% from 33%

1. Planning Policies and Planning History

1.1 The planning policies and planning history are as previously presented in the committee report on the 7th January 2015 (Appendix 2).

2. Consultations

2.1 Since the last committee report (Appendix 2), list of conditions from Planning Inspector’s decision on outline consent (Appendix 3) and committee updates report (Appendix 4) were published there have been further responses received as a result of the most recent re-consultation. These are detailed below.

2.1 Environment Agency To be reported orally at committee.

2.2 Anglian Water To be reported orally at committee.

2.3 Costessey Parish Council To be reported orally at committee.
2.4 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objection to proposed development.

2.5 Representations  
An additional 1 letter of representation has been received. This identified the following issues:

The amended plan does not address the concerns relating to the relationship between the proposed garage on plot 1 and the existing property. Insufficient space exists to provide screening (trees and hedges).

3 Assessment

3.1 The application was considered at the Development Management Committee on the 7th January 2015 and the item was deferred to investigate the possibility of re-siting the proposed pumping station elsewhere within the site in order to address concerns in respect of neighbour amenity, particularly in respect of Holkham House and to reduce the impact upon the character and appearance of the streetscene when viewed from Townhouse Road.

3.2 This report amends the position on this previously reported application. The committee report from Development Management Committee on 7th January (Appendix 2 and 4) provides the full consideration of this case, this report seeks to update paragraphs 4.16 to 4.19 in respect of the pumping station. The recommendation is as stated above with recommended conditions.

3.3 The applicant has considered the issues raised, and now proposes the pumping station in the south-eastern corner of the proposed public open space within the development. This revision means that in terms of neighbour amenity, the separation distance between the proposed pumping station and the nearest existing neighbour (Holkham House) is approximately 85 metres. This represents a significant increase on the 16 metre separation that was indicated in the plan considered at the previous Development Management Committee. The re-sited pumping station is also approximately 85m from any other existing residential dwelling.

3.4 It is also necessary to have regard for the impact of the proposed pumping station upon future residents of the proposed dwellings. The revised pumping station is 15m from the nearest proposed dwelling which complies with the requirements of Clause 2.18 paragraph 3 of the Sewers for Adoption Guidance. states:

3.5 “The pumping station should be located no closer than 15m to habitable buildings in order to minimise the risk of odour, noise and nuisance…….”

3.6 The siting of the pumping station would now mean it would not be highly visible from Townhouse Road, and so would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

3.7 By way of clarification, the revised plan also now confirms that the access to the ecological protection zone is to be gated in order to prevent public access and meet the requirements of condition four from the outline planning permission for the site (2009/1996). The recommended planning condition on boundary treatment will address the exact design and height of this gate in order to ensure it is sufficiently robust to prevent public access.
3.8 The additional representation is noted but is not considered to raise any new material planning issues for consideration that have not been addressed in this and the previous committee report and therefore do not change the recommendation in this report.

3.9 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above and in the report in Appendix 1 are of greater significance.

3.10 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) given that it is a reserved matters application, whereby the outline approval was granted prior to the adoption of CIL.

4. Conclusion

4.1 The proposed development is considered to comply with policies within the Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted 2014), the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) identified in the list of policies in the previous committee report (Appendix 2).

4.2 The application as amended is considered to address the concerns raised in respect of the siting of the pumping station and the represents an acceptable development which has appropriate regard to relevant planning policies and guidance, having due regard to all material considerations.

4.3 It is acknowledged that a number of detailed issues are yet to be resolved and these will be done so through the appropriate mechanism, namely discharge of condition application, which will be the subject of consultation with appropriate bodies at that time. This, as presented to councillors at the last committee meeting, is not considered to be a reasonable justification to refuse the current reserved matters application.

4.4 With the principle of development having been established by the appeal decision, it is evident that the current scheme has had regard to the conditions of the Inspector’s decision, where necessary, and the scheme complies with relevant national and local planning policy in respect of providing a development which has sufficient regard for its prominent position with the river valley, the amenities of neighbouring properties and the importance of Carr’s Hill Wood. The proposal is, therefore, considered to accord with the relevant national and local plan policies as detailed in this report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail: craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2
Appendix 3

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. Agreement for the approval of the proposed works on the site are in accordance with the local planning authority and have been made from the date of this Appendix.
reconnaissance strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the timetable.

3. The submissions also indicate that the impact on groundwater reduces in proportion to water usage. No dwellings shall be occupied until the local planning...
# Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

## 7th January 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 2014/0799 | 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. | 24 |
| 2 2014/0889 | No updates. | 56 |
| 3 2014/1440 | 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 Whittleingham Water Recycling centre to deal with foul drainage flows. | 67 |
| 4 2014/1857 | Agent advises a further, lower offer has been received from the potential purchaser who previously withdrew. | 88 |
| 5 2014/1365 & 6 2014/1366 | Numbers of letters of objection received from consultations:  
   
   - **First consultation 21/7/14 to 11/08/14** - 4 separate letters of objections received | 92 |
- **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 compiled 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 2014/2262</th>
<th>Numbers of letters of objection received from consultations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First consultation</strong> – 15 letters of objection received from 14 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 2014/2269</td>
<td>No Updates</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2014/2282</td>
<td>No updates</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2. **Appl. No**: 2014/1824/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Eric Warnes  
Site Address: Elm Farm Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: Proposed extension to Business Park for B1, B2, B8 and D1 uses

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Standard estate road construction – details to be agreed  
4. Cycle parking provision to be agreed  
5. Construction traffic parking  
6. Wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed  
7. Wheel cleaning facilities to be retained  
8. Off-site highway works – 3m wide footway/cycleway  
9. Off-site highway works - road markings on B1172  
10. Completion of off-site highway works in condition 9  
11. Renewable energy – 10% from decentralised source  
12. Details of foul water disposal – management and maintenance to be agreed  
13. Surface water – management and maintenance to be agreed  
14. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
15. Implement of approved remediation for contamination  
16. Full details of external lighting to be agreed  
17. Landscaping scheme to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy (2011)  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan (2003)  
ENV2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area  
ENV8: Development in the open countryside  
IMP2: Landscaping  
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP9: Residential amenity  
IMP10: Noise  
IMP15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
EMP6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises
1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be 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 (2013)
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM2.1 Employment and business development
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies (2013)
Wymondham Area Action Plan
WYM7 Land at Elm Farm Business Park, Norwich Road

Statutory Duties

Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

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 2010/0202 Non Material Amendment to 2005/2160/F (Erection of office / storage building (existing buildings to be demolished)) - Addition of 12no low level lighting bollards to the rear of parking area and 1no addition CCTV pole with camera. Approved

2.2 2005/2160 Erection of office / storage building (existing buildings to be demolished) Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council No objection

3.2 District Member No objection
3.3 Environment Agency
Object.

The additional information they have provided has been very helpful for us to assess the reasonableness of their proposal. Taking into account the potential environmental impact, the proposed volume of discharge (estimated to be 18m3/day – would be good for the Applicant to check this), the distance to the main sewer, and the relative costs of onsite versus mains treatment, it is considered that the proposed non-mains solution has not been adequately justified.

We note that the applicant refers to a nearby development ‘The Drive’ which was permitted with a non-mains solution. This development was permitted under reference 2012/2202/O and conditions were discharged under reference 2014/0073/DC. We were not consulted on the outline or reserved matters applications for this development.

Notwithstanding the above we do not consider that this development justifies allowing the proposal subject of this application to use a non-mains solution.

3.4 SNC Flood Defence Officer
No objection

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection.

3.6 NCC Ecologist
No objection.

3.7 SNC Landscape Officer
No objection.

3.8 SNC Conservation Officer
No objections.

3.9 Natural England
No objection.

3.10 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)
No objection subject to conditions

3.11 NCC Highways
No objection subject to conditions

3.12 Highways Agency
No objection

3.13 Representations
No representations received.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for an extension to the existing Elm Farm Business Park, Wymondham consisting of a mix of B1, B2, B8 and D1 buildings. The application is accompanied by an indicative layout which highlights access to the development via the existing access (Norwich Common B1172), albeit widened to take account of increased traffic flows and highlights the following breakdown of units:
- Use class B1 3090m² light industry, offices
- Use class B2 200m² General industry
- Use class B8 200m² Storage & Distribution
- Use Class D1 262m² non-residential (e.g. children’s nursery)

4.2 The Design and Access Statement indicates that the B1 premises would be two storey, with the B2, B8 and D1 premises anticipated to be single storey. It also indicates that the B1 and D1 premises would be constructed using traditional materials (red brickwork and terracotta pantiles, with flint detailing as appropriate), with the B2 and B8 premises to be of composite cladding fixed to a steel frame with brick plinth.

4.3 The site lies on the north-eastern edge of Wymondham to the north of the existing Elm Farm Business Park. Elm Farm Business Park consists of commercial premises with the majority constructed of brick, flint work with pantile roofs and are of traditional appearance. The business park enjoys a road frontage onto Norwich Common (B1172) which also provides vehicular access to the site. To the south of the site, immediately to the west of the existing business premises, is a detached dwelling under the ownership of the applicant. To the east of the site is open land and to the north is a relatively dense area of trees.

4.4 To the west of the site is open land which benefits from extant permission for a new Wymondham Rugby Club (WRC) facility (2012/1883), and permission was recently refused for this land to be developed for new housing as part of the application re-locate the rugby club to an alternative site (2014/0799).

Key issues

4.5 The site presently lies outside of the defined settlement limit for Wymondham within land covered by Policy ENV2 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan SNLP (Strategic Gap). Given this policy was adopted pre 2004, Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 215 states that it is necessary for decision makers to give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF. In this case ENV2 is considered to be consistent with the aims of the NPPF and therefore continues to carry weight.

4.6 These are areas of open land which maintain physical separation between settlements in the Norwich Policy Area, in this case Wymondham and Hethersett. The policy requires:

"Inappropriate development and other development which would erode the gaps between the built up limits of settlements, or which would otherwise undermine the general quality of the openness of these gaps will not be permitted."

Inappropriate development is defined within the existing Local Plan as new buildings for any purpose other than agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sports and recreation, limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings, limited infilling or redevelopment of major existing developed sites identified in adopted plans.

4.7 This site is proposed for the development of B1, B2 and B8 units as part of the expansion of Elm Farm Business Park, in order to facilitate local employment opportunities and economic growth in Wymondham consistent with the aims of emerging Policy WYM7 in the Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP).

4.8 Whilst the WAAP is not adopted, it is currently at an advanced stage having been through examination by the Planning Inspectorate, and Policy WYM7 has received no objections, and as such is considered to have significant weight.
4.9 Policy WYM7 clearly identifies that the site is suitable for employment development without compromising the functioning of a strategic gap. Also it is proposed that the strategic gap between Hethersett and Wymondham be re-aligned based upon a review undertaken by Chris Blandford Associates (2012). This would result in the proposed site no longer being located within the strategic gap as part of the future Local Plan.

4.10 On the basis of the above, it is considered that the impact on the strategic gap from this development would not be significantly harmful.

4.11 Policy EMP6 of the SNLP makes provision for the alteration and extension of existing business premises provided that certain criterion are met, these are:

i) The size and design of the proposals would be in keeping with the existing building and its surroundings.

ii) The existing landscaping of the site would not be seriously compromised and that full and effective landscaping for the proposed alteration or extension would be incorporated.

iii) All necessary parking, servicing, access and circulation can be accommodated on site for both the existing building and the proposed extension.

Whilst the current application is in outline form and as such does not provide a detailed layout and design, the proposed extension to Elm Farm Business park would be capable of satisfying these requirements through a reserved matters submission.

4.12 As stated above, policy EMP6 was adopted pre 2004 and as such it is necessary to have regard to the requirements of Annex of the NPPF in respect of establishing the weight of this policy based upon its consistency with the NPPF. It is considered that this policy is consistent with the aims of the NPPF and as such continues to carry significant weight in the determination of the application.

4.13 Policy WYM7 of the WAAP has a number of criterion to be considered in the determination of an application at this time, these are addressed in turn:

- Site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure and facilities Wymondham through S106 or the payment of CIL, including Bus Rapid Transit, improvements to the Thickthorn junction and Green Infrastructure enhancements;

4.14 The application is accompanied by the necessary completed forms associated with CIL.

- Heritage statement and field evaluation may be required to assess the impact of the development on the historic environment, in particular the setting of Wymondham Abbey;

4.15 In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting under the provisions of Section 66 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990. The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that they have no objection in respect of impacts upon heritage assets. It is also evident that the application proposes predominantly single storey buildings with only the B2 and B8 components of two storey composition, both of which are of limited size when seen in the context of the entire site (200m² in each case). On this basis no heritage statement or field evaluation is considered necessary, and it is considered that the scheme would not harm the setting of any listed building in accordance with paragraph 137 of the NPPF and IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
• A detailed ecological assessment. New development will be required to provide ecological links and buffers to the nearest green infrastructure, the design of which to be negotiated with South Norfolk Council and other relevant bodies to ensure adequate protection of important ecological sites and maintenance of habitat connectivity;

4.16 The application is supported by an ecological report. This has been assessed by the Ecologist who has confirmed that the report is fit for purpose and indicates that the site has very low ecological value and therefore there are no objections at this time. Given Policy WYM7 of the WAAP requires the provision of ecological links and buffers it is suggested that these are considered when detailed landscaping matters are developed.

• Satisfactory wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;

4.17 The application details, including the flood risk assessment have been assessed by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer who has confirmed they have no objection to the proposal in terms of environmental harm.

4.18 The Environment Agency has however raised an objection to the scheme on the grounds that the application has not adequately demonstrated that it is not viable/appropriate to connect to the mains sewer in order to deal with foul water disposal. This conclusion has been reached having regard to both the costs of connecting to mains system compared to a private treatment plant and the distance to the nearest available mains connection.

4.19 It is necessary to have due regard for the national Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) on this matter which confirms the following:

“Where a connection to a public sewage treatment plant is not feasible (in terms of cost and/or practicality) a package treatment plant can be considered. This could either be adopted in due course by the sewerage company or owned and operated under a new appointment or variation. The package sewage treatment plant should offer treatment so that the final discharge from it meets the standards set by the Environment Agency.”

4.20 With the above guidance in mind, in terms of cost, the agent has provided a detailed costing which indicates a cost of between £250,000 and £300,000 to connect the proposed development to the mains system, compared with approximately £22000 to provide a new private treatment plant on-site in place of the existing on-site system (this does not have sufficient capacity to deal with the additional foul water flows from the proposed units). The applicant has confirmed that the cost of connecting to the mains system would compromise the viability of the scheme.

4.21 With regard to practicality, the nearest appropriate connection is on Norwich Common approximately 750 metres away from the proposed site.

4.22 Notwithstanding the objection of the Environment Agency, officers consider that both the significant cost and significant distance to the nearest connection represent justifiable reasons to permit a connection to a private treatment plant when having due regard to PPG as set out above and having due regard to the lack of any environmental harm resulting from the use of the treatment plant and the Council’s aim of supporting economic growth.

4.23 The applicant has also drawn attention to a nearby residential development for 11 dwellings (2013/1533) which has been granted permission to use a package treatment plant and lies approximately 250m away from the nearest mains connection point. It is considered that this does not represent a significant factor in determining the acceptability of a non-mains option in this instance.
4.24 The PPG stresses the importance future ownership and maintenance, it is considered that this can be controlled through a suitable worded condition.

- Development of this land should enhance and improve the gateway to Wymondham as approached on the B1172 from Hethersett.

4.25 It is acknowledged that this is an outline application with all matters reserved, and as such the detailed layout or appearance of the units are not to be considered at this time. It is evident however from the indicative layout that the scheme could be developed to enhance this gateway location and the Design and Access Statement highlights the desire to use traditional materials to complement the existing collection of traditional looking buildings.

Environmental protection

4.26 In providing their comments, the Environmental Protection Officer had regard for the proposed residential development on the adjacent land which formed part of the proposal to re-locate Wymondham Rugby Club (2014/0799). This scheme was recently refused, and as such their observations regarding the need to have regard for the amenities of future occupiers in developing any reserved matters scheme are no longer necessary. However, in the event that the adjacent site is not developed for the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club and an alternative use is agreed, there is no reason why employment and other uses could not co-exist adjacent to one another provided that layouts are fully considered at the reserved matters application/s stage.

4.27 The Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed that they agree with the conclusions of the contaminated land assessment submitted by the applicant insofar as that there is a need for further investigative work. They are satisfied that this be can be dealt with via a suitably worded condition. They have also requested that details of external lighting also be agreed via planning condition. This is considered to be a reasonable request in this instance.

Highway safety

4.28 In terms of highway safety, the application is supported by a Transport Assessment which has been considered by both the Highways Agency, given the close proximity of the site to the A11 and Norfolk County Council (NCC) as Highway Authority and both have confirmed that they have no objections. NCC has requested a number of planning conditions which are considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

Other issues

4.29 Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy requires development over 1000m² (as is the case here) to include sources of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy providing at least 10% of the scheme’s expected energy requirements. This will be secured through a planning condition.

4.30 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.31 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but would be calculated and collected at the reserved matters stage.
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The scheme is considered to have due regard for the relevant planning policy requirements, and it is considered that significant weight can be attached to Policy WYM7 of the WAAP in the determination of the application. It is considered that the principle of development can therefore be supported.

5.2 The objection from the Environment Agency is noted, but it is considered that the guiding principles of the Planning Policy Guidance have been followed on this matter, with the sewer connection being a significant cost to a development that will deliver jobs and employment when the sewage treatment plants do not pose any environmental issues for the site.

5.3 Whilst acknowledging the outline nature of the scheme, it is considered that a scheme could be secured under a subsequent reserved matters application that could have adequate regard for the character and appearance of the locality, have full regard for neighbouring land uses, highway safety and develop ecological enhancements. On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions identified above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number     Chris Raine, 01508 533841  
and E-mail:                           craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2014/2429/F  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Jamie Bird  
**Site Address**: Land Between Queens Road And Jaguar Road Hethersett Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Erection of 22 new homes plus associated roads, landscaping and public open space  
**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions:

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Tree protection to be agreed  
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
5. Ecology mitigation to be agreed  
6. Maintenance of amenity areas to be agreed  
7. Open space provision to be secured  
8. Control of lighting during construction  
9. External materials to be agreed  
10. Surface water drainage scheme  
11. Location of bird and bat boxes to be agreed  
12. Re-survey for bats if not commenced in 2 years  
13. Provision of fire hydrant  
14. Archaeological work to be agreed  
15. Standard estate road construction to be agreed and implemented  
16. Management/maintenance arrangement of roads to be agreed  
17. Visibility splay to be agreed and provided  
18. Construction traffic (Parking) to be agreed  
19. Highway improvements – Offsite to be agreed and implemented  
20. No additional rear first floor windows plots 13-16  
21. Water efficiency to be secured  
22. 10% renewable energy to be agreed  

1. **Planning Policies**  

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 20: Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 14: Habitat protection
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the
Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 17: Off site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 3: Protection of important spaces (Part Consistent)
IMP 5: Streetscape
IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

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
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.1 Building Fabric Energy Efficiency, Carbon Compliance and Allowable Solutions
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.5 Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open spaces
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide (2012)

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/1484 Erection of 27 new homes plus associated roads, landscaping and public open space Withdrawn
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Consultations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>Object for the following reason – The application is contrary to the Local Plan and Policy which designates the site as 'a preferred new important space site'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 | District Members  
Cllr Dale  
Cllr Bills | To Committee  
To Committee |
| 3.3 | Anglian Water Services Ltd | Require condition for surface water drainage scheme. Confirm capacity for foul water. |
| 3.4 | SNC Design Officer | Building for Life assessment – 11 Greens, 1 Amber |
| 3.5 | NCC Ecologist | No objection subject to conditions for the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy, location of bird and bat boxes, control of lighting during construction in regards to bats. |
| 3.6 | SNC Environmental Services (Protection) | No objection subject to a note in respect of potential contamination of found. |
| 3.7 | NCC Highways | No objection subject to conditions in respect of management and maintenance of streets, detailed plans of roads, visibility splay, on-site parking for construction vehicles and widening of footpath adjacent to Queens Road. |
| 3.8 | SNC Affordable Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager | The proposal for 7 affordable dwellings is compliant with policy and, should permission be granted, would be secured by S106. |
| 3.9 | SNC Flood Defence Officer | No objection subject to further clarification on adoption of the surface water system and submission of a surface water drainage scheme. |
| 3.10 | NHS England | No comments received |
| 3.11 | NHS Clinical Commissioning Group | No comments received |
| 3.12 | Historic Environment Service | An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching has been carried out on the site and an interim report submitted with the planning application. The evaluation found the site has archaeological significance and is likely that further heritage assets will be present on the site. No objection subject to a condition to secure an archaeological scheme of investigation and mitigatory work comprising an archaeological excavation. |
| 3.13 | Environment Agency | No objection subject to a condition to secure a surface water drainage scheme |
| 3.14 | SNC Landscape Officer | No objection subject to conditions to cover tree protection, detailed planting proposals and management plans. |
| 3.15 | SNC Parks and Amenities Officer | No objection. Discussions are ongoing regarding commuted sum for children’s play provision and management and maintenance of the open space. |
3.16 NCC Public Rights Of Way

No objection but further clarification as to the type of footways will need to be had to determine if they will be public rights of way or adopted footways and who would ultimately therefore be responsible for them.

3.17 SNC Planning Obligations Coordinator

CIL would cover education and library provision. A condition is required for a fire hydrant to be provided.

3.18 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

The biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy goes some way to alleviating concerns of loss of green space and biodiversity but the Council will still need to satisfy themselves that the loss of local green space and can be fully compensated for and the proposed ecology area will be able to perform the function intended. If approved ongoing conservation management will need to be conditioned.

3.19 Norfolk Police

No comments received

3.20 Representations

57 letters of objection and 16 letters of support received.

Letters of objection on the following grounds:

- Against the concept of building on this historic paddock which is part of an ancient common which has been designated as ‘public open space’ in successive local plans, a designation that has recently been upgraded to ‘important open space’. This is all the more significant in view of the impending development of the village to the north.
- There are already too many new houses planned for Hethersett turning the village into a suburb of Norwich.
- GP surgery cannot cope.
- The site forms the last open/rural site of the village, is the lungs of Hethersett and supports a wide range of wildlife.
- The site is a haven for wildlife.
- Hethersett has already been earmarked for significant development which will stretch the facilities and infrastructure of the village.
- As the Council has a 5 year land supply no further development is either required or wanted.
- Plots 1-3 overlook adjacent property resulting in impacts on privacy, noise and light pollution and will devalue that property.
- A Hethersett Paddock Conservation Group consisting of 12 villagers has been set up and they would be prepared to manage the site for landscape and wildlife preservation with limited access only for schools and groups by prior arrangement.
- The application differs little from that which was withdrawn recently.
- This pasture land is in the centre of the village and its presence is essential in maintaining a pastoral aspect to the community. Apart from the memorial playing field the paddock is the only natural space left in the village.
- The proposed ecology area is unsuitable and would be disturbed during construction in any case.
- Opening the site up to the public including dogs would reduce the presence of wildlife.
- The development would increase volumes of traffic in the vicinity which during school times is congested. This would pose a safety risk.
The scheme is about developers and landowners making money and will be of very little benefit to Hethersett.

If permission is to be granted it should include some of the amenities the village needs such as a larger doctors surgery, larger dentists, larger post office and larger library etc.

The views and concerns of existing residents are not being listened to – too much housing is already approved in Hethersett.

There is no clarity on how construction vehicle access would be controlled as presumable this would come off Queens Road this would be a concern for pedestrian safety.

The type of housing is not right for the village. 1 bed flats are unsuitable for a village location. Affordable housing Hethersett is short of are 2 bed houses. Also bungalows are needed.

The works access through Jaguar Road is not appropriate- the road is narrow and twisted, has cars parked along it and a children’s play area.

The development will increase the likelihood of anti-social behaviour in the area as will provide a pedestrian link through from Queens Road through to the village hall.

The development will exacerbate the existing poor junction at Jaguar Road/Back Lane.

The proposal will exacerbate the existing surface water problems encountered off the paddock on to properties to the north and on Jaguar Road.

The development is contrary to the important local open space policy.

There is no proposed designated parking for the public who will use the public open space.

A moratorium on all future major developments in Hethersett should be imposed until shortcomings in infrastructure are resolved.

Concern if the existing tracking from Back Lane to the site would become a public right of way.

The existing trees form a bat corridor and there is concern that the development will affect this.

Concern how the ecology area would be maintained in the future.

Ponds on the site would be a health and safety risk for children.

More screening would be required on the southern boundary.

Suggests that a hibernation survey for Great Crested Newts needs to be carried out.

There are many Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species recorded around the surrounding area.

Provision of allotments here would be better.

Disturbance of wildlife in particular the resident population of breeding newts.

Challenge the statement of community involvement submitted.

The access through Jaguar Road is inadequate- it is already congested and difficult to traverse.

The proposed public access is incompatible with meaningful enhancement of biodiversity.

Noise and pollution impacts.

Letters of support on the following grounds:

The proposal has been well thought out and considers and actually offers the village something.
- The proposal delivers development on less than half the site and on areas that are clear from ecology and have been previously farmed with sheep.
- The pedestrian route created through the site will be well used and become an important route in time and connect the northern part of the village to the centre and schools.
- The open space in the middle of the site and pedestrian routes through is such a benefit to the village.
- This development is how new housing should be delivered with a low density and attractive green spaces.
- The houses are stylish and tasteful and have been well considered for the space and its context.
- At present the land only benefits a minority, but the proposed development of the land offers so much more to the rest of the village.
- The reports all say there is little in the way of wildlife on the land so development that makes improvements to this and allows the village to have the open space this land was once supposed to be should be allowed.
- Having a new ecology area which will be open to the public with a pond and new plants and trees will be a great benefit to wildlife and local people of Hethersett.
- The proposal is a well-considered, balanced approach to the site providing bio-diversity, public access, affordable housing and amenity space as well as efficient new homes.
- New development brings in new people thus supporting the local shops and facilities.

A further letter of support was received from the applicant with the following key points to address matters raised in objections:
- The proposal will deliver public open space and ecology areas on the land which otherwise would remain in agricultural use.
- The proposed development is likely to allow for the substantial financial investment required for the creation and future management of this new asset to the village.

4. **Assessment**

Site description and proposal

4.1 The application is for the erection of 22 dwellings and provision of 1.83Ha of public open space on a 3.1Ha site which currently consists of a fairly flat grassland area used for grazing, bisected by a central copse, a pond and historic field boundaries. The site is in private ownership with no public access.

4.2 The site is located in Hethersett between Queens Road and Back Lane and sits to the west of the High School. It is located within the defined settlement boundary and is an area that is allocated as public open space by policy HET3 in the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

4.3 The site is a rough square shape centrally with an additional area of land projecting south connecting to Queens Road, and an informal access track which is informally used as a rear access to the High School for pedestrians, to the north-east of the site connecting to Back Lane.

4.4 The relatively narrow frontage to Queens Road is dominated by a mature overgrown hedge and a single storey brick-built telephone exchange is located on the south-west corner, set slightly back from the street.
4.5 Along its western boundary the boundary treatment is varied with fairly low and insubstantial fence and hedging allowing the 5 residential properties that are adjacent to the site to overlook the undeveloped site. There are also a number of trees protected by Tree Presentation Orders which lie outside of the site but along the western boundary.

4.6 To the northern boundary lies the fairly recent residential development on Hawk Close, Bucaneer Way and Jaguar Road and the boundary here is delineated by a 1.8m close boarded fence.

4.7 There is an informal track running along the eastern boundary of the site which is dominated by mature trees. This boundary backs on to the buildings and grounds of Hethersett Academy High School.

4.8 The site is well contained with existing residential development and overgrown hedging to the relatively small boundary on Queens Road such that the application site is not highly visible beyond its immediate context.

4.9 The application is a full application and proposes 22 dwellings, 15 of which would be market and 7 affordable. Vehicular access is proposed from two points. 5 dwellings would be served from a new access from Queens Road. The remaining 15 dwellings would be served from an extension from Jaguar Road from the north. There would be no vehicular permeability through the site.

4.10 Off-site highway works include the widening of the footpath on the Queens Road frontage to a minimum of 1.8m.

4.11 All properties would be two storey comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and apartments and would be located on the northern and eastern boundaries around the perimeter of the copse and proposed open space and ecology areas. The proposed area of public green/open space is 1.83 Ha.

4.12 The existing informal access on the north-eastern boundary of the site is to be stopped up and a portion of the land transferred to the school.

4.13 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development and policy considerations, ecology and trees, design, open space provision, drainage, affordable housing, highway matters and residential amenity.

Principle of the development and policy considerations

4.14 The principle for the application falls to be considered by two key policies from both the existing and emerging policies which whilst similar in their intentions for open space do not have the same policy requirements. Consideration against both policies is set out below.

Existing policy - South Norfolk Local Plan (2003)

4.15 Policy HOU4 indicates that residential development will be permitted within the defined Development limits of Norwich Policy Area settlements including Hethersett provided such development would not prejudice the supply of land for other purposes. It indicates that wherever possible, visually important open spaces within or adjacent to the built up area, the development of which would be detrimental to the character of settlements, have been excluded from Development Limits and are covered by policy IMP3.

4.16 The site is not designated under Policy IMP3 as an important open space, but Policy HET3 does cover the site, which allocates the land for use as public open space in Hethersett.

4.17 Whilst the proposal does involve the erection of dwellings on part of the site (1.27ha), the majority of the site (1.83ha) would be opened up and improved in order to deliver public
open space, as required by the policy. It is therefore considered that the proposal for housing on part of the site would in fact enable and allow the implementation of the local plan policy in opening up the rest of the site for publicly accessible open space, which would otherwise remain private. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with the existing policy HOU4 in permitting new residential development within the development limits and Policy HET3 in delivering public open space on the site.

4.18 In regard to the changing policy context, it is important to consider how much weight is to be attributed to existing and emerging policies. Officers consider that more weight is to be given to the existing policy at this time since the emerging policies are yet to be adopted and the Inspectors report is not yet received. In line with Paragraph 216 of the NPPF some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation but full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be spring 2015.

4.19 Notwithstanding the above, that less weight should be attributed to the emerging policy, as the emerging policy varies to the existing policy, assessment against this policy is also set out below.

Emerging policy

4.20 As there was little reasonable prospect of the site coming forward for public open space in recent years, the emerging policy (policy DM 4.5) has not included the requirement for public open space, it proposes to allocate it instead as an Important Local Open Space. This policy indicates that these sites are designated to be protected and positively improved where opportunities arise. It indicates that these are identified as locally recognised important open spaces and natural environmental assets which are important to local communities and the natural environment.

4.21 With specific regard to this site, the policy advises that the land was allocated for use as public open space in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 to help meet previously identified deficiencies in open space provision in the village. Since that time, the farm buildings have been converted to residential use with some of the former open space allocation now being in residential use. It goes on to advise that the JCS identifies a need for Green Infrastructure in Hethersett. Although this site does not presently afford public access to the countryside, it forms a valuable element of the existing green infrastructure in the village.

4.22 Part b of Policy DM 4.5 advises that on the ‘Important Local Open Spaces’, development will only be permitted where it retains the open character and appearance of the site, where it respects the contribution which the identified open site or open frontage makes to the form and character of the settlement and where there is no significant adverse impact on the setting of any existing building. It goes on to advise that new development impacting on these designated sites will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise.

4.23 Part c of Policy DM 4.5 goes on to advise that developers will need to work with partners to evolve strategies to enable new development sites to contribute most effectively to the opportunities for the establishment and positive improvement of coherent ecological networks, Biodiversity Enhancement Areas and multi-functional Green Infrastructure Networks.

4.24 The site has been argued by local residents to be one of the few remaining green spaces in Hethersett. It sits adjacent to the school playing fields and is surrounded on all other sides by residential development. The site is not highly visible to the wider area from public highways and has limited visual presence within the streetscene with its existing opening on to Back Lane by an unmade access track only, and presence on Queens Road being limited by existing frontage housing development to a large degree. Officers therefore
consider, that notwithstanding the proposed allocation as ‘important local open space’ that the sense of openness the site provides to the wider area from public vantage is limited. It is acknowledged however that the site does provide a sense of openness to those residential properties that immediately adjoin the site.

4.25 Members will note that the emerging policy does not preclude development on the site but instead indicates that development would only be permitted where it respects the contribution which the identified open site makes to the form and character of the settlement and there is no significant adverse impact on any existing building. As detailed above, the application provides 1.83 Ha of open space, with the proposed residential dwellings being located to the north and east side of the site. Officers consider that the usable public open space in the quantum being proposed would respect and in fact, as would be opened up to the southern boundary, enhance the contribution the site makes as an area of open space for Hethersett.

4.26 The proposed dwellings are of an appropriate scale and height and located to ensure that there is no significant adverse impact on any building. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with this part of the emerging policy.

4.27 Part b of the emerging policy concludes that new development impacting on these designated sites will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise. Members will note that whilst the site is currently open, the ecological report indicates that the ecology and habitat the site offers is not special or diverse. The application proposes areas of wild flower meadow, copse and ponds to form an ecology area, retention of mature trees and hedging within the public open space, a planted buffer strip on the western boundary and a ‘green lane’ along the north eastern side of the site to provide a green link between the site and future planned green space to the north (part of Hethersett North Masterplan reference 2011/1804). It is considered that the proposed green spaces and ecology area would result in a positive improvement of this environmental asset and would provide opportunities for the establishment and positive improvement of coherent ecological networks in the area. The proposal would therefore accord with part b and c of emerging policy DM 4.5.

4.28 In summary in respect of the existing and emerging policies, it is considered that the existing policy carries more weight than the emerging policies. However, Officers consider that the application as proposed would accord with both existing and emerging policies as set out above. The principle of the development is therefore considered acceptable.

Sustainable Development

4.29 Further to the above policy context, it is necessary to consider the development in the context of sustainable development.

4.30 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan unless there are other material considerations which indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

4.31 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF confirms that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. 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 but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.32 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development:
Economic Role

4.33 The NPPF highlights the economic role as “contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.”

4.34 The site is within an identified growth location of Hethersett in the Norwich Policy Area and would aid delivery of housing growth advocated in JCS policy 9 and 14. The site is located within the defined development limits of Hethersett within walking distance of its facilities and services. It is considered that there are significant economic benefits to the proposal.

Social Role

4.35 The NPPF confirms the social role as “supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations: and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being.”

4.36 The site is within the development limits of Hethersett and would help contribute to housing delivery in Hethersett, which is an identified location for housing growth in the JCS. It would deliver policy compliant affordable housing.

4.37 The proposal would deliver a high quality built environment and delivery of 1.83 Ha of public open space which would help deliver health, social and cultural well-being of the community. It is therefore considered that the proposal would deliver significant social benefits.

Environmental Role

4.38 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as “contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment: and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”

4.39 The proposed development through the delivery of public open space and ecological enhancement of the site and introduction of dedicated ecology areas would enhance the natural environment and help improve biodiversity. It is therefore considered that the environmental benefits of this development would be significant.

4.40 In summary it is considered that the sustainable location of the development and benefits in all three dimensions amount to the development representing sustainable development. As advocated by para 49 of the NPPF, there is therefore a presumption in favour of this sustainable development.

Ecology and trees

4.41 In respect of landscaping, the scheme has retained a large percentage of the existing trees including all of the best ‘A’ category trees. More importantly these will also be within areas of open space so their long term management will be easier to regulate. It is considered that the schemes layout and design respects the constraints of the main trees and other landscape assets in a sympathetic manner. Whilst some hedgerow removal is proposed this is counteracted by the proposed further planting in the site and the retention of the majority of significant trees. On balance therefore it is considered that the loss some hedgerow would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the landscape character of the site, area or its habitats.
Subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of tree protection, detailed planting proposals and clear management plan for the public domain and open space, it is considered that in respect of trees and landscaping that the proposal is acceptable.

In respect of Ecology, as detailed earlier it is considered that the proposal will result in enhancements to the biodiversity of the site.

The site is currently the remnants of four sheep-grazed fields divided by hedgerows. In the centre of the site is an area of planted woodland dominated by Alder with occasional oak and limited ground flora (the copse).

There are several mature/veteran trees within the site and three natural ponds. The copse currently supports a number of bird species, but the ponds and surrounding improved grassland currently offer little support for biodiversity.

The application is supported by protected species surveys, a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy, an arboricultural impact assessment and a concept sketch masterplan for the central open space.

The surveys submitted, with which the County Ecologist confirms agreement, indicate that: the site does not have the potential to hold common reptiles; Great Crested Newts do not occur at the site; in terms of bats five trees were identified of bat interest and these are to be retained and bat corridor retained; no rare plant species or communities were recorded; some loss of hedgerow would result requiring a removal of hedgerow notice; the succession of habitats on the site from scrubby grassland to woodland would suit most common breeding resident species of birds and some migrant species – the majority of the better bird habitat can be incorporated in the proposed wildlife area and any scrub removal would be undertaken in the winter months.

The report also concludes that if managed correctly and protective fencing placed around the area during construction, the proposed wildlife area would provide a suitable area to hold all species displaced from the housing area. A biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement strategy has been submitted which would be conditioned to ensure the mitigation and enhancement of the site for biodiversity is realised.

The south western field, the central copse and some areas of grassland around it will be retained and enhanced incorporating woodland, hedges, dense scrub, wetland and wildflower grassland.

The copse and ponds will be formed as an Ecology Area open to the public and available for schools to use.

Whilst the site is a habitat for a number of species, the proposal would not result in harm to any species, protected or otherwise, and can adequately be displaced in the proposed wildlife area.

It is considered that the proposal would result in positive improvement for biodiversity and would create appropriate green corridors to link to the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that the proposed green/open space would provide a valuable community asset and subject to conditions to secure precise planting details, the management and maintenance for the area in addition to control of lighting during construction for bats, the Councils Ecologist has confirmed that the proposal is acceptable.

Officers consider therefore that the proposal accords with polices ENV14 and 15 of the SNLP.
Design

4.54 The Council’s Design Officer has carried out a Building for Life and South Norfolk Place making guide evaluation. This secured 11 greens and 1 amber. The Design Officer considers that the site creates a place with a locally inspired character based on traditional building forms and materials but with modern architectural detailing. The layout of the site has a strong character informed by its landscape context and position within an attractive new amenity space and ecology area. This results in a development that responds positively to the overall site context that achieves a distinctive character.

4.55 It is therefore considered that subject to conditions to secure details of materials that the development will comply with NPPF paragraph 7; requiring good design and JCS Policy 2; promoting good design.

Open space/play space

4.56 As discussed in detail earlier in the report the proposal would deliver 1.83Ha of public open space which would implement the aims of policy HET3 in the delivery of public open space on the site.

4.57 Policy LEI7 of the SNLP requires on schemes of 15-24 dwellings a minimum of 400sqm of children’s playspace and this to be well related to serve the dwellings proposed. The Council’s Parks and Amenities Manager has confirmed that given there is an equipped children’s play area on Jaguar Road, in this instance a commuted sum in lieu of any on site provision of play equipment would be preferred to enable this play area to be improved. The applicant has confirmed that a commuted sum is acceptable and discussions are taking place regarding the sum required. This would need to be secured through S106 obligation.

4.58 Discussions are ongoing regarding the future management and maintenance of the open space. This would however be secured by condition.

Drainage

4.59 In respect of foul water, Anglian Water has confirmed there is available capacity for this development.

4.60 The application proposes surface water to discharge into the existing surface water sewer via a pipe network in the road and two shallow swales in the central open space as the infiltration drainage on this site would not be possible due to the high ground water levels.

4.61 The Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the Council’s Flood Officer advise a condition be imposed to require a surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved. Therefore subject to a condition in this respect the proposal would be acceptable in respect of drainage and flood risk.

Affordable Housing

4.62 JCS Policy 4 requires 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. The application proposes 7 dwellings in accordance with the policy. The Councils Strategic Housing Officer has confirmed that the proposed mix and tenure is acceptable. Subject to a S106 to secure the affordable housing the proposal would accord with policy 4 of the JCS.

4.63 The affordable housing units are located in one area in the north-east corner of the site. In this instance, given the small number of dwellings, the single location of affordable housing is considered acceptable as the design approach is consistent with the market dwellings.
Highway Matters

4.64 Vehicular access to the site is proposed from two points. Five dwellings would be served from a new access from Queens Road. The remaining 17 dwellings would be served from an extension from Jaguar Road from the north. There would be no vehicular permeability through the site, only pedestrian access. The Highway Authority has confirmed no objection subject to a number of conditions including provision of a 1.8m wide footway along the site frontage on Queens Road, which has now been included on an amended plan, details of future management and maintenance of the roads, and details of on-site construction vehicle parking.

4.65 The application proposes sufficient parking in accordance with the Councils parking standards in accordance with policy TRA19 of the SNLP.

4.66 Therefore subject to the imposition of conditions the proposal is not considered to result in any adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic or highway safety and would accord with policy 6 of the JCS and policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

Residential amenity

4.67 Policy IMP9 of the SNLP requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

4.68 Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties largely relate to those properties to the north of the site. The distance of the properties to this boundary and the control of windows for bathroom/landing type uses and obscure glazing at first floor level would ensure that the proposed dwellings would not result in any adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of those properties to the north. To all other boundaries there is sufficient distance between the proposed dwellings and existing dwellings and or boundary screening to ensure no significantly adverse overlooking would result from the proposed development.

4.69 In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity. Furthermore gardens of sufficient size and shape for their intended purpose are proposed and adequate space for on-site parking provided. The amenity of future residents is therefore considered acceptable.

Sustainable construction and energy efficiency

4.70 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of the building, the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. The D&A submitted with the application indicates how this will be addressed including dwellings incorporating solar panels, wood burning stoves, air source heat pumps or waste-heat recovery on drainage. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Education

4.71 Given the recent examination of the Wymondham Area Action Plan there are known capacity issues for education in Hethersett and Wymondham. Therefore having regard to the NPPF, consideration should be given to whether this development would result in unsustainable pressure being placed on the education resources of Hethersett and unsustainable transport practices and poor social cohesion if children do not attend school where they live. It is considered in this case, that due to the very low numbers of children associated with this development, the proposals would not lead to a significant impact in
terms of community cohesion, education provision and transport movements and would not merit refusal of this application on this ground.

Other matters

4.72 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.73 The application has been screened but does not require an Environmental Statement. The reasoning for this is given in the Screening Opinion associated for this application.

4.74 The proposal would not affect the integrity of any internationally protected sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation) individually or in accumulation with other permitted development and extant consents in the surrounding area and therefore, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, it is considered that the development would not have a significant impact on any protected habitats and accordingly no Appropriate Assessment of the development is required.

Section 106 agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4.75 The application is liable for CIL and would be payable on commencement of the scheme. Should consent be granted a S106 would need to be entered into to cover the following: Affordable Housing, open space provision and a management and maintenance company for the open space, financial contribution in lieu of on-site play equipment.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The scheme would assist in delivering housing and is also considered to represent sustainable development. The scheme would also provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing and would implement policy HET3 with the Council’s aspirations for the site to deliver public open space. The proposed open space and ecology area would secure ecological enhancements to the site and would make a valuable contribution to local green infrastructure. Whilst it is recognised that there is local concern in relation to the proposed development on this land, the proposals are considered to deliver public and ecological benefits through public access to the site and an improved biodiversity value to the site.

5.2 The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions listed above and the completion of a S106 legal agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2014/2642/RVC  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
Applicants Name : Mr Mark Dickinson  
Site Address : Land South Of Hall Farm Bungay Road Tasburgh Norfolk  
Proposal : Variation of conditions 3 and 17 of permission 2014/0562/F - Installation of a solar PV array plus ancillary development changes to arboricultural assessment as a result of minor changes to layout.

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve subject to no new material issues being raised in the remainder of the consultation period which expires on 5th February 2015, subject to the following conditions:

1. Temporary 30 year permission  
2. Decommissioning scheme  
3. In accordance with plans  
4. Construction worker parking  
5. Construction Traffic Management and access plan  
6. Wheel washing  
7. Hours of construction  
8. Construction Management Plan Noise and Dust  
9. Surface Water Drainage  
10. Landscaping details to be agreed  
11. Landscape habitat management and maintain  
12. Retention of trees and hedges  
13. No external lighting unless agreed  
14. Details of CCTV to be agreed  
15. No loud speakers or warning devices  
16. Scheme of archaeology  
17. Tree protection

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be 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  
DM4.2 Renewable Energy  
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
1.6 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

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.

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.” It should be noted that the Barnwell Manor case principles (see above) are of similar application in the context of s72 duties, also, - i.e. considerable importance and weight must be given.

2. Planning History


2.2 2014/2483 Discharge of conditions 5 - Construction Traffic Management, 6 - Wheel cleaning, 8 - Construction management plan - noise and dust and 9 - surface water drainage of planning permission 2014/0562. Approved

2.3 2014/2420 Discharge of condition 16 - Archaeological Mitigation of permission 2014/0562/F Approved

2.4 2014/0562 Installation of a solar PV array plus ancillary development. Approved

2.5 2013/0542 Screening Opinion for a proposed solar photovoltaic development Environmental Impact Assessment not required

2.6 2010/1310 Erection of 16,000 bird Free Range Egg Unit, 3 x feed silos, Access Way and Hard Standing, Underground Tank Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Long Stratton Parish Council No comments

Tasburgh Parish Council No comments received

Thornton Parish Council No comments received
3.2 District Members
   Clr F Ellis          To be reported if appropriate
   Clr T Blowfield     To be reported if appropriate
   Clr A Pond          To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Landscape Officer
   No significant issues
   - There were some discrepancies and ambiguities on the original information submitted, but these were adequately corrected. The precise details of work to trees will be agreed through the landscape management plan as conditioned.

3.4 Other Representations
   One letter of support
   - Will help with CO₂ emissions
   - This site does not impact too much on the scenery and views of many residents

4 Assessment

4.1 Planning permission was granted last year for a solar farm with associated equipment on a 30 hectare land south of Hall Farm in Tasburgh. This application was considered by Development Management Committee on 15th October 2014 and subsequently approved. The report for this original application to committee is attached as Appendix 2 to this report. This current application being brought before Members for consideration is to vary conditions 3 and 17, which propose very minor changes to the layout including removing the access track from the area of archaeological importance, which along with refining the tree survey on site has resulted in some changes to the arboricultural report recommendations.

4.2 The changes will which will result in the pruning of a category B and a category C tree, and removal of a category C and a category U tree. The tree protection measures have also been updated and are still considered to be acceptable. The Landscape Officer is content with the proposed changes which will not compromise the integrity of the scheme in accordance with the NPPF, policy 2 in the Joint Core Strategy and IMP2 in the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.3 The previous committee report (Appendix 2) considered the original scheme. There have been no changes to material planning considerations to change the overall acceptability of the proposed development. This report considers the acceptability of the amendments proposed as detailed above. The rest of the scheme remains the same as the approved application and there are no other impacts on residential amenity, the setting of surrounding heritage assets, highway safety, surface water drainage and biodiversity given the very minor changes proposed to the landscaping.

4.4 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.5 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as it creates no new floorspace.

5 Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion the minor changes to the layout and the arboricultural report are not significant and do not result any significant changes in terms of the impact or acceptability of the solar farm.
5.2 The solar farm would have a 15MW capacity which is estimated to 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 which identifies communities have a responsibility to contribute to the provision of renewable energy.

5.3 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 limited harm to the setting of the grade I listed St Marys Church at Thorston however, but this current application does not worsen this impact, and as previously reported 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 acceptable in planning terms and is recommended for approval.

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

5. **Appl. No**: 2014/1903/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Julian Freeman  
Site Address: Little Dial Farm  Station Road Spooner Row Wymondham NR18 9SP

Proposal: Change of use of Land for Self Storage Purposes (B8 usage) and the siting of Storage Containers

Recommendation: Refusal  
1 Unsustainable location of development

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
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 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be 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  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM2.1 Employment and business development

1.6 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:  

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.
S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.” It should be noted that the Barnwell Manor case principles (see above) are of similar application in the context of s72 duties, also, - i.e. considerable importance and weight must be given.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 There is no relevant planning history for the application site.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Recommend approval.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways No objections subject to conditions regarding parking and turning area and visibility splays.

3.4 Ecologist No objections.

3.5 Conservation Officer No objections - The location for the containers is some distance away from the farmhouse and outside of its immediate curtilage. The proposal would not cause harm to views of the farmhouse or its setting.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections.

3.7 Other Representations One letter of objection from Gurney Reeve (company opposite) - concerns regarding additional traffic and unsuitable access.

4. **Assessment**

Proposal

4.1 The proposal is for the change of use of the land for storage purposes (B8 use) and the installation of 38 storage containers for the purposes of providing self-storage facilities to both domestic and commercial customers at Little Dial Farm, Station Road, Spooner Row. The containers would be 6.09m long x 2.43m wide x 2.69m tall. Also proposed is a permeable roadway to access the containers, concrete bases and a new gate. The applicant states that the proposal would create one new full time job and provide an income which could be invested into the proposals for egg and fruit juice production from the site.

4.2 The site is the northern part of an agricultural field at Little Dial Farm, with Station Road immediately to the north east and London Road to the north west. It is approximately halfway between the towns of Wymondham and Attleborough, with the nearest village being Spooner Row. It is surrounded by mature hedgerows. The farmhouse, a grade II listed building occupied by the applicant, lies to the south east, and the driveway for this property would also form the access to the site. The A11 is in close proximity to the south and opposite the site entrance are premises occupied by Gurney Reeve and Co., a company manufacturing sweeping and materials handling equipment. The land is designated as open countryside within the current adopted South Norfolk Local Plan.
4.3 The main considerations are the principle of development, visual impact of the development including on the listed building and wider countryside, impact on highways and impact on neighbouring occupiers.

Principle of development

4.4 Previously this type of proposal would have been considered under policies ENV 8 and EMP 4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), however these policies are not consistent with the NPPF in relation to employment development which promotes a less restrictive approach to economic development proposals. Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) states that farm diversification, home working, small and medium scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified will be acceptable in the countryside. In addition some weight can be attached to policies DM 1.3 and DM 2.1 of the Development Management Policies Document (Proposed Submission Version).

4.5 Policy DM 1.3 requires proposals to positively contribute towards sustainable development. Proposals should be located on allocated sites or within the defined development boundaries of settlements. Where the proposal is for a new employment site within the countryside, Policy DM 2.1 emphasises a preference for proposals that: would re-use redundant rural buildings and hard standings; are located on sites well related to rural towns and villages and it is demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available; and that would create accessible jobs and business opportunities in the rural area.

Farm diversification

4.6 Further information was requested from the applicant regarding the scale of the existing farm business, to establish whether the proposal can properly be considered a farm diversification project. The total size of the site is 3.6 hectares. The site has previously been used for horse breeding and the applicants have continued this use, but this is not an agricultural use. The applicants also carry out small scale egg production, and have planted a number of fruit trees for future production of fruit juices for sale. There are plans to expand both the egg production and fruit growing. It is argued that the proposed storage business would facilitate this process.

4.7 From an assessment of the information provided, it is considered that the land concerned is small for a farm and does not currently constitute a viable farming business. The application cannot therefore be considered to represent a typical farm diversification scheme, although it would no doubt introduce a new income stream which would assist the applicant in bringing the land into a more productive use.

4.8 Information has been submitted which seeks to demonstrate that there are no other suitable commercial sites available within a 10 mile radius of the application site.

4.9 Whilst the availability of suitable sites is not necessarily disputed, the proposal is on a greenfield site and is not well related to an existing town or village, when it is likely that most customers of the business would come from nearby towns such as Wymondham and Attleborough. The proposed business is not one that demands a rural location, and therefore does not meet the requirements of Policy 17 of the JCS. In addition the proposal does not fall within the criteria of section (7) of policy DM 2.1 of the emerging Development Management Policies Document, and would conflict with guidance within the NPPF and policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy, which seek to reduce carbon emissions and the causes of climate change.

4.10 Visual impact of the development including on the listed building and wider countryside.
The site is well screened from public view by mature hedgerows so there would be a limited visual impact on the wider countryside. Although there would be some visual impact in that it would affect the approach to the listed building, the location of the containers would be some distance away from the building and outside of its immediate curtilage. The Listed Building officer raises no objection in terms of the impact on the setting of the heritage asset.

4.11 On balance, in terms of the visual impact, there is considered to be no material conflict with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan in so far as they safeguard the landscape character and appearance of the area.

Impact on Highways

4.12 The applicant estimates that 90% of the storage containers would be let for domestic clients wishing to store their possessions. The combined vehicle movements predicted therefore would be approximately 2.7 vehicle movements per day.

4.13 The Highway Officer raises no objection subject to conditions requiring confirmation of parking/turning areas within the site and an improved access/visibility splay. The land adjoining the access is within the control of the applicant and therefore adequate visibility would be achieved. The proposal complies with policy IMP 08 of the South Norfolk Local Plan in that it would not prejudice highway safety.

Impact on neighbouring occupiers

4.14 Policy IMP 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan requires development proposals to safeguard residential amenity. Aside from the farmhouse there are no other residential properties within the immediate vicinity of the site. Given the low number of vehicle movements anticipated and relatively low noise impact of the proposal, it is considered there would be no material harm to neighbouring occupiers. One letter of objection has been received, from the business opposite the site (Gurney Reeve and Co.) raising concern about the impact of additional vehicle movements and the suitability of the access. However, as reported above, the Highway Authority are satisfied with the scheme.

Conclusion

5.1 The proposal would bring economic benefits in that it would create one new job and bring in income for the applicants which they could use to develop their egg and fruit production plans. In this sense it accords with guidance within then NPPF which seeks to promote the development of the rural economy. In addition the operations would not be particularly visible due to the high level of screening at the site.

5.2 On the other hand the proposal would lead to the development of a greenfield site which is not well related to a designated settlement, for a use which does not require a countryside location, and would give rise to additional vehicle movements, running counter to guidance within the NPPF which aims for sustainable patterns of development which minimise carbon emissions.

5.3 Furthermore the proposal is not consistent with emerging local policy which states a preference for locating employment on allocated sites, within development boundaries, or by re-using previously developed buildings and/or land. On balance, it is considered the proposal does not represent a sustainable form of development and this outweighs the relatively modest benefits of the scheme. For this reason, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.
5.4 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new floor space would be created.

6. Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposal is for the development of a greenfield site in the open countryside for a business use which does not necessitate a rural location. The proposed development site is not well related to an existing designated settlement and therefore does not represent a sustainable form of development. This conflicts with policies 1 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, policies 1.3 and 2.1 of the Development Management Policies Document (Proposed Submission Version), and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2014/2359/F  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

Applicants Name: Mrs Alison Clarke  
Site Address: Buildings At Twin Barn Farm, Ketteringham Lane, Hethersett Norfolk

Proposal: Demolish Barn 1 and replace with new dwelling. Conversion of existing Barn 2 to workshop, garage, machinery store and boiler room associated with the adjacent proposed new dwelling. Conversion of existing agricultural cart-sheds to 4 small scale workshops / starter units, for local trades and crafts (mixture of B1 and B8, see planning statement for more details).

Recommendation: Refusal  
1 Contrary to policy ENV8 of SNLP and NPPF para. 55  
Subject to views of Highway Authority

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 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be 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  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety  
DM4.2 Renewable Energy  
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM2.10 Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
2. Planning History

2.1 No recent Planning History

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  No views or comments

3.2 District Members

Clr Dale  To be determined by Committee
- Whilst Hethersett enjoys several Office employment opportunities, sadly for those who are of a practical skill set, there is almost nothing.
- It’s my belief that currently there is only 1 location in Hethersett where artisan type employment can happen.
- This application, if suitably conditioned will provide 4 workshops over and above that required by the site owner.

Clr Bills  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Flood Defence Officer  No objections subject to conditions

3.4 NCC Highways  To be reported

3.5 Ecologist  No objections subject to conditions

3.6 Other Representations  3 letters of objection
- Residential development on land outside development boundary.
- Development boundaries are there to protect our beautiful countryside and prevent sprawl.
- Concerned about number of units proposed and the additional traffic on a very narrow lane, quite dangerous and over-used.
- No need for a residential dwelling for such a workplace.
- Previous applications refused on this site and others in the lane in accordance with policy which we thought remained in force.
- The buildings to be converted have little or no historic or vernacular merit to conserve.
- Consent given for the adjacent site due to its unique design and sustainability, and will be the largest code level 6 development in Eastern England so cannot be compared to this application.
- 28 jobs would mean 28 cars on site for which there is insufficient parking.
- Large number of customer visits, 7 days operation, noise and disturbance, industrial development would be detrimental to residential amenities.

If minded to approve, request via formal legal documentation the following:
- Commercial elements are developed prior to works starting on the residential dwelling.
- No further residential development be permitted on the remainder of the site.
4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the following:
- The erection of a sustainable, energy efficient contemporary dwelling
- The conversion of existing cart-shed/barns to 4 workshop units for local craft and trade workshops falling into B1/B8 uses
- The conversion of modern farm building to workshop, storage and bio mass boiler to be used in association with the dwelling for the clients furniture making and restoration business

4.2 To the southwest of the site is open countryside and to the northwest is the site which gained planning permission under 2012/1061 for a carbon neutral dwelling as an exception to normal policy under Para 55 of the NPPF. To the northeast and southeast is Ketteringham Lane with open countryside beyond and to the southwest/south are residential properties and associated land.

4.3 The main issues in this case are: the principle of development in this location and design; employment; and highway safety.

Principle of development and design

4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development but development in conflict with Development Plan policies should still be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. However, the Council does have an up-to-date housing supply and local plan policies, including policy ENV8, should therefore continue to be given full weight.

4.5 In terms of policy, the site is outside any development boundary or village limit and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under this policy and therefore the erection of a new dwelling in this location is contrary to that policy. An exception to the above is Paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:
- The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work;
- Such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- Re-use of redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting;
- The exceptional quality or because of the innovative nature of the design. Such a design should:
  o Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural area;
  o Reflect the highest standards in architecture;
  o Significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
  o Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

4.6 The submitted design and access statement and supporting documents sets out that the development will reflect high quality 'low-cost, low-tech, high-performance' architecture. The application, however, does not demonstrate that the development would be of exceptional quality or be innovative to the extent that it would justify granting consent under paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

4.7 The applicant's agent has stated that 'the dwelling is considered to be the linchpin for the success of this development as it allows the client on-site maintenance of his furniture making and restoration business. Being able to live on the development will also allow the client to efficiently manage and maintain the other workshop units, ensuring economic
sustainability and appropriate ongoing usage of the development. It is believed that without the client's dwelling situated on the site, this development would be unfeasible for the client as off-site accommodation would make managing the business and associated workshop units insurmountably difficult.'

4.8 Whilst I fully appreciate the advantages of having a dwelling on site, it is by no means unusual to have an employment development without on-site residential accommodation. I do not consider that the above factors provide adequate justification for a new dwelling in the countryside in conflict with policy ENV8 and the circumstances do not satisfy the exception criteria stated in Para 55 set out above.

Employment development

4.9 In respect of the conversion of the existing buildings for employment uses, these elements of the development accord in principle with policies set out in the NPPF and the JCS which support the re-use of existing rural buildings for economic uses. With appropriate conditions, I consider the employment use of the site could be approved without unacceptable harm to the visual or residential amenities of the area. This does not, however, justify the erection of a new dwelling.

Highways

4.10 In pre-application discussions the highway officer advised that the current level of visibility from the site entrance was very poor in both directions, owing to outgrowing vegetation, and therefore recommended that splays of at least 2.4 metres by 59 metres be provided in both directions. At the time of writing this report the highway officer’s formal comments have not been received and his comments will be reported orally at the committee meeting.

4.11 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. This application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

5.1 Whilst the importance of supporting employment development is recognised, the erection of a dwelling on this site would conflict with the South Norfolk Local Plan and the NPPF policy and employment elements of the proposal do not justify approval of a new dwelling contrary to policy. Therefore I recommend that the application be refused.

6. Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposed development is outside any Development Limit or Village Boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan. In the absence of any special need identified the proposal conflicts with policy ENV8. The South Norfolk Norwich Policy Area has a residential land supply, so the overriding presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Although the design is intended to be sustainable and energy efficient, that alone is not sufficient for the design to be considered as truly outstanding or innovative. In view of the above the proposal is contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policy 2 and South Norfolk Local Plan policy ENV8. Because the proposal development conflicts with the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations that override it, including the criteria set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the proposal is refused in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail:  ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2014/2378/RVC  
**Parish**: FORNCETT

Applicants Name : Orchard Developments  
Site Address : Fourways Long Stratton Road Fornsett St Peter Norfolk  
Proposal : Variation of condition 5 of planning permission 2012/1615/F - Boundary Treatment and Removal of condition 13 of planning permission 2012/1615/F - Junction of Norwich Road with long Stratton Road. (Seeking approval of specific details for visibility splays and boundary treatments as shown on the submitted drawings in lieu of the conditions)

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. In accordance with approved details  
2. External materials  
3. Tree planting  
4. Boundary treatment  
5. Retention trees and hedges  
6. Tree protection Plan  
7. Access Gates - Configuration  
8. Provision of parking, service  
9. Surface Water Drainage  
10. Foul sewage connection  
11. No alterations to lose garage

Subject to satisfactory amended plans

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
TRA 19: Parking standards

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
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 Housing Quality
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place making guide

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/2317 Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1615/F - revision of house and garage on Plot 3
Refused

2.2 2012/1615 Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 detached houses and garages and ancillary works
Approved

Appeal History

2.3 2014/2317 Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1615/F - revision of house and garage on Plot 3
Dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Application should be refused
- Conditions just as important for safety, in perpetuity, as they were on the day they were imposed
- At the time of original application Parish Council recommended two houses leaving a large gap between Norwich Road and the first house
- Developer has known of condition. If the developer is sure that the conditions are not needed for safety grounds an application should have been made immediately after first imposed.
- If condition creates problems for future occupiers the design should have been amended
- Developer says that larger visibility splays are not required because there is no evidence of the junction being an accident black spot. This could be because there has been no tall vegetation fence or hedging in the area
- The safety fencing and vegetation on site have demonstrated that any obstruction to a clear line of vision is a potential hazard

3.2 District Member The original condition should be held to. This development as a whole has not been to the advantage of Fornett from its inception.

3.3 NCC Highways It is not considered that a highway objection can be raised due to recommendations made in the Manual for Streets document with reference to vision splays.

3.4 Landscape Officer No comments received
3.5 Other Representations

5 letters of objection

- Imprudent to revoke condition
- Property is dominant and imposing that it detracts from any driver approaching junction
- Access could be compromised by boundary treatment higher than 0.9 metres. In fact strong case for ground level boundary
- At times junction and feeder roads will be overburdened with vehicles. Any reduction in visibility will be to the detriment of the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians
- Relevant to note types of vehicles that use junction
- Restrict view approaching junction
- On site visit required
- Visibility problems still apply
- Developer knew condition applied and should never attempt to rescind this condition
- Allowing height of fencing and hedging to creep up will reduce visibility further
- The open nature of boundary is detrimental to occupier but this was evident when planning site layout
- Consent granted on clear understanding good open visibility maintained. Developer should have taken this into account in the design and layout
- Anything higher than mown grass level is too high

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located within the development limits for Forncett End and Taconeston. The site is located on the eastern corner of the Long Stratton Road, Norwich Road, Tabernacle Road and Common Road junction.

4.2 Planning consent was given under planning application 2012/1615/F for the demolition of a bungalow and erection of 3 detached houses and garages and ancillary works. The planning consent was approved at the Development Management Committee on 27 March 2013. The permission included condition No.5 that states:

"No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the buildings are first occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter."

4.3 Due to concern with regard to highway safety the members of the committee directed officers to negotiate to ensure the front garden area to plot 1 would not have any structures or planting which would reduce the current visibility splay. This was dealt with by an additional condition No.13 on the approval notice which states:

"Prior to works commencing on site and notwithstanding the submitted approved drawings a plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, for written approval, which details the retention of the open nature of the site at the junction of Long Stratton Road and Norwich Road. The plan shall cross reference the approved tree planting and boundary treatment and shall be implemented and retained as approved in perpetuity."
4.4 This application is for the revocation of condition 13 and the amendment of condition 5 because the applicant considers the conditions are unreasonable and to the detriment of the residential amenity that the future occupiers of Plot 1 may reasonably expect. Due to the Committee Members involvement in the imposition of Condition 13 this application has been brought back before the Development Management Committee for a decision.

4.5 The reasons suggested by the applicant’s agent for the revocation of Condition 13 are:

- Highways have offered no objection to the development as long as the verge is maintained, the proposal is for a 900 mm high three railed timber fence to be erected on land behind the highway boundary. The fence will be similar to that already erected on Bentley Road. [Officer Note: the application also proposes a 2100mm close board fence along the highway boundary of Norwich Road adjacent the rear and side of plot 1 where the land is lower than highway level]

- The development provides parking for each of the three dwellings in accordance with the county parking standards. The retention and improvements of the existing access arrangements provides for loading and turning in accordance with the county parking standards.

- The highway visibility splay requirements at the junction of Long Stratton Road to Norwich road are as Table 7 in the Manual for Streets (2.4m X 43m). In practice, visibility splays to the north can be achieved measuring 2.4m X 116.7m or 3.2m X 82.6m as shown on the submitted plan.

- All visibility splays are on land within the ownership of Norfolk County Highways and a longer splay than required is already in use at the junction.

- The development does not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

- The development without Condition 13 will not be detrimental to the functionality or safety of the highway network and satisfies the requirements of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.6 The reasons suggested by the agent for the amendments to condition 5 are:

- The footpath to Norwich Road is 400 mm higher than ground level abutting the dwelling, the approved boundary fence (1.8m) is to be increased in height by 300 mm to compensate the difference in levels.

- The windows to the shower room and sitting room in plot 1 are more open to view from the footpath and therefore the length of close boarded fencing is to be extended to improve the residential amenity.

- The open nature of the boundary is detrimental to the future occupiers of the properties, a three railed timber fence at a height of 900 mm is to be erected along the boundary of the site in front of plot 2 and 3 and with a privet hedge planted behind the fence on plot 1.

4.7 The agent also highlights paragraphs from the National Planning Policy Framework in support of the application.

4.8 There have been concerns raised with regard to this application from the District Member, the Parish Council and local residents.
4.9 The Highways Officer considers that a highways objection cannot be raised to the revised proposals due to the recommendations of the document Manual for Streets. The document recommends that vision splays are measured from a setback distance at the centre of the minor road of 2.4 metres. As submitted the fence along Norwich Road is set back behind this line at about 3.5 metres from the road edge and is also behind the highway verge. The manual does not recommend that set back distances are used for vision purposes greater than 2.4 metres.

4.10 The applicant’s agent has argued the need for the increase of height to the fence to protect the amenities of the occupiers of the new dwelling. Although this is appreciated, given the character of the immediate area which is predominantly hedging and vegetation, the erection of a 2.1 metre high close boarded fence would have a potential negative impact on the area. A compromise would be to set the fence back and plant a hedge of a native variety on the road side of the hedge.

4.11 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 Because the proposed layout of boundary treatments allows visibility splays that accord with the advice in Manual for Streets and is not objected to by the Highway Authority, I consider that a refusal of this application to remove condition 13 would be difficult to justify and defend at appeal.

5.2 The appearance of the boundary treatments and planting as proposed pursuant to condition 5 is acceptable, although the proposed 2.1m fence would appear rather harsh in this location. Negotiations are continuing to request the fence is set further back to allow room for planting in front of it, without obstructing the visibility splay. An update on this negotiation will be given orally at the Committee meeting.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Reports

1. **Enforcement Ref**: 2014/8068  
   **Parish**: SCOLE
   **Site Address**: Land North of Exchange Lodge, Low Road, Scole  
   **Development**: Standing of shipping container and storage of building materials on allotment land  
   **Developer**: Mr Andy Robinson

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to our attention that building materials were being stored on the land and a steel shipping container had been sited on the allotment land. These have been left on the land by the builder following the completion of the works to replace the telephone exchange with single storey dwelling exchange to the south of the site.

1.2 The owner of the land was invited to remove the container and stored items or submit an application for planning permission to regularise the situation. The materials have not been removed from the site and the steel shipping container remains.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)  
   JCS 2 Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   ENV8 – Development in The Open Countryside

2.4 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.

2.5 Development Management Policies  
   DM 3.9 Design Principles applying to all development

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3.1 2012/1239 Demolition of old telephone exchange building and erection of new dwelling (re-submission of 2012/0716/F) with part change of use small area of side allotment for adjacent parking.  
   **Approved**

3.2 2012/1240/F Demolition of old telephone exchange Building (re-submission of 2012/0717/CA)  
   **Approved**
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The site is located outside any defined development boundary or limit where the principle of development would only normally be supported if requisite for agriculture or justified to sustain economic and social activity in rural locations.

4.2 The site was specifically excluded from the application for the replacement of the existing telephone exchange with a new single storey dwelling as it formed part of an existing allotment and its inclusion within the curtilage of dwelling was not considered appropriate.

4.3 Whilst I appreciate there are other modest buildings on the adjacent allotment plots, for example, sheds and greenhouses that are normally associated with allotments there are no other buildings/structures of this scale.

4.4 The siting and design of the shipping container in this location due to its size, scale and design constitutes a visual intrusion which is not considered appropriate in this location. Furthermore the storage of building materials and items not associated with the allotment use also constitute a visual intrusion which is not considered appropriate in this location.

5. **Recommendation**

5.1 That enforcement action be authorised to secure the removal of the shipping container and all stored items not incidental to the allotment use.

Contact Officer: Andy Baines  
Telephone Number: 01508 533840  
E-mail: abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals received from 18/12/2014 to 23/01/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/0832</td>
<td>Broome Land To Rear Of 179 Yarmouth Road Broome Norfolk</td>
<td>Mrs Alison Neilsen</td>
<td>Erection of two storey residential dwelling with detached garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
#### Appeals decisions from 18/12/2014 to 23/01/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/0725</td>
<td>Pulham St Mary Land East Of Semere Green Road (forming Part Of Upper Vaun...</td>
<td>Upper Vaunces Wind Farm Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of three wind turbines (maximum 126m in height) and associated development for a period of 25 years, including control building, electricity transformers, underground cabling, access tracks, crane hardstandings and vehicular access</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed by Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0025</td>
<td>Bramerton Land East Of Orchard House The Street Bramerton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Neil Walker</td>
<td>Proposed 8 no residential units, with associated garages, parking, garden and related infrastructure.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>