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.

Other applications

1
Appl. No : 2013/0963/F
Parish : KESWICK AND INTWOOD
Applicants Name : Mr T Donena
Site Address : Land South of Railway and East of Intwood Road, Intwood, Norfolk
Proposal : Retrospective application for Pole Barn for wood storage and beehives for maintenance and repair, and retention of caravan and sheds.

Decision : Members voted 8-2 for APPROVAL
Approved with conditions
1. Retained in accordance with submitted drawings
2. No commercial activities on site

Updates
Correction to replace paragraph 5.2 with the following text:

The site contains a number of structures which are ancillary to the woodland management and beekeeping activities which take place on the land. There is no commercial activity associated with the site. Although the applicant has the occasional barbeque on the land this only occurs on an infrequent basis, and therefore does not constitute a material change of use. Should this intensify in the future, a further permission for leisure use may be required. The planting of the southern boundary has enhanced the landscape and provides ecology benefits. The application as submitted and conditioned accords with policies ENV8, ENV14, ENV15, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Oral update –The flood risk area is identified as zone 1 for the buildings/structures, therefore a flood risk assessment is not required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>2015/0095/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>TIBENHAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Declan Lohan  
**Site Address**: Land South of The Poplars, Low Road, Tibenham, Norfolk  
**Proposal**: New residential dwelling  
**Decision**: Members voted 6-4 for **APPROVAL** (contrary to officer recommendation)  

Authorise the Director of Growth & Localism to approve with conditions, as appropriate.  
Subject to satisfactory ecology report being submitted and agreed  

**Reason for Overturning Officer Recommendation**  
Design had a degree of excellence, given context, and was considered to be in-keeping with landscape, in accordance with Paragraph 55 of the NPPF.  

**Updates**  
The applicant has instructed an Ecologist to carry out the necessary site inspections/surveys in order to prepare an ecology report. The applicant would be pleased to receive a conditional approval, should the committee be minded to approve the scheme, based on the findings of the ecology report.  

With regard to the location of the site, the applicant’s agent has commented that: “as a result of modern living the majority of county villages, especially villages classified as ‘other’ do not offer the type of services that were available two or three decades ago. There are generally few village shops and post offices and also very few frequent bus services to employment centres, as such the issue of sustainability is somewhat in question.  

It is unreasonable, in strict policy terms, to insist that all new development in village locations is to be within easy pedestrian access of the necessary facilities and transport services and accessible by suitable pavements. This does not and cannot happen in these rural locations.  

In interpreting the policy there must be an element of common sense and not a point blank refusal on policy terms for individual development. This type of development after all is how villages have both evolved and survived historically.”