Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that planning application Item Nos 1 & 2 will be heard from 10.00am

Planning application Item Nos 3 - 13 will be heard from 1.00 pm onwards

Pool of Substitutes
To be confirmed

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am Blomefield Room

Date
Wednesday 3 June 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 on items 1 or 2, and arrive at 1.00pm if you intend to speak on items 3 to 13.

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

26/05/2015
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 8)

4. Minutes of the meetings of the Development Management Committee held on 29 April 2015;
   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 21)

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>2014/2495/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Between London Road And Suton Lane London Road</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/2611/O</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Land North And South Of Dereham Road</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014/1743/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Brooke House Care Home Brooke Gardens</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2014/2576/CU</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>9 Rectory Road Dickleburgh</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/0186/CU</td>
<td>ALBURGH</td>
<td>South Farm Tunbeck Road Alburgh</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/0445/CU</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Waveney Farm Shop High Road Wortwell</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/0564/O</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Subdivision Of Garden Of 72 Common Road Bressingham</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/0697/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Storage Land (Citygate Developments) William Frost Way</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/0698/F</td>
<td>EARSHAM</td>
<td>Subdivision Of Garden Of Sunrise Church Road</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/0771/H</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/0772/LB</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/0848/H</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>30 Brecon Road Brooke</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/0892/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Venta Icenorum (Roman Town) Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>116</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. Planning Appeals (for information);  

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 24 June 2015 (in Colman and Cavell Rooms)
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;
  - Objectors(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 much time you have used 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 left or right 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 | G | Proposal by Government Department |
| AD | Certificate of Alternative Development | H | Householder – Full application relating to residential property |
| AGF | Agricultural Determination – approval of details | HZ | Hazardous Substance |
| C | Application to be determined by County Council | LB | Listed Building |
| CA | Conservation Area | LE | Certificate of Lawful Existing development |
| CU | Change of Use | LP | Certificate of Lawful Proposed development |
| D | Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent) | O | Outline (details reserved for later) |
| EA | Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Opinion | RVC | Removal/Variation of Condition |
| ES | Environmental Impact Assessment – Scoping Opinion | SU | Proposal by Statutory Undertaker |
| F | Full (details included) | 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 S A L P | Site Specific Allocations and 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Related pecuniary interest

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.

YES

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

NO

Other Interest

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

YES

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 29 April 2015 at 10.00 am.

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

Apologies: Councillor Y Bendle, L Hornby and L Neal

Substitute Members: Councillor B Riches (for Y Bendle) and L Webster (for L Neal) (for part of meeting)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Planning Decisions and Enforcement Team Leader (C Trett), the Place-Shaping and Major Projects Team Leader (J Hobbs), the Senior Planning Officers (C Curtis, C Raine and R Webb) and the Planning Officer (J Jackson)

(the press and 51 members of the public were in attendance)

199. 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 4 2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>All (except L Webster)</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6 2014/2239/F</td>
<td>FORNCETT</td>
<td>All (except L Webster)</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7 2014/2634/F</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>L Webster</td>
<td>Predetermined. Member left the committee and did not take part in discussion or voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9 2015/0167/F</td>
<td>BURGH ST PETER</td>
<td>M Gray C Gould</td>
<td>Other interest – Members of the Broads Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12 2015/0518/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13 2015/0615/A</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14 2015/0581/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15 2015/0631/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16 2015/0703/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest – the applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
200. MINUTES

Subject to a slight amendment, the minutes of the Development Management Committee dated 1 April 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

201. 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>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Item 1 2014/1969/D | WYMONDHAM        | Mr C Cooper, Objector  
                              | Ms L Townes, Agent for Applicant               |
| Item 2 2014/2042/D | WYMONDHAM        | Ms L Townes, Agent for Applicant               |
| Item 4 2015/0075/F | KETTERINGHAM     | Ms A Jordan, Parish Council  
                              | Mr C Griffiths, Objector  
                              | Mrs C Sheridan, for the Applicant              |
| Item 6 2014/2239/F | FORNCETT         | Mr B Kennard, Applicant  
                              | Cllr B McClennning, Local Member              |
| Item 9 2015/0167/F | BURGH ST PETER   | Mr T Caulfield, Agent for Applicant            |
| Item 10 2015/0447/F | CARLETON RODE    | Mr S Richards, Agent for Applicant  
                              | Mrs S Foulds, Applicant  
                              | Cllr B Spratt, Local Member                   |
| Item 11 2015/0605/H | WINFARTHING      | Cllr K Weeks, Local Member                      |

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.

202. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.40 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

1  Appliance No : 2014/1969/D
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Persimmon Homes Anglia
Site Address : Land North-west of Carpenters Farm Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Reserved matters application (following outline planning permission 2012/0839/O) for residential development of 217 dwellings, including details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Decision : Members voted 9-1 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1  In accordance with plans
2  In accordance with external materials schedule
3  Boundary treatments to be agreed
4  Construction site management plan to be agreed

NOTE – Applicant’s attention was drawn to the need to comply with the outstanding conditions attached to the outline planning permission for the site 2012/0839

Updates
Natural England, NCC Public Rights of Way Officer and Sport England all confirmed that they had no further comments to make.

7 further letters of objection had been received which re-iterate the concerns expressed in the committee report in respect of the continued concerns surrounding the implications of the construction of the current development (construction traffic, mud on roads, the state of the site compound, hours of operation etc) and how the proposed scheme will impact upon these, concern that the current problems are prevented on the proposed next phase.

Concern had also been expressed at the ability of infrastructure to cope with more development in Wymondham and potential removal of vegetation in the south-east corner of the site.
2  **Appl. No** : 2014/2042/D  
**Parish** : WyMondham

**Applicants Name** : Persimmon  
**Site Address** : Land Between The A11 Spinks Lane And Norwich Road  
Wymondham Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Reserved matters application (following outline planning permission 2012/1385/O) for residential development - Access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

**Decision** : Members voted 9-0 (with 1 abstention) to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to **APPROVE**  
Approved with conditions  
1. In accordance with submitted drawings (amended plans)  
2. Landscaping scheme – planting schedules and management  
3. Details of acoustic fencing and bunding to be agreed  
4. Secure a deed of variation to Section 106 agreement to vary the affordable housing from 33% to 32%  
5. Water efficiency  
6. Renewable energy  
7. Construction Site Environment Management Plan to be agreed

**Updates**  
**Change recommendation** to Delegated Authority for the Director of Growth and Localism to approve subject to remaining matters relating to highways and landscaping to be satisfactorily resolved.

**3 further letters of objection** received on the same and similar grounds to those reported in the committee report or covered by condition on the Outline consent. Also note that further planting in addition to the existing hedgerow on Spinks Lane should be proposed to strengthen the hedge, in addition to that the maintenance access at the south end of Spinks Lane should be gated and locked to prevent access by pedestrians, play areas would only be for under 6 years old, the proposed pond on site would sometimes have no water in it, and lighting and the precise location of the Toucan crossing has not been identified.

Amended plans and details received in respect of the design of the SUDS which demonstrate they can be accommodated on the site without the need for safety fencing. Highways have confirmed no objection subject to the resolution of the final technical highways specification matters.

The SNC Landscape Officer had made further comment with no objection to the amended landscape plan subject to further clarification in respect of root protection areas for some of the existing trees.

**Oral Update** – Officer confirmed that they had received an email from Environmental Services requesting the inclusion of a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Site Environment Management Plan
3  **Appl. No** : 2015/0331/RVC  
**Parish** : PULHAM ST MARY  

Applicants Name : Areas Estate Ltd  
Site Address : Old Maltings Station Road Pulham St Mary Norfolk IP21 4QT  
Proposal : Variation of condition 5 following planning application 2008/1189 - landscaping  

Decision : Members voted 7-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1. In accordance with approved drawing  
2. No permitted development rights for walls, fences  
3. No permitted development rights for extensions, ancillary buildings  

**Other Applications**

4  **Appl. No** : 2015/0075/F  
**Parish** : KETTERINGHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr Michael Austin  
Site Address : Land North of High Street Ketteringham Norfolk  
Proposal : Use of land for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erection of day room, and retention of existing gates.  

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **DEFERRAL**  
Deferred to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee  

**Reason for Deferral**  
Members requested additional information regarding the Applicant’s status.  

**Updates**

**Corrections to the report**  
Paragraph 4.2: The residential properties adjacent to the site are identified as being within open countryside by the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. The residential properties are within the proposed development boundary for Ketteringham as identified by the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (Submission Version). The proposed site is adjacent to, but outside of this boundary.  

Paragraph 4.4: Policy HOU 23 is not a saved policy and therefore is not a consideration in the determination of this application.  

Paragraph 4.16: The 4th sentence which begins “Concerns have also been raised...” relates to general objections received from neighbours and does not relate to objections from the occupiers of the property known as “Amathus”. The occupiers of “Amathus” did not raise an objection on the ground of loss value to property.  

**Further correspondence**  
A further letter of objection has been received raising concerns that the proposal does not comply with criteria within the South Norfolk Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), published in 2014. This document has not been finalised and was published for consultation purposes. It relates to the identification of sites
through the local plan process. The current application must be assessed on its merits under relevant planning policies and this document is not a material consideration in the assessment of the application.

**Flooding and Drainage**

The Council's Flood Defence Officer has provided additional comments following the receipt of further information in relation to drainage from an objector and a subsequent response on behalf of the applicant.

The information submitted by the objector was based on percolation tests carried out within the grounds of no. 5 High Street, an adjoining property and information regarding previous flooding events in the area. Concern is raised that adequate drainage of surface and waste water would not be possible during wet winters due to the geology of the site.

The Flood Defence Officer has reviewed the further submissions that have been made and concludes that although existing flooding and drainage issues have been identified at no. 5 High Street, the proposal would not increase flood risk at the site or elsewhere. If the proposed hard standing area were to be constructed of permeable material this would not change the existing drainage regime of infiltration to ground. Alternatively the hard standing area and the roof water from the proposed day room could be discharged to a soakaway within the meadow area to the east where it is unlikely to impact on No 5 High Street and may reduce the volume of water entering the ground behind No 5. Likewise the proposed package sewage treatment plant and tail drains could also be located in the meadow to disperse the discharge over a wider area.

General drainage in the area may be improved by ditch maintenance in High Street which may enable water to clear from the higher land and roads more efficiently but this is outside of the remit of this application. If the Council is minded to approve this application a suitable condition to ensure that detailed surface water and foul drainage arrangements for the site were submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to any development taking place is requested.

**Additional condition requiring:**

- details of any hard surfacing to be approved by the local planning authority, and a requirement that the hard surfacing be permeable so as not to increase flood risk
- removal of permitted development rights relating to the provision of hard surfacing within the site unless it is permeable.

| 5 | Appl. No | : 2013/1630/F |
|   | Parish   | : HEMPNALL    |
|   | Applicants Name | : Mr John Hollis |
|   | Site Address | : Springwood Spring Lane Hempnall Norfolk NR15 2NT |
|   | Proposal | : Retrospective application for change of use of land to retain existing forestry accommodation (2 no caravans) |
|   | Decision | : The item was **DEFERRED** to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee |
6  **Appl. No**  :  2014/2239/F  
**Parish**  :  FORNCETT  
Applicants Name  :  Mr & Mrs B Kennard  
Site Address  :  Land North Of 12 Bentley Road Forncett St Peter Norfolk  
Proposal  :  Erection of a two storey dwelling  
Decision  :  Members voted 8-1 (with 1 abstension) for **REFUSAL**  
            
Refused  
1  Impact on the setting of listed buildings  

**Updates**  
A report had been sent by the applicant to the members of the Development Management Committee.

7  **Appl. No**  :  2014/2634/F  
**Parish**  :  WRENINGHAM  
Applicants Name  :  Mr & Mrs Page  
Site Address  :  Land East of Snowdrop House Top Row Wreningham Norfolk NR16 1AR  
Proposal  :  New detached dwelling  
Decision  :  Members voted 8-0 for **APPROVAL**  

Approved with conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accordance with submitted amendments  
3  External materials to be agreed  
4  Boundary treatment to be agreed  
5  Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
6  Slab level to be agreed  
7  Details of foul water disposal  
8  Provision of parking areas  
9  Development to accord with water efficiency levels  
10  Reporting of unexpected contamination  
11  Measures in FRA to be adhered to  
12  Retention of trees and hedges
8  **Appl. No**: 2015/0111/F  
**Parish**: ROCKLAND ST MARY  
Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Richardson  
Site Address: The Old Hall 132 The Street Rockland St Mary Norfolk NR14 7HL  
Proposal: New detached four bed house including new cart shed  
Decision: Members voted 8-0 for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions:

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with amendment
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Tree protection
5. Retention trees and hedges
6. Slab level to be agreed
7. Details of foul water disposal
8. Reporting of unexpected contamination
9. Visibility splay, approved plan
10. Provision of parking
11. No additional first floor area in entrance hall
12. New Water Efficiency

9  **Appl. No**: 2015/0167/F  
**Parish**: BURGH ST PETER  
Applicants Name: Mr W Graham  
Site Address: Land North East Of Staithe Road Burgh St Peter Norfolk  
Proposal: New Grain Store incorporating Solar Panels on roof and associated access  
Decision: Members voted 7-1 (with 1 abstention) for **REFUSAL**

Refused:

1. Adverse impact on landscape.
2. Adverse impact on neighbour amenity.
3. Adverse impact on highway safety.

10  **Appl. No**: 2015/0447/F  
**Parish**: CARLETON RODE  
Applicants Name: Mrs Foulds  
Site Address: Plot Adj To Greenways Farm Flaxlands Carleton Rode Norfolk  
Proposal: Proposed dwelling  
Decision: Members voted 9-0 for **REFUSAL**

Refused:

1. Unacceptable design
2. Unacceptable neighbour amenity impact
3. Insufficient information to assess highway impacts
11  
**Appl. No:** 2015/0605/H  
**Parish:** WINFARTHING  
Applicants Name: Mr D Negus  
Site Address: Arum Hall Road Winfarthing Norfolk IP22 2EJ  
Proposal: Retrospective application for erection of 1.35 metre fence  
Decision: Members voted 8-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with no conditions

**Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council**

12  
**Appl. No:** 2015/0518/F  
**Parish:** WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name: South Norfolk Council  
Site Address: Unit 406 Copper Smith Way Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0WY  
Proposal: Change of use from an industrial unit to a temporary fitness facility to include additional car parking spaces  
Decision: Members voted 7-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1 Full Planning permission time limit  
2 In accordance with approved plans  
3 Temporary permission – 2 years

13  
**Appl. No:** 2015/0615/A  
**Parish:** WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name: South Norfolk Council  
Site Address: Unit 406 Copper Smith Way Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0WY  
Proposal: Proposed 2 x non-illuminated signs to be displayed on front elevation  
Decision: Members voted 7-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1 In accordance with approved plans  
2 Standard advertisement conditions
14  Appliance No : 2015/0581/F  
Parish : WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council  
Site Address : Wymondham Leisure Centre  
Norwich Road  
Wymondham  
Norfolk  
NR18 0NT  
Proposal : External - Extension to reception creating new cafe and larger reception area, extension to sports hall to create a new two storey fitness area.  
Internal - General refurbishment to all areas, new spa, separation to swimming pool & new soft play.  

Decision : Members voted 7-0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions  
1 Full Planning permission time limit  
2 In accordance with approved plans  
3 External materials to be agreed  

Updates  
Two letters of objection received raising concerns that the proposed soft play area would take business away from private operators providing this facility in the locality. This is not considered to be a planning matter as planning permission would not be required for this change alone. Concern also raised about the parking provision at the site – this matter is addressed in the Officers report.

15  Appliance No : 2015/0631/RVC  
Parish : PORINGLAND  
Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council  
Site Address : Land North Of Shotesham Road  
Poringland  
Norfolk  
Proposal : Variation of Condition 2 following planning application 2014/0393/D -  
Material change to windows and doors for the residential units and external changes to the materials for the commercial units  

Decision : Members voted 7-0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions  
1 Conditions on previous permission  
2 In accordance with submitted drawings  
3 Reporting of unexpected contamination  
4 Ecological management plan  
5 Provision of Bat and Bird boxes to accord with agreed details  
6 Tree protection to accord with agreed details  
7 No dig in root protection  
8 Implement landscaping scheme  
9 Retention trees and hedges  
10 Water efficiency to be achieved  
11 Slab levels to accord with agreed details  
12 Restrict office use to B1 use only
Updates
Parish Council:
Supports approval of this application and requests that the UPVC windows maintain their reveals on the domestic housing
1 letter of support
Would improve existing windows

16 Appl. No : 2015/0703/A
Parish : DISS
Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council
Site Address : Diss Swim & Fitness Centre 106 Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG
Proposal : Replacement of existing facia and roadside signs.
Decision : Members voted 7-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1 In accordance with submitted drawings
2 Standard advert conditions
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No**: 2014/2495/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

- **Applicants Name**: Hallam Land Management  
- **Site Address**: Land Between London Road And Suton Lane London Road Wymondham Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Outline application for up to 375 dwellings and associated infrastructure, new cemetery and 1.2 ha of land for neighbourhood centre comprising A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and/or B1 and/or D1 uses

- **Recommendation**: Refusal:  
  1. Outside development limit for Wymondham contrary to policies HOU4 and ENV8  
  2. Harm to setting of Gonville Hall  
  3. Unsustainable development due to impacts from education capacity  
  4. Premature and highly prejudicial to the outcome of the Wymondham Area Action Plan

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
- NPPF 05: Supporting high quality communications infrastructure  
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 5: Access and Transportation  
- Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
- Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
- Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
- ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
- ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
- ENV 15: Species protection  
- ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture  
- IMP 2: Landscaping  
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
- IMP 9: Residential amenity  
- IMP 10: Noise  
- IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
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IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
UTL 15: Contaminated land
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 17: Off-site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards
WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey Towers

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
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
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
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Wymondham Area Action Plan
WYM 8: Rear servicing of commercial premises in the central area of Wymondham
WYM 13: Protecting the setting of Wymondham Abbey
WYM 15: Provision of replacement allotments in Wymondham
WYM21 Wymondham Development Boundary

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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.”
2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2013/2011** Outline application for up to 385 dwellings, including affordable housing; a site for a two form entry primary school and a reserve site to provide for its future expansion; green infrastructure accommodating landscaping, public open space, a multi-use games area and children's playspace; new roads, car parking, cycleways and footways; associated infrastructure, including a sustainable drainage system; vehicular access to be secured from London Road and land for a new cemetery with separate access from London Road (amended title)

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Wymondham Town Council** Support. Good transport links to B1172 (formerly A11), community amenity land to be provided, provides a new cemetery which is key element within the WAAP, conforms with WAAP in having a number of smaller developments rather than a large development in south Wymondham, balance of the town to offset existing and approved schemes to the east of the town, closer to town centre than south Wymondham developments and it is next to an employment area. Whilst it is accepted it is not within the site specific allocation of the WAAP it is felt the scheme offers advantages to the town. WTC would wish to confirm that this does not set a precedent for others.

3.2 **District Member** To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **Wymondham Heritage Society** Object

3.4 **SNC Design Officer** The development will result in a degree of harm to heritage assets - this needs to be weighed against the public benefits, which in this case need to be considerable considering the significance of the heritage assets affected. The extent to which the setting of the listed building are preserved – less so for the Abbey due to harm already resulting from existing development, but greater for the listed hall. These factors need to be taken into account in ensuring a good design code and landscaping plan for reserved matters. Good design and landscaping will help to mitigate against any resulting harm, so these need to be carefully conditioned to ensure compliance if the application is approved.

3.5 **SNC Ecologist** No objections subject to conditions

3.6 **Historic Environment Service** No objection subject to a condition

3.7 **Anglian Water Services Ltd** No comments received, although a pre-planning assessment has been submitted as part of the application

3.8 **Environment Agency** No objection subject to conditions and note
| 3.9 | SNC Environmental Services (Protection) | No objection subject to a condition |
| 3.10 | NCC Highways | Object, lack of guaranteed secondary school places, and remote from alternatives contrary to the aims of achieving sustainable development. |
| 3.11 | SNC Affordable Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager | No objections subject to agreement of appropriate tenure mix. |
| 3.12 | SNC Landscape Officer | No objection subject to conditions. |
| 3.13 | SNC Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group | No objection but concerns over connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, including to Spooner Row |
| 3.14 | NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator | Object. Concerns over lack of secondary school availability. |
| 3.15 | Police Architectural Liaison Officer | No objection |
| 3.16 | SNC Flood Defence Officer | Support the recommendations of the Environment Agency |
| 3.17 | NHS England | No comments received |
| 3.18 | NHS Clinical Commissioning Group | No comments received |
| 3.19 | SNC Conservation Officer | Agree with observations of Historic England. |
| 3.20 | Historic England | The scheme represents a level of harm, which is less than substantial and less than that caused by the previous scheme. The LPA will need to give due consideration in reaching a view on the merits of the scheme having regard to the advice contained within the NPPF. |
| 3.21 | Other Representations | 11 objections to most recent re-consultation on the amended plan. A summary of these is as follows:  
• contrary to WAAP,  
• school capacity issues,  
• has flooding been properly considered,  
• bad for the town,  
• outside development limit,  
• increased traffic,  
• detrimental to setting of Gonville Hall and Wymondham Abbey,  
• lack of infrastructure in Wymondham,  
• a scheme in the site has previously been refused planning permission, |
more housing than identified in the WAAP,
difficulties with dealing with foul waste,
detrimental to the views of local residents,
increased noise,

24 objections to the original scheme which highlighted the same points as raised above.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The application site is located approximately one mile south west of the town centre and covers approximately 23.22ha of grade 3 agricultural land positioned between London Road and Suton Lane. The site is of an irregular shape and is largely flat.

4.2 The Suton Lane eastern boundary has no hedgerow but does contain several mature trees, with the road sitting at a lower level than the field boundary. The London Road boundary contains section of hedgerow and trees along the boundary. London Road and Suton Road meet at the roundabout adjacent the modern Abbey Road development. The north eastern boundary of the site is adjacent a small triangular parcel of land which has approval for the development of 18 dwellings (outline 2012/1201, reserved matters 2014/1156).

4.3 The southern boundary of the site contains a substantial tree belt and is shared with the curtilage of Grade II listed Gonville Hall. Gonville Hall is accessed from a lane way onto Suton Lane and has on its southern aspect a series of barns converted into dwellings (Gonville Hall Farm). On the eastern side of Suton Road is an employment site which has approval to expand through outline approval 2012/1201 and also on a separate area of land a County Wildlife Site (CWS). Other surrounding land is largely in agricultural use.

4.4 Wymondham Abbey is located to the north east of the site beyond the Abbey Road development and views of the Abbey can be obtained from the site and from further south.

4.5 The site is located outside of both the current and emerging development boundaries of Wymondham and falls wholly within Flood Zone 1. It is subject to no other specific planning designations.

4.6 The application is in outline with all matters reserved apart from access. The application proposes up to 335 dwellings which would include the provision of 33% of the housing stock as affordable housing.

4.7 The application also proposes to create a site a neighbourhood centre on 1.2ha of land which would provide A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and/or B1 and/or D1 uses. It would also provide a new cemetery on 3.13ha of land and public open space.

4.8 The two vehicular access points proposed for the residential development would also both be on London Road with a roundabout being provided on one.

Current policy background

4.9 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in determining planning decisions.

4.10 With regard to the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), Annex 1 of the NPPF at paragraph 215 states that where a plan is adopted pre 2004, such as is the case with the SNLP, decision makers should give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF. Therefore, where reference is made to SNLP policies within this assessment, the level of weight for each policy will be set out.
4.11 By way of clarification, the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS), which also forms part of the Development Plan, was adopted in March 2011, with amendments in 2014, and as such paragraph 215 of Annex A of the NPPF as above is not applicable to the JCS.

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

4.13 With regard to the NPPF, paragraph 49 confirms that:

“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.”

4.14 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that:

“for decision-taking this means: Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or

Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

4.15 The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three roles, 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.

4.16 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that:

“Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.”

Development limits

4.17 The site lies outside of the development limit for Wymondham and as such is contrary to Policy HOU4 of the SNLP.

4.18 Policy HOU4 seeks to locate development of residential development within the defined settlement limits of settlements within the Norwich Policy Area, of which Wymondham is one. On this basis the proposed 335 dwellings would not accord with this policy.

4.19 With regard to establishing the weight attributable to Policy HOU4 in light of the requirements of paragraph 215 of Annex 1 of the NPPF, Policy HOU4 is considered to be fully consistent with the NPPF as it is consistent with positive planning for new development, and provides sufficient land for supplying housing for present and future generations as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF by virtue of the Council being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply including a the 5% buffer. The Council’s current position is that it has a 5.1 year supply as of the 1st of December 2014.

4.20 Policy ENV8 is applicable to residential development outside of defined settlement limits. It states that:
“Permission for development in the open countryside, outside the development limits and village boundaries of existing settlements and areas identified for development in the Plan, will only be granted if it:

i) Is requisite for agriculture or forestry; or

ii) Is justified to sustain economic and social activity in rural communities, and demands a rural location; or

iii) Is for the suitable adaptation and re-use of an existing rural building.

All such development must

iv) Respect the intrinsic beauty, the diversity of landscape, the wealth of natural resources, and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside; and

v) Be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design, while avoiding creating ribbon development or an unduly fragmented pattern of development.

4.21 As referred to above, given that this was adopted pre 2004, it is necessary to establish how much weight can be attributed to those in the decision making process by assessing its consistency with the NPPF. It is evident that this matter was recently considered by the Secretary of State (SoS) and Planning Inspectorate in the Appeal decision for Chapel Lane, Wymondham (2012/1434) in which the SoS agreed with the Inspector’s observation at paragraph 101 which stated:

“With regard to Local Plan Policy ENV8, I accept that is, to some degree, the ‘other side’ of Local Plan Policy HOU4 that allows housing within Development Limits[54]. However, on its face it is a policy that is designed to protect the countryside, rather than being one of the ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing’154. As such, I consider it is not out-of-date, though I accept that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, addressing a housing land shortfall may well necessitate conflicting with this policy.”

4.22 Therefore, in the context of no housing land shortfall it is considered that Policy ENV8 continues to carry significant weight in the decision making process and the proposal is unacceptable as it does not satisfy any of the above stated criterion, and would lead to unacceptable residential development in the countryside.

4.23 It is evident that in the context of the Development Plan, the scheme conflicts with policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP.

Sustainable development

4.24 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as the golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. On this basis it is necessary to establish whether the current proposal represents sustainable development in the context of the NPPF as a whole. The following seeks to establish this.

4.25 Firstly, it is considered appropriate and beneficial to establish the benefits of the scheme which will in turn be included in the following assessment. These are set out as follows:

- The scheme would provide 335 new dwellings, including 33% affordable housing units at a mix and tenure that complies with the requirements of Policy 4 of the JCS in terms of affordable housing provision. The Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has no objection to the proposal in respect of the affordable housing provision offered.
- The scheme would deliver a 1.2ha neighbourhood centre comprising A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and/or B1 and/or D1 uses
• Open space provision
• Cemetery

4.26 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental, and defines these as the economic, social and environmental roles. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. With this in mind it is considered appropriate to firstly assess the scheme in the context of each of these roles. Each of the three assessments also includes reference to other policies as necessary.

Economic implications

4.27 Paragraphs 18 -22 of the NPPF highlight the government’s commitment to securing sustainable economic growth, and defines 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.”

4.28 In local planning policy terms the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area, Policy 10 Locations for new major development in the Norwich Policy Area and Policy 19 The hierarchy of centres highlight that Wymondham is identified as a key area for growth.

4.29 The adopted policies as set out above are consistent with the aims of the NPPF in terms of economic implications in highlighting the importance of economic growth and that a location such as Wymondham will play a key role in achieving this objective.

4.30 In relation to the economic implications of the scheme, in the short and medium term, the construction of 335 dwellings and neighbourhood centre would make a contribution to the local economy. This would be via the associated construction works which could employ local tradesman, and also through the inevitable associated spend in the locality such as shops for example.

4.31 In the medium and long term, the neighbourhood centre at the point of opening would make a contribution in economic terms and would also create employment opportunities within the club. Also in the medium and long term, the occupants of the new dwellings would increase spending within the locality.

4.32 However, the NPPF makes particular reference to:

“sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation”.

4.33 With this in mind it is evident that the Council does have an up-to-date 5 year housing land supply as highlighted above in the report and as such it is considered that sufficient land does exist now, and in the right places, thus leading to the opinion that the benefits of presenting more land for housing is of less benefit than would be the case if the Council did not have sufficient housing land within the Norwich Policy Area.

4.34 In summary, it is considered that the scheme would be of some economic benefit to the local area and meets local and national policy in this respect.
Social implications

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 Paragraphs 18-22 of the NPPF highlight the Government’s commitment to economic growth which in turn contributes towards creating strong, vibrant and healthy communities. Paragraphs 29 – 41 confirm the Government’s commitment to promoting sustainable transport which assists with improved health. Paragraphs 47 – 55 highlight the need to deliver high quality housing. Paragraph 69 – 78 highlight the need to promote healthy communities.

4.37 In local planning policy terms the following policies are relevant: JCS Policy 7: Supporting communities expects new development to maintain or enhance the quality of life and wellbeing of communities; SNLP Policy LEI 7 open space provision in new developments and Policy TRA 1 Provision of pedestrian links confirm the need to secure sufficient open space and need to provide suitable pedestrian links within developments emphasising the importance role both play in achieving health and wellbeing.

4.38 From a policy perspective, it is clear that both local and national policy are consistent with one another in seeking to improve the quality of life for everyone, and highlight the important role housing plays in this, as well as providing services and facilities that reflect people’s needs. It is also important to be able to access these services and facilities.

4.39 With regard to the proposal, the provision of 335 houses would increase the supply of housing. However, it is necessary to have regard to the fact that the Council does have an up-to-date 5 year housing supply, and as such it is considered that the Council has fulfilled the requirement of the social role insofar as it is required to provide:

"the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations".

4.40 Therefore, the benefits of providing further land for housing beyond that already provided is less than would be the case if there was not an up-to-date 5 year housing land supply.

4.41 The application has confirmed its commitment to provide 33% affordable housing which complies with the requirements of Policy 4: Housing delivery of the JCS, and with a mix of house types and tenure which meet local need as recognised by the Council’s Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer. From the documentation presented it would also appear that there are no clear reasons why the site could be “delivered” in the near future.

4.42 The site lies on the south-western edge of Wymondham and this does allow for access to a range of facilities and services which are all accessible by a wide range of modes of transport (public transport, cycling, walking and private vehicles).

4.43 The consultation response of Norfolk County Council (NCC) highlights the ongoing concerns relating to the capacity at Wymondham High Academy. The Masterplan for Wymondham High Academy has been developed to cope with the demands of committed growth and no more. It is evident that it is not possible to create greater capacity within the confines of the existing Wymondham Academy site and the landlocked nature of the current sites means it is not possible to increase the size of the current site.
4.44 The possibility of disaggregating the high school function from the sixth form college function has been highlighted, but there is an unwillingness on the part of Wymondham Academy to pursue this option as they consider that it is undesirable in education terms. From the County Council’s point of view matters of affordability are not addressed by this proposal. It is also important to consider that academy status limits the power/authority the Local Education Authority (Norfolk County Council) has to enforce a change of structure (should it consider it desirable) such as separating out the sixth form element from the high school into separate campuses.

4.45 On the basis of the above factors it is clear that there is no reasonable prospect of capacity being made available at Wymondham High Academy to accommodate more children than is currently planned for and consequently it is not possible for Wymondham Academy to accommodate children from the proposed development, which lies within its traditional catchment area.

4.46 The agent has confirmed that it does not consider that education capacity in local schools is not a justifiable reason to refuse the application, and in any event they believe that capacity will be available to accommodate more dwellings beyond current committed growth by 2026.

4.47 Notwithstanding, the agents contention as set out above, education constraints remain a significant concern to the Council, as was the case in the previous refusal for the site.

4.48 If children were not able to attend secondary school in close proximity to where they live there would be an adverse impact on the social cohesion of local communities. Children would live at some distance from other children attending the same schools as them, which would not help the social cohesion of new communities delivered through the proposed housing development.

4.49 For the purposes of clarification, NCC has confirmed that there are no such concerns relating to nursery, infant and junior schools in terms of capacity.

4.50 The provision of a cemetery, would be of benefit to the town, as is evident from the comments of Wymondham Town Council and as such this benefit must be acknowledged in reaching a balanced decision no whether the scheme represents a sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

4.51 Likewise, the neighbourhood centre would provide additional facilities for any potential future residents of the scheme but also to existing residents in the locality. This benefit will also be acknowledged in researching a decision on whether the scheme represents sustainable development.

4.52 In terms of creating a high quality built environment, the outline nature of the proposal results in there being limited capacity to fully assess the quality of the built environment and the role this would play in creating a positive environment for future occupiers and visitors, however, there is no planning reason why this could not be secured at reserved matters stage. The Council’s Design Officer has confirmed that further regard would need to be had to the impacts of the scheme in visual terms, but that it is not unreasonable for this to be done via a suitably worded condition requiring the agreement of a Design Code before any reserved matters application is submitted.

4.53 Provision of open space and playspace is also considered to be indicated at an appropriate level, and if the application were recommended for approval this would be secured through reserved matters, appropriate conditions and a Section 106 agreement. All comments raised by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer would be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

4.54 In summary, the scheme would result in some positive aspects from a social perspective, such as a cemetery, neighbourhood centre, and public open space, however, the lack of adequate secondary education facilities within Wymondham, would be detrimental to the structure of the local Wymondham educational community which is a significant concern, as was the case in refusing a previous application at the site.
Environmental implications

4.55 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.”

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF identifies a core planning principle of decision making to be taking “account of different roles and character of different areas … recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside…” Paragraphs 29 – 41 highlight promotion of sustainable transport modes and reduce the need to travel therefore reducing use non-renewable natural resources. Paragraphs 109 – 125 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Paragraphs 126 – 141 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

In local planning policy terms the following policies are relevant:

4.56 JCS Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets requires all development to be located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise emissions and adaptable to climate change; Policy 3 energy and water minimise reliance on non-renewable energy sources; Policy 10 of the JCS identifies “extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a ‘Kettes Country’ pastoral landscape, which will strengthen landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hethersett.”

4.57 With regard to the SNLP, ENV8 prevents development within the open countryside unless specific criterion are met. IMP2 landscaping requires development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping.

4.58 It is considered that the adopted policies are consistent with the aims of national policy in respect of the environment, as identified in paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

4.59 It is considered that national policy and local policy, are consistent with the aim of central Government as expressed in national policy and guidance.

4.60 It is also necessary to have regard for Section 66 (1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 in respect of Gonville Hall which is a Grade II Listed Building which lies immediately adjacent to south of the site.

4.61 The application includes a Heritage Statement following dialogue with Historic England and comprehensive Landscape and Visual Appraisal.

4.62 As part of the consultation process, Historic England initially confirmed that the scheme continued to represent a level of harm to the setting of Gonville Hall, albeit it less than substantial (as was the case with the previously refused scheme), however, they also confirmed that if the scheme was amended to re-site the cemetery the level of harm may reduce further. In light of these observations, the applicant has revised the location of the proposed cemetery, which in turn reduced the number of dwellings proposed from 375 to 335. Historic England has duly updated their response to confirm:

“the development is now wholly contained north of the east-west farm track and the revised cemetery location would ensure that there would be no built forms to the west/northwest of Gonville Hall. This, combined with the cutting back of the housing on the east/northeast side of Gonville Hall that was incorporated earlier following the refusal of the previous application, would markedly reduce the harm that would result to Gonville Hall through development within its setting. The housing would now been contained in an arc to the north - northeast of Gonville Hall behind significant landscape buffering, and while a degree of harm remains, arising from the new housing continuing to suburbanise the setting of Gonville Hall in views
from the north, the level of harm has now been reduced to the point where it would be difficult to envisage what further mitigation might be provided whilst still delivering a meaningful number of new dwellings. To remove this remaining harm would effectively require land to remain in agrarian use. In determining this application it will be necessary for the Local Planning Authority to assess whether the residual harm that remains is now outweighed by the wider public benefits delivered by the proposal, in accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF. In the event that the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve the application, then Historic England would strongly recommend that a condition is included to restrict built forms to those areas identified for residential use and the neighbourhood centre and/or community use set out on the revised Land Use plan (drawing No CSa/2071/120) and the overall housing number limited to 335 (rather than the 375 set out in the project description). We would further recommend that any built form within this development be restricted to a maximum of two storeys."

4.63 Having regard to the comments above, it is considered that the wider public benefits are limited and as such do not outweigh the harm identified.

4.64 In the context of establishing whether the scheme represents a sustainable development or not, this harm will be factored into what is a balanced judgement.

4.65 The Council’s Ecologist, Listed Buildings Officer and Historic Environmental Services (formerly Norfolk Landscape Archaeology) have no objections to the scheme subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. In particular relation to the impact upon the wider natural landscape, existing trees and hedges the Council’s Landscape Officer has confirmed that he has no objection subject to conditions.

4.66 With regard to drainage, the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the Council’s Environmental Protection Team have all been consulted. They have all confirmed that there are no fundamental objections in respect of either foul or surface water drainage subject to the imposition of conditions. Furthermore, the Environment Agency and the Environmental Protection Team have confirmed they have no objection in terms of ground contamination subject to conditions.

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

4.68 It is considered that the proposal would have no significant harmful impact upon ecology, trees, archaeology or any heritage assets or the locality in terms of drainage or contamination implications. However, it is considered that the proposed development would result in some harm to the setting of Gonville Hall.

4.69 From an environmental perspective, the lack of secondary school capacity within Wymondham could lead to the need for future residents to rely on the private car to access secondary education, thus leading to the use of non-renewable fuel sources and air pollution which is environmentally undesirable.

4.70 In terms of the environmental role, it is considered that aforementioned concerns in respect of the harm on the setting of Gonville Hall, albeit less than substantial, less than in the previously refused application, and less than in the original plans submitted as part of this application, coupled with the reliance on the private car to access secondary education means that the proposal conflicts with the environmental role of the NPPF.
4.71 In summary, paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are not to be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent. Therefore, in making a judgement on whether the scheme represents sustainable development, it is necessary to make a rounded judgement, based upon the merits of the scheme when considered against the aims of the NPPF. Notwithstanding the benefits of the scheme as set out above, it is considered that the harm presented outweighs these and as such the scheme cannot be considered to represent sustainable development.

Undermining of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (prematurity)

4.72 Planning Policy Guidance entitled “Determining a Planning Application” Paragraph 014 Reference ID: 21b-014-20140306 explains:

“how weight may be given to policies in emerging plans. However in the context of the Framework and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account. Such circumstances are likely, but not exclusively, to be limited to situations where both:

a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan; and

b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

4.73 Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, or in the case of a Neighbourhood Plan, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how the grant of permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.”

4.74 It is considered that the proposal is substantial (335 homes), and if approved, would undermine the plan-making process in relation to the WAAP, which is presently at an advanced stage (the formal Hearing stage was held between 21st October and 10th December 2014, but the Examination is not yet complete, with consultation on Proposed Main Modifications currently underway. The key concern of the Council relates to the impact the proposal would have in potentially pre-determining matters relating to the scale and location of new development in Wymondham.

4.75 This application would promote additional growth in the WAAP area, which is currently subject to examination. The Inspector is considering whether a 2,200 dwelling limit for the WAAP is appropriate and requested that a sustainability appraisal addendum was prepared relating to the spatial distribution of the “floating” allocation of at least 1,800 dwellings set out in Joint Core Strategy Policy 9. Depending on the consultation on the proposed modifications, it is possible – but far from certain – that the Inspector may make a further residential allocation (or allocations) in the WAAP. Given the uncertainty on this point, it is considered that only limited weight can be afforded to the potential for additional allocations needing to be made in Wymondham at this time.

4.76 To grant consent for the application sites now would therefore be wholly premature and highly prejudicial to the outcome of the plan-making process.
Traffic implications

4.77 The scheme has been assessed by both the Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council in their capacity as Highway Authority and both have confirmed they have no objections in relation to technical highway matters, the issue of sustainability and objection on these grounds still stands.

Residential Amenity

4.78 Given the outline nature of the application it is not possible to assess the full impacts on neighbour amenity. However, it is evident that a scheme could be designed which has adequate regard for neighbour amenities in respect of amenity e.g. light, outlook, privacy and noise to ensure an appropriate level of amenity for both existing and future occupiers of the development.

4.79 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the amount of which would be calculated at the reserved matters stage.

4.80 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.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 As set out above the scheme is contrary to policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP which as set out above continue to be up to date and carry significant weight in the decision-making process.

5.3 In the presence of a five year land supply housing policies in the local plan area considered to be up-to-date. In accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which this report has considered in detail.

5.4 The scheme does present a number of benefits namely the deliverability of housing, including 33% affordable housing, a new cemetery, neighbourhood centre and public open space, however, It is considered that the acknowledged benefits are outweighed by the negative impacts resulting from the lack of available secondary school places within Wymondham, and subsequent adverse impact on sustainable transport to schools and social cohesion of local communities, harm to the setting of Gonville Hall (Grade II listed building) and undermining of the WAAP and as such the scheme is not considered to represent sustainable development in terms of the NPPF as a whole.

5.5 On this basis the scheme is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

1. The principle of residential development is not acceptable, by virtue of the site being outside existing and emerging development boundaries, there being a five-year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area and the development not therefore on balance being considered sustainable development. In the absence of an exception justification relating to affordable housing, agriculture, forestry or sustaining economic or social activity in the surrounding area the proposed development is not considered to be a sustainable form of development and is considered to be contrary to saved policies ENV8 and HOU4 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), policy 10 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted 2011, with amendments adopted 2014) and paragraphs 14 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
2. The development would lead to a detrimental impact to the setting of the Grade II listed building of Gonville Hall, and its moats which are of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument by virtue of the loss of the open and rural character of the land surrounding the heritage asset and wider Tiftey Tributary Farmland Landscape character, through the proposed urban form to the north of Gonville Hall eroding the open, rural character of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Saved Policies IMP2, IMP15 and WYM12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (adopted 2003), policy 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (adopted 2011, with amendments adopted 2014) and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). The harm identified is considered to be less than substantial, however in the planning balance in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm caused to the significance of designated heritage assets.

3. The proposal has been assessed against the three dimensions of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), in acknowledgement of paragraph 49 of the NPPF which requires the consideration of housing applications in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 14 of the NPPF which confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as a golden thread that runs through decision making.

   It is considered that the acknowledged benefits of the scheme namely the delivery of housing, including 33% affordable housing, a neighbourhood centre, open space the provision of a cemetery are outweighed by the negative impacts of the lack of available secondary school places within Wymondham or Hethersett and subsequent adverse impact on sustainable transport to schools and social cohesion of local communities and undermining of the Wymondham Area Action Plan, having due regard to the existence of a five year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area, and as such the scheme is not considered to represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF when taken as a whole.

4. The proposed development represents a substantial development, which, if approved, would undermine the plan-making process in relation to the Wymondham Area Action Plan (Submission version 2013), which is presently at an advanced stage of preparation. The development, if approved at the present time, would potentially pre-determining matters relating to the scale and location of new development in Wymondham. To grant consent for the application sites now would therefore be wholly premature and highly prejudicial to the outcome of the plan-making process in respect of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (2013) and not in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance entitled "Determining a Planning Application" Paragraph 014 Reference ID: 21b-014-20140306.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No:** 2014/2611/O  
**Parish:** EASTON

**Applicants Name:** Easton Landowners Consortium Joint Venture LLP  
**Site Address:** Land North And South Of Dereham Road Easton Norfolk  
**Proposal:** The erection of 907 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works.

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Outline time limit
2. Reserved matters to be approved, including location and design of village hall
3. Amended plans
4. Off site highway works – Dereham Road right hand turn
5. Off site highway works – Marlingford Road/Hall Road new spine road
6. Off site highway works – Bawburgh Road new spine road
7. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
8. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway phase T and road narrowing
9. Off site highway works - footway/cycleway and road narrowing phase Z
10. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
11. Submit green infrastructure strategy – wider ecological corridors
12. Landscaping scheme to be agreed
13. Noise mitigation – earth bund as required
14. Submission ecological management plan
15. Contamination reports required
16. Reporting of unexpected contamination
17. Fire hydrants
18. Written scheme of investigation for archaeology
19. Surface water strategy
20. Foul water strategy
21. Minerals and waste safeguarding
22. Requirement for design code
23. Water efficiency
24. Renewable energy - submission of details
25. Standard highway specification – details
26. Future management and maintenance of estate roads
27. Construction worker parking
28. Wheel cleaning facilities

Subject to the completion of a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, open space, land for primary school extension, green infrastructure, ecology mitigation and travel plan, and Community Infrastructure Levy

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)
TRA 13: Corridors of movement
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
LEI 12: Costessey Pits
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
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
DM1.1 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
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
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
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
EAS1 Land south and east of Easton

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/2293 Scoping opinion for Easton village masterplan
Environmental Impact Assessment required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils: Easton

Object.
When JCS was produced we said that development should only take place when necessary infrastructure was provided, upgrades to Longwater junction and Easton Roundabout. Longwater is already gridlocked at certain times of the day and the scheme does not provide a solution to the problems including for cyclists and pedestrians. This is impossible to exit at certain times of the day, this situation would be made worse by this development and there is also uncertainty over the western end of the NDR. Anglian Waters has identified a potential drainage solution, however, we would want to know exactly what is planned in this respect.
The size of the development is out of all proportion with the existing village.
We have no Doctor’s Surgery. Concern at Roundwell Medical Centre’s capacity to cope. Outlying surgeries such as Mattishall cannot take more patients.
The size of the proposed village hall and car park is not acceptable. Gt Wickingham’s new hall is 535sqm and this would be more appropriate than 300sqm as suggested
Response on 17 May 2015 from new member of Easton PC:

Quality of TROD footpath along Dereham Road poor, now accessible for all under Equalities Act. Footpath could not be used by cycles. Crossing on Dereham Road proposed unsafe due to road speeds, suggest signalised pedestrian crossing instead. Further details of the proposed new footway required to ensure it is safe for people to use. Request all pedestrian and cycle routes in place before development can commence.

Marlingford and Colton
Object.
Volume of traffic. Access between Marlingford and the Dereham Road/A47 would become noticeably less direct. Access between Colton and the Dereham Road/A47: for such traffic, there would be two give-ways at Church Lane, Easton – this route is the main access to the Dereham Road/A47 for residents of Colton; it also has significant HGV traffic and, seasonally, heavy farm vehicle (tractor and trailer) traffic. It is the Council’s view that access would become significantly more difficult. Road infrastructure in the wider context: although steps are being taken to improve the Longwater interchange, it is clear that major investment in infrastructure will be needed at the interchange and in the area to the north of the A47. Surface Water Drainage, the Parish Council fully endorses the views expressed by the Flood Defence Officer. It seems essential that surface water run-off from the proposed development does not exceed the existing run-off rate, and, preferably, would be less, as indicated in the Flood Defence Officer’s report. Likewise, it seems essential to have in place, as stated in the Flood Risk Assessment, the implementation of ‘arrangements to ensure adequate, long-term maintenance of private drainage systems/riparian ditches’. Further, those measures should extend all the way from Easton to the River Yare. Lighting, the Parish Council would encourage the use of all possible measures to reduce light pollution of the night sky.

Bawburgh
No objection subject to appropriate supportive infrastructure being provided.

Costessey Town Council
Object. Given the well documented capacity problems at Longwater Interchange and surrounding areas, CTC cannot support this application for development unless the necessary highway/infrastructure improvements have been made to mitigate the traffic congestion.

In light of a re-consultation on the basis of additional/amended highway related information and mitigation further comments are envisaged, these will be reported via the committee update procedure.

3.2 District Member To be determined by Development Management Committee

3.3 Highways England No objection subject to conditions

3.4 Natural England No objection
3.5 Historic England

Object. The proposal is for a large development extending in a broad arc from the east side of the existing village, across the southern side of the village and around to the west of the village. A new village centre is to be located immediately south of the existing school. English Heritage is satisfied that the majority of the scheme would not adversely impact on the historic environment, but is concerned that a relatively small component of the housing on the western edge of the development would result in harm to the Grade I listed Church of St Peter. English Heritage do not believe that the harm has been adequately justified as required by paragraph 132 of the NPPF and therefore recommends that that application should not be approved in its current form and that the layout should be modified to mitigate this harm prior to being approved.

3.6 Broadland District Council

No comments received

3.7 Historic Environment Service

No objection subject to a condition

3.8 SNC Landscape Officer

No objections, but concern over the future management of woodland buffer zones shown. This matter can be addressed further through conditions.

3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection subject to conditions

3.10 SNC Design Officer

Principles of masterplan presented provide good basis for further design work at the reserved matters stage. Condition required for design code to ensure cohesive development. Building for Life Assessment to be orally updated at committee.

3.11 SNC Ecology and Green Infrastructure

Observations – Green infrastructure strategy should be secured outside of a S106 agreement either through submission of further information or secured by way of condition. New public rights of way (PROW) are created to improve access to the countryside, these may be informed by the GI Strategy, a developer “welcome pack” shall be created and provided to all new residents and in public places for existing residents. Slow worm mitigation should be addressed through the submission of a mitigation plan as opposed to via a S106 agreement.

3.12 Environment Agency

No objection subject to conditions.

3.13 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection subject to a condition in respect of unknown contamination.

3.14 NCC Highways

After discussions on the highway improvements required no objection subject to conditions and comments received. (Appendix 1 for full response).

3.15 SNC Property Consultant

A viability assessment was submitted with the application. Following discussions with the applicants this assessment is accurate.

3.16 SNC Affordable Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager

No objection to the application, the proposed 17% affordable housing level is accepted after consideration of the viability. The Section 106 agreement will secure this provision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.17    | NCC (Mineral and Waste)  
Object on the grounds of mineral resource safeguarding |
| 3.18    | NCC Planning Obligations  
Co-ordinator  
No objection subject to transfer of land to NCC for expanded primary school |
| 3.19    | Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
No objection |
| 3.20    | SNC Flood Defence Officer  
No objection subject to condition |
| 3.21    | NHS England  
No comments received. |
| 3.22    | NHS Clinical Commissioning Group  
No comments received. |
| 3.23    | Other Representations  
Roundwell Medical Centre - No objection.  
St Peters Church of England Primary School  
The Governors are satisfied that the available evidence suggests that this burial site is likely not to be in the area of the school extension and also that Foot and Mouth disease is an animal disease that is not a danger to humans. However, in order to dispel the concerns in the village we would support the proposal suggested by Boyer Planning Ltd that the planning application has a condition put on it stating that investigative work be carried out to establish the exact location of this pit before any development of the school can take place.  
Mattishall and Lenwade Surgery  
No spare capacity for more patients at this time  
Petition with 502 signatures objection to scale of development, the village and surrounding area cannot cope.  
297 letters submitted with the following issues identified against a checkbox. Different objectors selected different issues, but all issues raised were:  
- Road capacity  
- Pedestrian access  
- Need for additional housing  
- Medical services capacity  
- Primary school size and road safety around school  
- Contaminated land – foot and mouth burial pits  
- Flooding risk increase  
- Wildlife – surveys not adequate  
- Food Hub – consider proposals in conjunction with application  
176 letters of objection received, a summary of their concerns is as follows:  
- Roads are close to capacity, frequent traffic jams,  
- Dangerous for pedestrians including school children,  
- TROD is not suitable to meet the needs of all e.g. disabled residents,  
- Traffic pollution,
Inadequate pedestrian access available to local facilities e.g. school medical practice,
Amount of housing proposed is disproportionate to Easton,
some growth is considered to be reasonable but scale as proposed is too great,
The Council has a 6.76 year housing land supply,
Insufficient medical facilities to cope with demand,
Extension of school is insufficient to deal with the number of pupils which will arise from the development,
Historic foot and mouth burial pits mean the it cannot be guaranteed that the land is 100% safe for the village heart or school extension,
flooding concerns,
Inadequate surveys and provision made to protect wildlife,
Contrary to South Norfolk Place-Making Guide
Impact upon trees and wildlife
Disturbance and noise,
Consideration of proposed Food Hub required
Contrary to Local Plan Policies HOU4 and ENV6
Contrary to JCS in respect of need for infrastructure upgrade expansion
Surveys in submission are inaccurate e.g. traffic surveys conducted on school holidays.

The campaign group “Easton Against Development” “EAD) has also expressed concern at the scheme, including on the above grounds.

Note: In light of a further re-consultation on the basis of additional/amended highway related information and mitigation further comments are envisaged, these will be reported via the committee update procedure.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located within the parish of Easton and consists of 46.45ha of land to the east, south and west of the existing built up area of the village. The site is predominantly made up of agricultural land, 29.32ha of the site is occupied for Easton and Otley College, with 22.98ha of it in arable production.

4.2 The site boundaries are formed by the A47 and the Dereham Road as well as the property boundaries of Bawburgh Road, Dereham Road, Cardinal Close, Woodview Road, Burton Close, Garnett Drive and Parkers Close and a number of field boundaries.

4.3 The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the following:
907 dwellings;
Land for an extended primary school;
a new village hall;
An A1 retail store;
areas of public open space including a village green;
relocated allotments, and;
highway works.
4.4 The application has been accompanied by the following documents:

- application form;
- plans (location plan, illustrative masterplan, phasing plan, building heights plan, land use plan, density plan and constraints plan);
- Arboricultural Impacts Plan;
- Archaeological assessment;
- A range of ecology related surveys;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Energy Statement;
- Environment Statement (including Non-Technical Summary);
- Flood Risk Assessment;
- Heritage Impact Assessment;
- Lighting Assessment;
- Geotechnical and Geophysical Reports;
- Planning Statement;
- S106 heads of terms;
- Statement of Community Involvement;
- Transport Assessment;
- Utilities Assessment.

Current policy background

4.5 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in determining planning decisions.

4.6 With regard to the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 215 states that where a plan is adopted pre 2004, such as is the case with the SNLP, decision makers should give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF. Therefore, where reference is made to SNLP policies within this assessment, the level of weight for each policy will be set out.

4.7 By way of clarification, the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS), which also forms part of the Development Plan, was adopted in March 2011, with amendments in 2014, and as such paragraph 215 of Annex A of the NPPF as above is not applicable to the JCS.

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

4.9 With regard to the NPPF, paragraph 49 confirms that:

“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.”

4.10 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that:

“for decision-taking this means:
Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or

Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

4.11 The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three roles, 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.

4.12 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that:

“Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.”

Relationship to the Development limit for Easton (as defined within the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2013)

4.13 The site lies outside of the development limit for Easton and as such is contrary to Policy HOU4 of the SNLP.

4.14 Policy HOU4 seeks to locate development of residential development within the defined development limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, of which Easton is one. On this basis the proposed 907 dwellings would not accord with this policy.

4.15 With regard to establishing the weight attributable to Policy HOU4 in light of the requirements of paragraph 215 of Annex of the NPPF as set out in paragraph, Policy HOU4 is considered to be fully consistent with the NPPF as it is consistent with positive planning for new development, and provides sufficient land for supplying housing for present and future generations as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF by virtue of the Council being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply including a the 5% buffer. The Council’s current position is that it has a 5.1 year supply as of the 1st of December 2014.

4.16 Policy ENV8 is applicable to residential development outside of defined settlement limits. It states that:

“Permission for development in the open countryside, outside the development limits and village boundaries of existing settlements and areas identified for development in the Plan, will only be granted if it:

vi) Is requisite for agriculture or forestry; or
vii) Is justified to sustain economic and social activity in rural communities, and demands a rural location; or
viii) Is for the suitable adaptation and re-use of an existing rural building.

All such development must

ix) Respect the intrinsic beauty, the diversity of landscape, the wealth of natural resources, and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside; and

x) Be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design, while avoiding creating ribbon development or an unduly fragmented pattern of development.

4.17 As referred to above, given that this was adopted pre 2004, it is necessary to establish how much weight can be attributed to those in the decision making process by assessing its consistency with the NPPF. This matter was recently considered by the Secretary of State (SoS) and Planning Inspectorate in the Appeal decision for Chapel Lane, Wymondham (2012/1434) in which the SoS agreed with the Inspector’s observation at paragraph 101 which stated:
“With regard to Local Plan Policy ENV8, I accept that is, to some degree, the ‘other side’ of Local Plan Policy HOU4 that allows housing within Development Limits [54]. However, on its face it is a policy that is designed to protect the countryside, rather than being one of the ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing’. As such, I consider it is not out-of-date, though I accept that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, addressing a housing land shortfall may well necessitate conflicting with this policy.”

4.18 Therefore, it is considered that Policy ENV8 continues to carry significant weight in the decision making process and the proposal is unacceptable as it does not satisfy any of the above stated criterion, and would lead to unacceptable residential development in the countryside.

4.19 In the context of the Development Plan, the scheme conflicts with current policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, but emerging policies are relevant and form part of the planning balance in this instance as discussed further below.

Emerging Policy within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document

4.20 Whilst acknowledging the above policy position in respect of the SNLP, it is necessary to have regard to emerging policy in respect of this site, and in particular Policy EAS1 the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document SSAPD. This policy seeks to allocate 52.6ha of land for housing (900 dwellings) and associated infrastructure, including a village centre.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF confirms that:

From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given)
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

4.21 In the context of para 216 of the NPPF, it is considered that Policy EAS1 of the SSAPD can be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process for the following reasons:

The Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document has been through examination by a Planning Inspector and proposed modifications have been consulted on, at present this is ongoing and due to expire on the 5th June 2015. It is evident that the proposed modifications do not include any significant revisions to Policy EAS1. Furthermore, Policy EAS1 is considered to be consistent with the aims of the NPPF, and in particular, in relation to boosting the supply of housing. This policy is therefore given significant weight in this recommendation.

Policy EAS1 states the following:

52.6 hectares of land is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation will accommodate approximately 900 dwellings and supporting facilities, including a new village centre.

The developer(s) of the sites will be required to ensure the following:

Master Plan

A comprehensive master plan which will need to cover the provision of social and green infrastructure and highways improvements, taking into account the other requirements of this policy, and address:
• Phasing which clearly identifies when key infrastructure will be provided in relation to the provision of new housing. Phasing should be designed to ensure development minimises the disturbance to existing residents;
• The relationship to any continued expansion of Easton College, the Royal Norfolk Showground (including the loss of any land currently used for Showground parking) and the proposed Easton Gymnastics Club site (Policy EAS 2);
• The approach to densities across the allocation, including higher densities close to the proposed village centre;
• Careful consideration of development west of the allotments, including the possible retention of this area as open space.

Enhanced Facilities
• Provision of a new village centre in the vicinity of the indicative site shown on the Easton Inset Map, to include a new village hall, village green/focal recreation space, post office/small scale convenience goods retail opportunity (approx. 250m² net), shared parking provision with primary school;
• Expanded primary school provision in agreement with the Education Authority.

Heritage Assets
• Application to be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of St Peter’s Church as a heritage asset, the extent of its setting and the contribution that its setting makes to its significance;
• Ensure that sufficient open space and landscaping is retained to the south, south east and south west of St Peter’s Church and that sufficient planting is provided, such that its setting, and the wooded setting of Diocesan House and the Vicarage, are protected.

Landscaping and Green Infrastructure
• Protection of the existing allotments and any other sites in community use, or relocation to an equivalent or better site;
• Provision of a landscape buffer and enhancements to the A47 corridor - layout and landscaping should take into account both visual enhancement and the noise implications of the neighbouring A47 and Showground and include any proposals for acoustic barriers;
• Identification and protection of significant biodiversity features, including trees and hedgerows, incorporated within open spaces and with off-site mitigation where on-site protection cannot be achieved;
• Green infrastructure enhancements, including the approach to the area between the village and Easton College;
• Proportionate contributions to the access improvements to the Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes.

Transport
Highways and transport improvements agreed with Norfolk County Council and, where appropriate, the Highways Agency, to include:
• Proportionate contributions to short, medium and long term improvements to the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions to ensure that junction capacity does not become a constraint on development;
• Provision of new vehicular accesses for development to the south of the village, to supplement Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Road;
• Provision for, and proportionate contributions to, Dereham Road Bus Rapid Transit, (BRT), including improved access to facilities in Costessey, and other public transport enhancements in accordance with the latest version of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS) implementation plan;
• Safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links to key locations, including Longwater employment and retail, Costessey Medical Centre, Ormiston Victory Academy, Costessey Park and Ride site and Easton College.
Site conditions and constraints

- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources.
- Investigation of ground conditions at the former gravel pit site north of Dereham Road;
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;

Site layout to take account of water mains and sewers crossing site.

Taking into account the above, it is considered appropriate to consider the proposal in the context of the requirements of EAS1. An assessment is as follows, based upon the headings provided in the Policy.

Transport

4.22 EAS1 requires highway and transport improvements, to a standard to meet the requirements of both NCC and Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency). These specifically relate to improvements to both the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions, new vehicular accesses for development to the south of the village (Marlingford and Bawburgh Road) provision for a contributions to Bus Rapid transport (BRT), safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links to key locations e.g. Longwater employment and retail, Costessey medical centre, Ormiston victory Academy etc..

4.23 Significant concern has been raised by the residents of Easton at a number of issues related to transport implications, including the lack of adequate pedestrian and cycle facilities and the ability of the local highway network to cope with the extra traffic which would be brought about as a consequence of the development, having regard to the existing difficulties experienced in relation to traffic in and around Easton.

4.24 Significant discussions have taken place, between the developer, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council and Highways England in order to establish a range of mitigation measures to ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist facilities are provided to access key facilities and establish improvements to the road network to secure the safe and efficient functioning of the local highway network. The following position has been established:

4.25 Highways England has confirmed that they have no objection subject to the imposition of conditions.

4.26 Norfolk County Council in their capacity as Highway Authority has confirmed the following:

The development will be accessed from a number of roads; Church Lane off Dereham Road, Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Lane.

Both the Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Lane access points have been drawn up to discourage significant additional traffic and use. Finally a new access road on the eastern side of the development will be provided which will connect to Dereham Road with a priority junction.

The revised junction forms have been submitted in an indicative form only and will be subject to detailed design as conditions, including trigger points for delivery of the improvements to which they relate.

A significant quantum of the development is within the necessary 3 mile walk to school catchment and the whole development is within walking and cycling distance of employment, medical facilities and a wide range of shopping and leisure facilities.
4.27 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states in Section 4 that 'the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel' (paragraph 29).

The Framework goes on to state in paragraph 35 that:

'developments should be located and designed where practical to ...... give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, have access to high quality public transport facilities; create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians...'.

Therefore a key element of the development is the delivery of a 3 metre wide shared use footway/cycleway from the development, along Dereham Road to the Longwater Interchange, over the Interchange and connecting into the existing footway/cycleway on William Frost Way and then along Dereham Road to Costessey.

4.28 Crossing of William Frost Way will be by using a new controlled crossing (Drawing No: Figure 9.2). Improvements to the route at the Longwater Interchange include signalised crossings on the west bound on and the east bound off slips of the A47(T) and the widening of the footway over the bridge (with an increased height in parapet).

4.29 In addition, footways and footway/cycleways will be provided along the site frontage on the Dereham Road and the existing TROD path will be upgraded to a 3 metre wide footway/cycleway. Crossing points will also be provided within the site frontage and near the Premier Inn/Showground public house.

4.30 The proposed footway/cycleways are conditioned and should be designed by and delivered by the various trigger points. NCC Highway Authority has requested the proposed footway/cycleway is provided prior to first occupation of any dwelling. It should also be noted that the Parish Council have requested the improvements are completed prior to commencement of development. The Highway Authority has not requested the improvements prior to commencement of development and so it is not considered reasonable to request this as a trigger point. The provision prior to first occupation has been considered and discussed with the applicants in relation to viability. Further information has been requested on the impact on viability and the final trigger point will be orally updated to committee.

4.31 These schemes are purely indicative at present and will be subject to detailed design as the development progresses.

4.32 The local Highway Authority has recommended that the delivery of the footway/cycleway along the southern side of Dereham Road and the connection across the Longwater Interchange to further footway/cycleway facilities be completed before first occupation of any dwelling. This is considered as a fundamental pre-requisite of the development as no such facility currently exists and it will provide an appropriate route for vulnerable road users particularly school children.

4.33 It is acknowledged that Highways England has recommended a slightly different trigger point for the delivery of the signalised crossings on the slip roads however the local Highway Authority maintains that these should be delivered at first occupation of any dwelling.

4.34 Dereham Road from the Longwater Interchange to the edge of the existing village is currently wide, has right hand turn lanes, lacks any speed controls or entry features and is in the same format as it was when it was a 60 mph trunk road.
4.35 To produce a highway corridor more appropriate for an urban speed limit the developer is proposing to narrow the carriageway, extend the 30 mph limit, remove the right hand turn lanes and provide an entry feature, all of which should enhance the village environment.

4.36 In terms of Travel Planning, it has been agreed that Norfolk County Council will deliver the Travel Plan at a cost of £250 per dwelling. The Travel Plan is conditioned below and funding will be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

4.37 It is anticipated that existing bus services will divert and serve the development as the development is built out. When reserved matters applications are submitted, bus stops and shelters will need to be provided at agreed locations along the main estate spine road.

4.38 By way of clarification, the submitted phasing plan has been used to define when the various pieces of highway infrastructure will be delivered.

4.39 In light of the above and provided the S106 is secured prior to the issue of any planning permission, the Highway Authority has no objection to the scheme.

4.40 In summary, the scheme is considered to deliver a range of traffic, cyclist and pedestrian improvements consistent with the aims of emerging Policy EAS1 and policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.41 The potential Food Hub has been identified in letters of representation and the need to consider the impact of any such proposals with this application. At present there are no proposals for this use that form a material planning considerations, such as a planning permission or defined location in an adopted policy document. Whilst there may be information that indicates there could be a potential development in the vicinity of this site in the absence of a planning permission or adopted policy document the Council can give no weight to such proposals in the determination of this planning application. Therefore no weight can be given to any potential location of such a development at this time.

Masterplan

4.42 A masterplan to cover social and green infrastructure, phasing, relationship to continued expansion of Easton College, the Royal Norfolk Showground (including the loss of any land currently used for Showground parking) and the proposed Easton Gymnastics Club site (Policy EAS 2), densities and careful consideration of development west of the allotments, including the possible retention of this area as open space.

4.43 A plan has been submitted indicating the likely phasing of the residential components of the site with the 907 dwellings being delivered across seven phases and makes provision for the various other social infrastructure to be developed namely the additional school land, village green and hall, retail unit and allotments.

4.44 This phasing plan is being used to inform the content of the S106 legal agreement in terms of linking the delivery of the social infrastructure to housing delivery across the site.

4.45 The illustrative masterplan has been developed in the full knowledge of both Easton College and Norfolk Showground so as to conflict with their future aspirations, and the masterplan does not conflict with the Easton Gymnastics Club expansion which already benefits from planning permission to extend their premises, with work having commenced earlier this year.

4.46 A density plan has been submitted in support of the scheme which adopts a principle of having the lowest density around the rural edge of the site, with higher densities areas positioned more centrally within the various parcels of land. This approach of having higher densities in central location means that no higher density developments will be located adjacent to existing residents.
4.47 The design approach to the masterplan for the site is considered to be acceptable. A condition for a design code to ensure a cohesive development is recommended. The Building for Life assessment scores will be orally updated at committee.

4.48 This section of Policy EAS1 makes reference to the need to carefully consider development to the western part of the site, this is considered in detail in the “Heritage Assets” assessment later in this report.

4.49 Policy EAS1 also makes reference to the need for a larger area of allotments than presently provided in Easton. The masterplan makes provision for this and this will be secured as part of the S106 agreement.

**Enhanced facilities**

4.50 Enhanced facilities in the form of a new village centre is to be provided. This will consist of a new village hall, village green/recreation area, associated parking provision which can also be used for parking associated with the functioning of the primary school, and a post office/A1 retail premises (250sqm net). Additional land is also to be provided to facilitate the expansion of the existing primary school.

4.51 The illustrative masterplan highlights where the village centre is to be provided, and this is consistent with the Easton Inset Map which accompanies the policy.

4.52 The schemes proposes a total of 5.4ha ha of land in total for public open space which is considered to be satisfactory in the context of council guidance for calculating open space provision. 0.16ha of this would be used to facilitate a new village hall. This is considered to be a sufficiently large site to facilitate an appropriately sized village hall. There has been significant debate in relation to the size of village hall required to meet the needs of the community, the application does make reference to a 300sqm facility and concern has been expressed locally that this is not sufficiently large enough to meet the needs of an expanded village.

4.53 It should be stressed that this is an outline application, and as such any outline planning permission would not restrict the size of village hall that could come forward at reserved matters stage, and it is evident that the land set aside for the village hall could facilitate a village hall that is larger than 300sqm.

4.54 The application does not propose to construct a village hall, it proposes to provide the land for this and the associated parking to the Parish Council via the S106 agreement along with the village green/recreation area. This is primarily on the basis that the development does not result in the loss of the present village hall, which the Parish Council will continue to have control over. Therefore, they have the option to continue to keep this facility or they could use any revenues from the disposal of this towards the delivery of a new village hall. It should also be noted that the development would deliver significant CIL funds to the Parish Council (they would receive 15% of the total CIL funds for the development which equates to in the region of £975,000 across the entire development) which could be used to deliver the scheme.

4.55 In terms of the land to facilitate the expanded primary school, an area of land has been identified on a plan and NCC has confirmed that they are satisfied with the location, configuration and size of the land offered and this will be duly provided to NCC as part of the S106 legal agreement.

4.56 In terms of the post office/A1 retail premises, the masterplan makes provision for this to be provided.
4.57 Whilst in outline, the application makes provision for a 300sqm unit and as such the proposal broadly complies with this requirement. In terms of para 24 of the NPPF, there is a requirement for a sequential test for main town centre uses such as A1 where they are not in a town centre and not in accordance with an up to date plan. It is considered that in this instance, a sequential assessment is not necessary in light of the stated aspirations of EAS1 to secure enhanced facilities, including an A1 retail premises, and acknowledging the advanced status of this policy. It should be noted that the relatively modest size of this A1 premises means that it falls beneath the size thresholds expressed in para 26 of the NPPF in respect of the need to undertake an assessment of the impacts of the development upon vitality and viability of town centres.

Heritage Assets

4.58 By way of background, the text within policy EAS1 as set out above has been revised as part of the proposed main modifications to the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document to reflect those concerns raised by Historic England that the previously suggested policy wording did not provide sufficient safeguards to adequately protect the setting of Grade I listed St Peters Church.

4.59 With this in mind, the application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment in acknowledgement of the need to understand the impact of the development upon the St Peters Church (Grade I), the extent of its setting and the contribution its setting makes to its significance.

4.60 The report recognises that the proposal would have an impact upon St Peters Church, however, it highlights that this impact can be minimised by setting residential development away from the Church, by adding to the exiting vegetation to the south of the Church and directing traffic movements away from the Church by providing new roadways away from the Church. This is highlighted on the submitted masterplan which can be used to inform any subsequent reserved matters on the phase adjacent to the Church.

4.61 This proposed mitigation has been assessed by Historic England who have concluded that whilst the majority of the scheme would not adversely impact on the historic environment, a relatively small component of housing on the western edge of the development would result in harm to the St Peters Church, and this harm has not been adequately justified in the context of paragraph 132 of the NPPF which states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

4.62 On this basis the scheme should be modified to mitigate this harm prior to it being approved.

4.63 Having regard to the views expressed above, the proposal has also been considered by the Council’s Conservation Officer, they consider that the proposed mitigation would have sufficient regard to St Peters Church and that the scheme would not compromise its setting. The proposals are therefore not considered to harm the special historic or architectural interest of the listed building, and meet the requirements of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, and paragraph 132 of the NPPF.
4.64 It is also evident that the views of Historic England were recently considered as part of the examination into the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document in respect of the allocation covered policy EAS1 and in particular their request to restrict the extent of the allocation to exclude the land at the western end of the village. It is clear that the proposed modifications have not included this request, but have amended the supporting text as referred to above.

4.65 In considering the points raised, by Historic England, the Local Planning Authority consider that the Heritage Impact Assessment is fit for purpose, and that the scheme does have appropriate regard for St Peters Church, and its setting, when considering the proposed mitigation highlighted on the masterplan and that a detailed reserved matters application could add sufficient detail in respect of the make-up of the area to be retained to the south of the Church.

Landscaping and Green Infrastructure

4.66 The current masterplan makes provision for an alternative allotments site, immediately adjacent to the existing site, this is also a larger site than is presently provided this will secured via the S106 agreement.

4.67 The landscape buffer and enhancements to the A47 corridor and noise mitigation are considered to be appropriate to agree in detailed landscape schemes via subsequent reserved matters approvals. It is acknowledged by the agent that in respect of the section adjacent to the A47 a suitable noise buffer will be required and this is likely to be via an earth bund.

4.68 As suggested within EAS1 the application has identified those significant biodiversity features (including trees and hedgerows) within its submission, including a number of supporting surveys (ecological and arboricultural). The masterplan has due regard for the findings of the above surveys and would sufficiently inform any subsequent reserved matters applications.

4.69 In acknowledgement of the reference to green infrastructure enhancements, including the approach to the area between the village and Easton College, it is considered that the detailed design of these can be secured at reserved matters stage based upon a Green Infrastructure which can be agreed via a pre-commencement condition.

4.70 Reference is also made to proportionate contributions to the access improvements to Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes. It is evident that the Regulation 123 associated with Community Infrastructure Levy funding makes it clear that strategic green infrastructure is to be provided via CIL. In this instance it is considered that access improvements to the Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes would be covered by this, rather than as being required to be directly delivered by this development.

Site conditions and constraints

4.71 Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources. In respect of NCC’s comments, an appropriate condition will be added to any consent to ensure minerals extracted through the site during the construction process are quantified.

4.72 Policy EAS1 also identifies the following matters. There should be investigation of ground conditions at the former gravel pit site north of Dereham Road. Environmental Services have requested conditions addressing this. Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place, which has been confirmed by Anglian Water subject to conditions. The site layout must also take account of water mains and sewers crossing site which would be determined at a reserved matters stage.
4.73 In summary, in assessing the scheme against the aims of emerging Policy EAS1, and having due regard to the outline nature of the scheme, it is considered that the current proposal is acceptable and would allow for all subsequent reserved matters applications to deliver schemes that meet the aims of emerging Policy EAS1.

Sustainable development

4.74 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as the golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. On this basis it is necessary to establish whether the current proposal represents sustainable development in the context of the NPPF as a whole. The following seeks to establish this.

4.75 Firstly, it is considered appropriate, to establish the benefits of the scheme which will in turn be referred to in the following assessment. These are set out as follows:

- The scheme would provide 907 new homes, including 17% of these as affordable housing units.
- The scheme would facilitate a new village green and land for a village hall, and public open space throughout the wider site.
- An A1 retail premises.
- Highway, pedestrian and cycling upgrades including improved linkages to Costessey via the Longwater Interchange.
- 0.84ha of land to facilitate a school expansion.

4.76 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental, and defines these as the economic, social and environmental roles. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. With this in mind it is considered appropriate to firstly assess the scheme in the context of each of these roles, and then reach an overall view on whether the scheme is considered to represent a sustainable development. Each of the three assessments also includes reference to other policies as necessary.

4.77 Economic implications
Paragraphs 18-22 of the NPPF highlight the government’s commitment to securing sustainable economic growth, and defines 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."

4.78 In local planning policy terms:
Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area and Policy 10 Locations for new major development in the Norwich Policy Area highlight Easton as a key location suitable for significant growth.

4.79 The above policies are consistent with the aims of the NPPF in terms of economic implications in highlighting the importance of economic growth and that a location such as Easton will play a key role in achieving this objective.
With regard to the economic implications of the scheme, in the short and medium term, the construction of 907 dwellings and the A1 retail unit would make a contribution to the local economy. This would be via the associated construction works which could employ local tradesman etc, and also through the inevitable associated spend in the locality, shops etc.

4.80 In the medium and long term, the A1 shop would create jobs and spending from local residents.
4.81 It is also considered that the application sufficiently demonstrates that the scheme is capable of being delivered.

4.82 In summary, the scheme would be of economic benefit to the local area and meets local and national policy aspirations in this respect.

Social implications
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.”

Paragraphs 18-22 of the NPPF highlight the Government’s commitment to economic growth which in turn contributes towards creating strong, vibrant and healthy communities. Paragraphs 29 – 41 confirm the Government’s commitment to promoting sustainable transport which assist with improved health. Paragraphs 47 – 55 highlight the need to deliver high quality housing. Paragraph 69 – 78 highlight the need to promote healthy communities.

4.83 In local planning policy terms, JCS Policy 7: Supporting communities expects new development to maintain or enhance the quality of life and wellbeing of communities. SNLP Policy LEI 7 open space provision in new developments and Policy TRA 1 Provision of pedestrian links confirm the need to secure sufficient open space and need to provide suitable pedestrian links within developments emphasising the importance role both play in achieving health and wellbeing.

4.84 From a policy perspective, it is clear that both local and national policy are consistent with one another in seeking to improve the quality of life for everyone, and highlight the important role housing plays in this, as well as providing services and facilities that reflect people’s needs. It is also important to be able to access these services and facilities.

4.85 The provision of 907 houses would provide the supply of housing, and these will contribute towards the Council’s five year housing land supply figure in the coming years which contributes towards the aim of “providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations.”

4.86 This is considered to represent a significant positive aspect of the scheme.

4.87 The applicant has confirmed that they will provide 17% of the total number of dwellings as affordable units. Given that this is beneath the amount outlined in Policy 4: Housing delivery of the JCS, the application was accompanied by a viability assessment which sought to highlight why this was not viable. This document has been assessed by the Council’s Property Consultant and they have confirmed that it is an accurate reflection of the proposal in financial terms. With this in mind it is considered that 17% is acceptable as Policy 4 of the JCS recognises that affordable housing provision is dependent on the overall viability of the development. In light of this figure, the S106 agreement will include a “claw back” provision.

4.88 The social role highlights the need for there to be “accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being”.

4.89 It is evident that there is a need to provide suitable links to such services, and in particular, to ensure that there is the ability to safely access those across the A47 in Costessey e.g. Ormiston Victory Academy, Roundwell Medical Centre etc. This requirement is directly reflected in emerging Policy EAS1 as set out above, again as set out above the scheme does provide safe and convenient links to facilitate access to key services.
4.90 As set out above, it is proposed to provide significant open space within the development including a new village heart. The S106 agreement will make provision for the transfer of the land along with contributions towards its ongoing maintenance and management. This would make a positive contribution towards health and social well-being.

4.91 Significant concern has been raised at the lack of capacity at local surgeries to cope with the inevitable demand from the proposed development. Roundwell Medical Centre is the nearest available facility, and they have confirmed that the Council that the centre has the ability to deal with the future requirements of the development. On a point of clarification, it should be stressed that there is no local planning policy requirement to provide a new surgery as part of the proposed development.

4.92 There has been concern at the potential lack of availability of school places, Norfolk County Council (NCC) has confirmed that the primary school within the village will need to be enlarged in order to cope with additional children. Consequently, as set out above, the application proposes to transfer 0.84ha of land to NCC in order to facilitate this. This would be secured as part of the S106 agreement. NCC has confirmed that it is satisfied with the amount, location and shape of land to be provided. In terms of secondary education, NCC have confirmed that sufficient capacity can be provided at Ormiston Victory Academy.

4.93 Any additional buildings or infrastructure required in relation to school premises could be funded via CIL monies.

4.94 In terms of creating a high quality built environment, the outline nature of the proposal results in there being limited capacity to fully assess the quality of the built environment and the role this would play in creating a positive environment for future occupiers and visitors, however, there is no planning reason why this could not be secured at reserved matters stage. The Council’s Design Officer has confirmed that further regard would need to be had to the impacts of the scheme in visual terms, but that it is not unreasonable for this to be done via a suitably worded condition requiring the agreement of a Design Code before any reserved matters application is submitted.

4.95 In summary, the scheme would result in some positive aspects from a social perspective.

Environmental implications

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.”

Paragraphs 29 – 41 of the NPPF highlights promotion of sustainable transport modes and reduce the need to travel therefore reducing use non-renewable natural resources. Paragraphs 109 – 125 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Paragraphs 126 – 141 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

4.96 In local planning policy terms, JCS Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets requires all development to be located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise emissions and adaptable to climate change. Policy 3 energy and water minimise reliance on non-renewable energy sources. With regard to the South Norfolk Local Plan, ENV8 prevents development within the open countryside unless specific criterion are met. IMP2 landscaping requires development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping.

4.97 It is considered that the adopted policies are consistent with the aims of national policy in respect of the environment.
4.98 As set out above, Historic England has raised concern in respect of the western most part of the proposal, for the reasons set out above, the Council consider that the proposed mitigation does sufficiently safeguard St Peters Church including its setting.

4.99 In terms of ecology, it is considered that appropriate surveys have been provided to assess the impacts of the scheme upon wildlife and subject to conditions in respect of protected species there is no objection.

4.100 Historic Environmental Services has confirmed that sufficient work has been carried out in respect archaeology, and request a condition be attached to any subsequent permission.

4.101 With regard to drainage, the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the Council’s Environmental Protection Team have all been consulted. They have all confirmed that there are no fundamental objections in respect of either foul or surface water drainage subject to the imposition of conditions. Furthermore, the Environment Agency and the Council’s Environmental Protection Team have confirmed they have no objection in terms of ground contamination subject to a condition.

4.102 In terms of the environmental role, it is considered that the scheme does satisfy the environmental requirements of the NPPF.

4.103 In summary, paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are not to be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent. Therefore, in making a judgement on whether the scheme represents sustainable development, it is necessary to make a rounded judgement, based upon the merits of the scheme when considered against the aims of the NPPF. With this in mind, it is considered that the scheme does present a number of economic, social and environmental benefits and as such can be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF.

Other issues

4.104 The outline nature of the scheme means that it is not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the scheme in respect of neighbour amenity with regard to light, outlook and privacy. However, it is evident from the submitted information that any reserved matters application could design a layout and house types which would prevent significant harm being caused in respect of the residential amenity including the aforementioned issues.

4.105 The amenity of future residents will be considered at the reserved matters stage through the final layout and plan of different phases. However, to ensure appropriate noise protection from the A47 a condition is recommended to agree appropriate mitigation measures as needed.

Environmental Impact Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

4.106 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. An Environmental Statement (ES) accompanied the application. The environmental, social and economic impacts raised in the ES have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and subject to the recommended conditions.

4.107 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.
4.108 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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which would be collected at the reserved matters stage.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 As set out above the scheme is contrary to policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP which as set out above continue to be up to date and carry significant weight in the decision-making process given SNC has an up to date five year land supply.

5.3 However, it is evident that the NPPF and the emerging policy EAS1, are material considerations in the determination of this application. It is also considered that this emerging policy carries significant weight in the decision-making process in acknowledgement of the contents of paragraph 216 of the NPPF, whereby the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document has been through examination by a Planning Inspector and proposed modifications are presently being consulted on, the proposed modifications do not include any significant revisions to Policy EAS1, and finally, Policy EAS1 is considered to be consistent with the aims of the NPPF, and in particular, in relation to boosting the supply of housing. The emerging policy is therefore given more weight in the overall consideration of this application than policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP.

5.4 The concerns raised by the local community have been considered in forming this recommendation on the application. However, the impacts of the development are considered to be acceptable with appropriate mitigation through condition or the Section 106 agreement and there is no material planning reason why the development should be refused.

5.5 In conclusion, notwithstanding the acknowledged conflict with Policies HOU4 and ENV8, it is considered that the material considerations in the form of the scheme represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF and in the overall planning balance, and being consistent with the aims of emerging Policy EAS1, which carries significant weight, the scheme is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 agreement.

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

3.  
   **Appl. No**: 2014/1743/F  
   **Parish**: BROOKE

   Applicants Name: Regency Care Homes Ltd  
   Site Address: Brooke House Care Home Brooke Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1JH  
   Proposal: Erection of extension to current dementia unit.

   **Recommendation**: Refusal

   1. Increased use of access with poor visibility would cause harm to highway safety, contrary to local plan policy IMP 8.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 3: Energy and water  
   Policy 4: Housing delivery  
   Policy 5: The economy  
   Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise  
   IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
   IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
   EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be 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  
   DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
   DM2.1 Employment and business development  
   DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs  
   DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

Statutory duties relating to Conservation Areas:

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.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0204 Erection of building to house Biomass boiler and hopper fuel supply Approved

2.2 2009/0303 To install a two-bay practise net facility Approved

2.3 2007/2615 Proposed extensions of existing EMI unit Refused

2.4 2007/1967 Proposed patio and paving Approved

2.5 2005/0336 Proposed modification of condition 7no of previous consent 1999/1807 to allow for an increase in residential rooms from 32no to 36no. Approved

2.6 2004/2096 Proposed extension to previous approved extension to increase communal area Approved

2.7 2001/0954 Change of use from Nursing Home to single dwelling Approved

2.8 1999/1807 Extension to nursing home Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommend approval providing the roof remains pitched and the County Council is satisfied that there are no highways reasons for refusal.

3.2 District Member This application raises a number of issues including:
- Additional adverse effect on neighbouring residential amenity
- Foul drainage
- Concerns about traffic generation and poor visibility at the access
- Concerns about the design and external lighting
- Cumulative impacts of proposed development added to previous changes and overdevelopment of the site.

3.3 NHS England No comments received

3.4 Heathgate Surgery No comments received
3.5 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council No comments received

3.6 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group No comments received

3.7 Historic England No comments received

3.8 Garden History Society No comments received

3.9 Historic Environment Service No comments received

3.10 Norfolk Gardens Trust No comments received

3.11 Landscape Officer The siting of the building would not conflict with the root protection zones of existing trees.

3.12 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections.

3.13 Conservation Officer The changes to the care home proposed do affect the conservation area and the historic parkland. I feel that with the comparatively modest scale of the scheme, the matching design and materials, and the position of the extension which avoids the loss of trees, the harm caused to the area and parkland is less than substantial, and this harm should be weighed against any public benefits the proposal can provide.

In the light of the above, I do not feel there would be an adverse impact on the historic form, character or setting of the parkland as outlined in policy ENV 5. The impact of the design would conform to policy IMP 18 as the scheme would blend in with the existing. While the scheme would not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area the other benefits of the scheme could provide an opportunity to enhance it and as such could be supported under section 72.

3.14 NCC Highways Object - Visibility measured from Brooke Gardens onto The Street (C203) from even the minimum recommended set back distance of 2 metres is quite severely restricted to the east (traffic direction) owing to the alignment of the road in this location and particularly the height of the hedge fronting the gatehouse property at number 6 The Street. Exiting out of the site onto The Street is currently hazardous owing to the restricted visibility.

The Agents have not proven that the development would not increase vehicle movements at the junction onto The Street. The application includes for an additional seven bedrooms and will require an additional seven staff. There is therefore a clear increase in development at the site.
3.15 Flood Defence Officer

No objection subject to conditions.

3.16 Anglian Water

No objection – there is sufficient capacity within the pipe leading to the main sewer.

3.17 Other Representations

11 letters of objection and a further joint letter of objection from the private residents of Brooke Gardens and letters of objection also received from Brooke Gardens Management Limited. Concerns regarding:

- Impact on historic parkland, conservation area and open countryside
- Impact on infrastructure, including access and foul drainage
- Impact on safe and free flow of traffic within the estate and at the junction with The Street
- Impact on residential amenity, particularly in terms of increased vehicle movements very close to neighbouring properties and intrusive lighting and noise for the immediate neighbours
- The proposal is about the same size as the previously refused application
- Impact on surface of private road from increased traffic
- Concern at increased deliveries from large vehicles
- Inadequate visibility at the access
- Design out of character with properties in Brooke Gardens
- Full height windows out of keeping
- The existing foul sewer system is known to overflow
- Light pollution from internal lights
- Potential for increased use of the biomass boiler and oil boiler

4 Assessment

Site and Proposal

4.1 The application site is Brooke Care Home. The home is situated within a large 1930’s property set within substantial grounds. The original building was extended with the addition of a significant single storey extension permitted in 2000. The grounds are mainly laid to lawn and feature a number of trees and hedges. The site is within a Conservation Area and also forms part of a designated Historic Parkland. The building is not listed.

4.2 The home is accessed via a privately owned road known as Brooke Gardens which is also a cul-de-sac. A number of residential properties are also accessed from this road. These properties are to the north of the site. To the west is a small area of woodland and beyond that a cricket ground. To the south and east is agricultural land.

4.3 The proposal is for a single storey extension to the home, with a floor area of which would be connected to the existing modern extension. The building would have the appearance of having a pitched roof although the central part of the roof would be flat. The walls would be a combination of cedar cladding and render. Windows would be white UPVc.

4.4 The extension would comprise 6 en-suite bedrooms, 2 communal rooms, an assisted bathroom and a laundry. An existing communal room within the main building would be converted to a bedroom, enabling an increase of 7 bedrooms overall, meaning a maximum of 7 new residents, making a total of 41 residents. Currently there are 10 full time care staff including the manager between 08.00 and 14.00 hours, 4 care staff between 14.00-20.00 hours plus and 5 full time care staff between 20.00 and 08.00 hours. In addition there are kitchen and maintenance staff, for which numbers have not been supplied. It is envisaged that the extension would lead to an increase in 1 staff member per shift for care purposes.
Principle of development

4.5 Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), policy EMP 6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the development of existing business and community facilities within the countryside, providing the impacts of the development are acceptable. The main considerations in the determination of this application are the design and visual impact of the proposal on the conservation area and historic parkland, the impact on residential amenity, the highway impact, the impact on trees, the impact on flood risk and the impact on foul drainage.

Design and visual impact of the proposal on the conservation area and historic parkland

4.6 Policy IMP 17 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that proposals for extensions to non-listed buildings within conservation areas will not be permitted unless the design and materials are sympathetic to the character of the appearance of the existing building and to the overall quality of surroundings. Policy IMP 18 requires development proposals in conservation areas to blend in with the area in terms of scale, height, form and massing, the traditional pattern of frontages, design detailing, and the contribution of spaces between buildings to the overall character or appearance of the locality. Policy ENV 5 requires protection of the park land quality and landscape integrity of the historic parks, with all development proposals being required to respect the nature and layout of the original parkland planting.

4.7 The height of the extension would be slightly lower than the previous extension to which it would be connected. The design of the extension uses similar elements to those used on the existing extension, although some different features are proposed, such as cedar cladding, and full height windows. The design would generally be subservient to the original house and existing extension. However it does introduce further built development onto an area currently laid to lawn, which forms part of the conservation area. In addition the site is within an area identified as a County historic park and garden, which while not of such significance as the historic parks listed by English Heritage, is nonetheless a designation that should be taken into account.

4.8 In consultation with the Conservation Officer, the scale of the proposal does not “challenge” that of the original house, although the extent of the spread of new build would exceed that of the original footprint. The view from the main road to the east would be largely unaffected due to the presence of the mature tree belt. The approach to the house from Brooke Gardens is focussed on the house and with the trees along the west side of the driveway, and given the position of the extension to the west of the previous extension, the proposal would not make a significant impact on that “setting”.

4.9 On balance, the scale, form and massing of the proposal is considered acceptable. There are some design details which are not found on the existing building, such as the full height windows and cedar cladding. The applicant was invited to change the design of the windows but has preferred to retain them. These design details, and the impact of further built development does result in a degree of harm to the conservation area and historic park land, due to the loss of the open space. Therefore there is a degree of conflict with policies IMP 17, IMP 18 and ENV 5.

4.10 The level of harm is considered to fall into the category of ‘less than substantial’. In such circumstances, paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the benefits of the proposal, in terms of the social benefit of providing 7 additional dementia care places, and economic benefits in terms of creating a small number of jobs and allowing a business to expand, is considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the conservation area and historic park.
4.11 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.” For the above reasons, the proposal does not fully preserve the character of the conservation area. However the benefits of the proposal are a material consideration which outweighs this harm.

4.12 Objectors have pointed out that the scale of the proposal is not dissimilar to that proposed under application 2007/2615, which was refused partly on the grounds of harm to the historic parkland and conservation area. Whilst the footprint would be similar, the height has been reduced so that the proposed extension would be more subservient than that which was previously refused. In addition, with the publication of the NPPF in 2012, there is an increased emphasis within national planning policy of supporting businesses, therefore additional weight has been given to the economic benefits of the proposal.

The impact on residential amenity

4.13 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupiers regarding the increased vehicle use of Brooke Gardens, which is privately owned and maintained by a local residents group, of which the properties and care home are part of. Concerns relate to the damage that could be caused by more large vehicles using the road, and increased noise and disturbance from more traffic using the road.

4.14 There is a disagreement between the applicant and the local residents regarding the numbers of vehicle movements to and from the site. The applicant has argued that the number of visitors has reduced since 2008 (when the last application to extend the building was refused), but this figure doesn’t take account of staff movements and deliveries. On balance, it is considered that the development proposed would not give rise to materially adverse impacts on residential amenity, over and above the existing impacts.

4.15 The separation distances between the proposed extension and the nearest residential dwelling house (Meadow End) is approximately 60 metres. The distance to the boundary of the garden is 40 metres. This distance, combined with the single storey size of the building is sufficient to ensure there would not be material impacts in terms of looking and overshadowing. Although there are conflicting views on the extent of increased vehicle movements, it is considered that the increase would not be of such an order which would cause harm to residential amenity or material harm to the road surface.

4.16 In terms of lighting, the external lighting would be emergency lighting which would be activated if the alarm is activated. The impact of internal lighting would be mitigated by curtains. No objection is raised by the Environmental Protection Officer. Overall the proposal is considered to comply with Local Plan policy IMP 09 with regards to impact on neighbouring amenity.

The highway impact

4.17 The Highway Authority initially raised an objection to the application due to the increased use of an access which has inadequate visibility. In response the Applicant submitted a Transport Statement which argues that the number of visitors to the home has reduced since 2007 as a result of the transition from a general care home to a dementia care home. The Transport Statement therefore states that the increase of seven beds would not result in a greater number of personal visitors to the site as a whole. It is also stated that in the last 27 years (the period for which data is available) there has only been one accident at the Brooke Gardens site access.
4.18 The Highway Authority contends that visitor numbers are not the only vehicle movements associated with the site. There would also be movements relating to increased staff and deliveries. The Highway Authority is concerned that visibility from Brooke Gardens onto The Street is severely restricted to the east, due to the alignment of the road and the height of the hedge fronting the dwelling at no. 6 The Street.

4.19 The traffic surveys carried out on behalf of the Applicant show that the speed of vehicles approaching the Brooke Gardens entrance from the east is above 30 mph, with the relevant figures being 32 mph for the 2009 survey and 33 mph for the 2014 survey. On this basis the relevant visibility standard is 47-49 metres. The actual visibility of 20m obtainable in the approaching traffic (critical) direction is less than 50% of that recommended. The Highway Authority objects on the basis that no solution is proposed to this problem and the Applicant has not proven the development would not increase vehicle movements at the junction onto The Street. The proposal therefore conflicts with Local Plan policy IMP 8 which seeks to ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

The impact on trees

4.20 There are a number of mature trees within the vicinity of the application site. An Arboricultural Report has been submitted which demonstrates that building can be accommodated without detriment to the trees. Although the recommendation is one of approval, should members be minded to approve the application, a condition requiring confirmation of the location and approval of any drainage runs and soakaways is suggested.

The impact on flood risk

4.21 The site lies within flood zone 1, the area of lowest flood risk. No objections are raised by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer on the grounds of flood risk.

The impact on foul drainage.

4.22 Concerns have been raised by local residents with regard to the capacity of the existing sewage system to deal with the increased demand that would result from the development proposal. Foul drainage is currently pumped to the main sewer. Anglian Water has confirmed that the sewage network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed extension.

Other matters

4.23 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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal for the extension to Brooke House Care Home would bring social benefits, in terms of accommodating 7 new residents with dementia care needs and also economic benefits, in terms of providing a small level of additional employment, and allowing for the expansion of an existing business. In this regard the proposal accords with relevant guidance within the NPPF and policies related to economic development and housing delivery within the Joint Core Strategy and current and emerging development plan policy.
5.2 The extension would cause a degree of harm to the character of the conservation area and the historic park land, leading to a degree of conflict with national and local policies relating to the protection of heritage assets, together with Section 72 of the Listed Buildings Act. However, this harm is classed as ‘less than substantial’ and on balance, in this instance, the benefits of the scheme outweighs this harm.

5.3 Despite this the proposal would lead to the increased use of an access with poor visibility and the application has failed to satisfactorily address this point. The benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm to highway safety that would be caused. The application is therefore recommended for refusal on highway safety grounds.

6 Reasons for Refusal

6.1 Visibility measured from Brooke Gardens onto The Street (C203) from even the minimum recommended set back distance of 2 metres is severely restricted to the east due to the alignment of the road in this location and the height of the hedge fronting the property at number 6 The Street. Exiting out of the site onto The Street is currently hazardous owing to the restricted visibility. The proposed development would increase vehicle movements to and from the site and increase the use of the unsatisfactory access. The proposal is therefore detrimental to highway safety, which is contrary to saved policy IMP 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003)

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Robert Webb 01508 533681
and E-mail: rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2014/2576/CU  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL  

Applicants Name: Mr Ismail Budak  
Site Address: 9 Rectory Road Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4NW  
Proposal: Change of use from a Doctor's surgery to a Fish & Chip shop together with a new ventilation extract outlet.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted plans  
3. Hours of operation: 10am – 11pm Mon-Sat only  
4. Retention of existing car parking  
5. Installation and retention of extraction equipment

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
SHO 8: Local and rural shops and services  
SHO 10: Class A3 uses outside the defined Central Business Areas  
SHO 11: Class A3 uses - control over hours of operation  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM2.1 Employment and business development  
DM2.6 Food, drink and hot food takeaways  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

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

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.”
2. Planning History

2.1 DE/2489 Provision of surgery Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Parish Council confirm that they own freehold of this property. Share some of residents concerns regarding likely impact on traffic and parking on Rectory Road and in village. Considerable traffic problems from heavy vehicles linked to packaging factory and increasing pressure of school traffic. Concern that lorries may divert off A140. Concern that Rectory Road may become unpleasant and dangerous.

3.2 District Member To be determined by Committee to allow issues of noise, traffic and odour to be considered.

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection subject to condition restricting hours of operation.

3.4 NCC Highways Requested further information regarding hours of operation of previous use and status of parking forecourt. Following receipt of this information considered that, given previous use, a highway objection could not be sustained.

3.5 Other Representations 16 letters of objection have been received. 10 from Rectory Road, 5 from Mill Close and 1 from Norwich Road.
- Will result in unwanted smell which will affect opening of residential windows and hanging out of washing.
- Will affect enjoyment of garden.
- Ventilation chimney does not appear high enough to take away smell of fumes.
- Extraction chimney should not be visible, will be in direct line of sight, would be out of keeping in conservation area.
- Food storage and waste will attract rats which are already a problem.
- Will increase litter.
- Will encourage youngsters to congregate.
- Increased noise from customers will disturb quiet street.
- Rectory Road already single file because of on-street parking.
- Already problems with heavy vehicles from packaging factory, caravans in the summer.
- Proposal will increase traffic volume and on-street parking.
- Will increase on-street parking in Rectory Road, Mill Close and Smiths Close.
- Forecourt currently used by residents, will force cars onto road.
- New houses will already create more traffic on Rectory Road.
- Already problem with parking after 5pm and at weekends.
- Already have a chip van visiting once a week, will affect its business.
- Will affect Crown public house which serves food.
- There are chip shops in nearby towns.
- Will encourage obesity.
- No employment benefit to village.
- Will affect house prices
- Applicant opens 7 days in other premises, object to this here.
- Will affect integrity of rural village.
- Were there any conditions when property was gifted to parish council?
4 Assessment

Site Description

4.1 The application site comprises of a vacant single storey building on the north side of Rectory Road, close to its junction with Mill Close. It is located within the development limits of Dickleburgh and within its conservation area. It is bounded by residential properties to the north and east and also on the south side of the road. The property is set back from the highway with a front forecourt with 'in and out' access and parking for up to 5 cars. There is a small enclosed garden on the north side of the property. It was previously used as a doctor’s surgery and this use ceased in February 2013.

Proposal

4.2 This application proposes the change of use of the property to a fish and chip takeaway shop (Class A5) and the installation of extraction equipment. Externally, this would comprise of a steel chimney with an extraction fan and silencer to be installed on the western elevation. The proposed use would create 3 FTE jobs and the applicant proposes operating hours of 11.30am - 2pm and 4.30pm - 9pm on Mondays-Saturdays and 4.30pm - 8pm on Sundays and bank holidays. It is proposed to retain the existing parking provision on the forecourt. The application was accompanied by two letters of personal reference relating to a similar business that the applicant operates in another district.

Principle of development

4.3 The application site is located centrally within the development limits of Dickleburgh. It was previously occupied as a satellite GP surgery, in association with the larger practice in Pulham Market. It was used for two days each week and was staffed by one GP and a receptionist. The practice manager at Pulham Market has confirmed that the premises were closed as they were inadequate, did not meet current standards and so are no longer required for this use. Policy SH08 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy DM 2.6 of the emerging local plan encourage the provision of services within village boundaries providing that they are of an appropriate scale and do not raise issues of noise, odour or general disturbance that cannot be controlled by conditions. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of this proposal may be acceptable subject to no adverse impacts being identified.

Highway safety

4.4 The application site includes a forecourt to the front which has been used for informal resident parking while the premises have been empty. However, this is not a designated parking area and the forecourt is included within this application to provide 5 spaces for staff and customers. There is existing on-street parking along Rectory Road and concern has been expressed that the proposed use would increase this problem and result in increased parking in nearby residential cul de sacs. The previous surgery use would have generated vehicle movements relating to staff and patients and, although it only operated two days per week before it closed, this use could have operated throughout the week. The nature of the use now proposed would result in short visits from customers and, given the previous permitted use and the parking provision within the site, NCC Highways do not consider that this proposal would result in any notable additional on-street parking and so do not consider that a highway objection could be sustained. They have further commented that, while the applicant could apply for no parking restrictions (yellow lines) along the frontage, they consider that this would be likely to be ignored for short periods in any case and this process could take up to 9 months to complete. As there would be adequate parking provision within the site, it is not considered that this approach would be necessary or reasonable. In addition, it is considered that the use of Rectory Road by any heavy vehicles associated with the nearby packaging factory is not likely to increase as a result of the proposed use and that it would be unlikely to develop as a stop for such vehicles from the A140 main road. The application property is located in the centre of the
village and close to other local services. Therefore, it is not considered that it would introduce any new issues of pedestrian safety on the highway.

Neighbour amenity

4.5 The applicant has submitted full details of the ventilation and extraction equipment that they propose to use. This would include an external flue to be sited centrally on the western elevation. Concerns have been expressed by residents that the proposed use will result in nuisance from odours and smell. However, Environmental Services have assessed these details and have raised no objections to the specification proposed. Therefore, the extraction equipment as proposed is considered adequate to preserve residential amenity and a condition is recommended requiring the retention of this equipment at all times.

4.6 Policy SHO 11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy DM 2.6 of the emerging local plan recommend closing times of 11pm on Mondays to Saturdays and 10.30pm on Sundays and bank holidays. The applicant proposes to close earlier than this in the evenings but also seeks to operate on Sundays and bank holidays. Environmental Services have recommended a closing time of 10pm on Mondays to Saturdays and 8pm on other days. It is considered that there is no planning reason to restrict these hours beyond our adopted and emerging policy criteria of 11pm on Mondays - Saturdays. However, given the location of the premises in a largely residential area, it is considered that the operation of the proposed use on Sundays and bank holidays when a lower level of activity can be expected would be likely to have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity. Therefore, a condition is recommended to restrict hours of operation to between 10am - 11pm on Mondays to Saturdays with no operation on Sundays and bank holidays.

Character of conservation area

4.7 This proposal would bring a vacant commercial premises back into use within the conservation area. The premises themselves are small in scale and so the proposed use and level of activity, subject to the restrictive conditions recommended, would not be likely to harm the character of the conservation area. The proposed extraction equipment is also small in scale and so would have an acceptable visual impact in this part of the conservation area.

4.8 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 The proposed change of use of these premises will add to the provision of services in this village location and so is considered acceptable in principle in accordance with policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy, policy SHO 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy DM 2.6 of the emerging local plan. It is also considered that the proposed use, subject to the recommended conditions, will have an acceptable impact on highway safety, residential amenity and the character of the conservation area in accordance with policies IMP08, IMP09 and IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policies DM3.12, DM3.14 and DM4.11 of the emerging local plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985
and E-mail: bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2015/0186/CU  
**Parish**: ALBURGH

Applicants Name: Mr Nigel Bond  
Site Address: South Farm Tunbeck Road Alburgh Norfolk IP20 0BS  
Proposal: Change of use from a firewood processing site to the standing of 6 self-storage cargo containers, for general public rental.

Recommendation: Refusal

1 Unsustainable location in conflict with Policy 17 of the JCS, and EMP8 of the SNLP 2003.

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 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (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  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

**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.”
2. **Planning History**

2.1 2014/0209  Continued use of the property for: (i) wood processing, storage and creation of wood products and sales of finished products online or by telephone but excluding wood planning of a continuous nature (blue on plan) (ii) food preparation and creation (purple on plan) (iii) long-term storage and occasional movement of stored items (green on plan)  

2.2 2012/1013  Installation of photovoltaic PV in ground mounted paddock area  

2.3 2012/1122  Installation of one micro scale wind turbine  

2.4 2011/0987  Erection of hanging sign  

2.5 2011/0986  Change of use to office and showroom  

2.6 2007/2370  Change of use from storage to a food preparation area, storage & office and retrospective planning permission for installation of 3 windows  

2.7 2007/0799  Change of use from storage to B1 use and retrospective planning permission for installation of 2 windows in the western elevation of the granary  

2.8 2007/0475  Change of use of store to brewery shop selling bottled & draught beers and some locally produced foods  

2.9 2006/2372  Proposed change of use from temporary to permanent use of buildings for storage and repair of motor vehicles  

2.10 2006/0106  Conversion of dairy & storage buildings to a micro brewery  

2.11 2005/0647  Conversion of farm building to provide two workshops and storage area  

2.12 2004/1910  Proposed change of use from agricultural building to storage and repair of motor vehicles  

2.13 2002/1622  Change of use from agricultural building to let building for the storage of animal feeds & other non-hazardous substances  

2.14 2000/1899  Change of use from dairy cubicle house to self-livery stabling  

Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council** Approve application - but consider being out of keeping with the farm buildings could make the farmyard look like an industrial site. If they are totally hidden then no objection.

3.2 **District Member** To be determined by committee if for approval.

3.3 **NCC Highways** No objection subject to condition to provide parking and turning on the site.

3.4 **Environmental Services (Protection)** No objection subject to condition limiting hours of use with no Sunday or Bank Holiday opening.

3.5 **Flood Defence Officer** Containers will stand on existing concrete therefore no additional surface water issues.

3.6 **Ecologist** No ecology survey available but considers there are no ecology constraints on the site.

3.7 **Representations** 4 letters of objection
- Increased traffic.
- Containers visible from lounge windows, will result in industrial type of development not appropriate for a rural area.
- Already noise and disturbance from commercial activities on the farm this will worsen the issues.
- Colour of containers unsightly and out of character with the area.
- Existing firewood business is not authorised.
- Question whether the constructions will be visible being in such close proximity to the road.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for the change of use of the land for storage purposes (B8 use) and which includes the standing 6 self-storage cargo containers for the purposes of providing self-storage facilities for storing household items at South Farm Alburgh. The containers would be 6.05m long x 2.43m wide x 2.5m tall.

4.2 The site is the east part of the site adjacent to Tunbeck Road, an existing earth bund and hedge partly screens the site which has previously been used for the storage of firewood, the applicant states the use of the site for firewood ceased in March 2014. The hard standing on which the containers are proposed to be located is adjacent to existing modern barns which are used for commercial workshop facilities. The farmhouse, is set some distance to the south of the site and is not listed. A grade II listed building (Gayridge Farm) lies to the north east of the site and a further listed building (Piccadilly Cottage) lies to the north. 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 on the setting of the listed building opposite the site, impact on highways and impact on neighbouring occupiers.
Principle of development

4.4 The proposal is considered under policy EMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan which requires such development should be ancillary to, and facilitate, the continued agricultural use of the farm holding; would enable existing farmland to remain in, or available for, agricultural use; make a positive contribution to the rural economy; would not have a demonstrably harmful impact on the local countryside in terms of landscape, public access or the living conditions of local residents; and be accessible by means other than a private car where non-farm workers are to be employed. This policy is consistent with the NPPF which supports scheme which benefit the rural economy, through the re-use of existing buildings, and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; and the site is accessible by means other than a private car.

4.5 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.

4.6 Commercial businesses already operate from a range of existing farm buildings on the site, as can be seen from the planning history section set out above. The site of the containers previously accommodated a fire wood business, although there is no planning permission for that specific operation, the applicant has stated the proposed change of use would eradicate the need for articulated lorries to deliver trees to South Farm to be processed into firewood, which would significantly reduce the traffic and noise.

4.7 This point is not disputed. The standing of storage containers for the purposes of self-storage does not however demand a rural location. No additional employment is expected but a domestic storage facility is likely to attract customers to the site which is not accessible by means other than private car. For these reasons the scheme is not considered to represent sustainable development and conflicts with Policy 17 of the JCS, and EMP8 of the SNLP 2003.

Impact on listed buildings

4.8 The site is partly screened from the public highway by a hedgerow however the site would be partly visible from various points along Tunbeck Road, and from the public footpath which runs to the north of the site.

4.9 The setting of listed buildings requires consideration under the NPPF and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, which requires local planning authorities to 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 site lies opposite to two grade II listed properties, which are separated from the application site by the highway to the east and a Public Right of Way to the north. The application has been assessed by the Conservation Officer who has raised no objection to the scheme on the grounds that it would not have any harmful impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with section 12 of the NPPF and Policy IMP15 of the SNLP.

Impact on Highways

4.10 The applicant states that the storage containers would be let for domestic clients wishing to store household goods, the Highway Officer raises no objection subject to conditions requiring confirmation of parking/turning areas within the site. The proposal complies with policy IMP 08 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Impact on neighbouring occupiers

4.11 Policy IMP 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan requires development proposals to safeguard residential amenity. Apart from the farmhouse to the south other residential properties lie to the north and north east of the site.
4.12 Four letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties raising concern about the impact of additional vehicle movements, the appearance of the containers which would result in an industrial appearance of the site, and additional noise.

4.13 In terms of traffic, no objections are raised by the Highways Authority and therefore I do not consider that the proposal can be refused on highway grounds.

4.14 In respect of noise disturbance from the use, given the small number of containers and in the absence of any objections from the Environment Services Officer, I do not consider that this would represent a reason to refuse the application.

4.15 Whilst the containers will be visible in the context of the locality, their appearance does not give rise to a situation so detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties to warrant refusal on visual impact grounds, the scheme complies with IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Financial

4.16 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.

4.17 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new floor space would be created.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is for the use of an existing hardstanding for the standing of 6 storage containers for domestic storage. The proposal would bring limited economic benefits by way of small income for the existing farm. The proposal does not demand a rural location, and the site is only accessibly by means of private car, for these reasons the proposal is not in a sustainable location and is in conflict with Policies 1 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, and EMP8 of the SNLP 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2015/0445/CU  
**Parish**: WORTWELL

Applicants Name: Mr J Stokes  
Site Address: Waveney Farm Shop High Road Wortwell Norfolk IP20 0EN  
Proposal: Change of use from Farm Shop to Car Sales to include take out of light beverages and refreshments

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. Amended plans  
3. Car washing of vehicles for sale only  
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and implemented  
5. Restriction on hours for vehicle washing  
6. Parking for staff and customers  
7. Hours of use 8am to 6pm 7 days/week  
8. No on-site cooking of hot food unless agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPFF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPFF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPFF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 3: River valleys  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
EMP 3: Adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment  
EMP 7: The retention of rural employment and services (Part  
TRA 13: Corridors of movement

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM2.2 Protection of employment sites  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/0219 Erection of various signs Approved
2.2 2007/2250  Change of use of part of shop to accommodate a café and variation of opening hours.  Approved

2.3 2007/2206  Extension to car park  Approved

2.4 1991/0418  Change of use of barn from agricultural to small plant and tool hire  Refused  Allowed on appeal

3.  Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Refuse
   • Already has two car sales businesses in this small village and feel that a third is unnecessary.
   • Strongly object to the removal of surrounding trees and hedges from the site without permission from the District council.

3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee -
   • No indication of layout of car display areas
   • If approved, will need the submission and implementation of a suitable landscaping scheme.

3.3 NCC Highways  Additional plan needed to identify parking spaces, customer parking and staff parking.

Comment on amended plans:
No objections subject condition to ensure parking spaces are kept available for specific purposes at all times.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections subject to conditions:
Car sales between 8am and 6 pm Monday to Sunday including bank holidays.
Car repairs and Pressure washing of vehicles between the hours on 9 - 5 Monday to Friday, 9 - 1pm on Saturday and no Sunday or public holidays.

3.5 Flood Defence Officer  To be reported

3.6 Representations  3 Letters of objection
   • Site is not suitable for car sales as the junction adjacent to A143 and the B1062 is the site of many accidents.
   • The sight of cars for sale which will be clearly visible since the removal of the shrubs would be a further distraction.
   • Already 2 sites for car sales in the village, do not need 3.
   • The site will not be an amenity to the community unlike the previous establishment that was useful to all.

4  Assessment

4.1 The site seeks permission to change the use from a former farm shop to that of car sales, with a small area within the building being reserved for the sales of light refreshment. The site is located on elevated land forming an island with the A143 Wortwell to the west, Flixton Road to the north and High Road to the east of the site. Two residential properties are situated on the south west boundary of the site.

4.2 Policies in the NPPF, JSC, saved policy EMP7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 seek to retain rural employment premises which contribute to the rural economy.
4.3 There are 2 key issues arising in this case. The first is the principle of the use of the site for car sales, the second is the visual appearance of the site since the original landscaping was removed. Other issues relate to onsite parking, car washing facilities and hours of operation.

Principle of use

4.4 The site is considered to have an established commercial use by virtue of the appeal decision in 1991 and the use of the site since that time. The farm shop has already closed and at the time of my site visit the site was vacant. The proposed use of the site retains local employment which in turn contributes to the local economy. The use of the building for car sales has raised objection from local residents, however, this tends to be in relation to the site if permitted, becoming a third site for car sales in the village. The other two sites are Goodswens garage situated in the centre of the village, the second site being further north from the application site close to the junction of Station Road at the old depot. Competition between businesses is not in itself a planning issue, however, the established use of the site is a material consideration and the site is considered to accord with Section 3 of the NPPF, Policy 5 of the JCS and with saved policy EMP7 of the SNLP 2003.

Visual appearance

4.5 The site at present is enclosed by security railings; the planting which was originally on site as a result of a condition on the appeal decision, has been removed. Concern has been raised by the Parish Council and the Local Member regarding the visual appearance of the site and the need for landscaping. The site at present has an urban appearance, a landscape scheme to reduce the urban appearance of the steel fence around the site would soften the visual appearance of the site and be more in keeping with the rural area. A condition has been included to ensure this is achieved.

Highways

4.6 The Highways Authority raised issue with the plan as original submitted which lacked information identifying customer and staff parking. An amended plan was sought to demonstrate the site had adequate space to accommodate the necessary customer and staff parking in addition to the spaces required for the display of cars for sale. Following re-consultation with the Highways Authority the scheme is now supported subject to the necessary condition, as amended the proposal accords with IMP8 of the SNLP 2003.

Other issues

4.7 The site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, being close to the River Waveney. While the site is proposed for car sales, concern has been raised through discussion with local residents regarding the potential for car wash facilities to be introduced onto the site, ancillary to the main use of the site. I acknowledge that the cars for sale will need to be washed as part of the normal business activities associated with car sales, however, to prevent potential flooding and pollution of the watercourse it is necessary to control the level of car wash activities on the site. For this reason a condition has been included to limit the use of car washing to vehicles for sale only. The comments from the Flood Defence Officer are not available at the time of the report but will be orally reported.

4.8 The applicant has requested opening hours of 8am to 6pm 7 days a week including bank holidays. Whilst the Environmental Services have raised no objection to the proposed hours of use, they have requested that a condition limiting any car repairs and pressure washing of vehicles between the hours on 9 - 5 Monday to Friday, 9 - 1pm on Saturday and no Sunday or public holidays. No car repairs are proposed as part of the application, however, given there are neighbours close to the boundary of the site, I consider this condition is reasonable to protect amenities which could be adversely affected by the noise of any compressor associated with a pressure washer for the business. As conditioned the
scheme accords with IMP9 and IMP10 of the SNLP 2003.

4.9 Included within the proposal is the take out of light beverages and refreshments. The applicant wishes to be able to provide refreshments for his customers that are visiting the site and for passing trade. Given that the site’s previous use included a café, the sale of refreshments is considered acceptable. However to protect the amenities of the nearby residential properties from odour nuisance a condition is proposed limiting the sale of food and drink to hot and cold beverages and snacks, sandwiches light lunches and no on-site cooking of hot food unless agreed.

Financial

4.10 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.

4.11 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as there is no additional floor space created, and the building has been in lawful use for 6 months of the last 12.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The site has an established commercial use, and the use as proposed retains employment in a rural area which accords with Section 3 of the NPPF, Policy 5 of the JCS and saved policy EMP7 of the SNLP 2003.

5.2 The amended plan ensures there is adequate parking on the site for customers and staff which accords with the requirements of the Highways Authority and IMP8 of the SNLP 2003. As conditioned the visual appearance of the site will be improved to be more in keeping with the surrounding locality, while the restricted hours of car washing facilities protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties, the scheme accords with IMP9 and IMP10 of the SNLP 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2015/0564/O  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr S Bye  
Site Address: Subdivision Of Garden Of 72 Common Road Bressingham Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 1no dwelling

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Cramped form of development and out of character contrary to NPPF, JCS policy 2 and Place Making Guide

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to 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  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.6 Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Settlements  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

1.6 South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2004/2546 Erection of conservatory  
Approved

2.2 2004/0286 Proposed single storey extension to form annexe – resubmission of 2003/1757  
Approved
2.3 2003/1757 Proposed erection of detached annexe within Approved existing residential curtilage

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve - but concern regarding the small size of the plot and how any building will fit in with the building line and parking.

3.2 District Member Can be delegated if officers are to approve. Site is within the development boundary, it could follow the boundary line, a limited division of garden has been permitted at No. 2 Common Road, also The Hollies has approval. Understood that if permitted it will be a self-build development in keeping with the government policy and SNDC own scheme and soul be given weight.

3.3 Flood Defence Officer Support subject to condition for disposal of foul and surface water.

3.4 NCC Highways If approved condition required to demonstrate visibility splays, access arrangements, parking and provision in accordance with adopted standard. and turning area.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection subject to condition for reporting contaminated land during construction.

3.6 Public Rights Of Way No objections, proposal does not impact on the public right of way.

3.7 Other Representations 1 letter of objection If inadequate space provided on site it will result in on street parking. Potential for loss of privacy from new property disposal of water into existing system.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is outline for one dwelling on a plot which currently forms part of the front garden of No 72 Common Road. No 72 is a large two storey detached property set in a substantial plot, the property is set back within the plot and is similar in this aspect to the property to the north (No74). A Public Right of Way runs immediately to the south of the proposed plot, but remains unaffected by the proposal. Common Road comprises a mix of semi-detached and detached properties, the size and design of these properties varies resulting in a mix of overall development in the immediate area, but all properties benefit from large plots either in terms of width, or are narrow but long.

4.2 Bressingham is defined in the JCS as an Other Village, where the infill plots and small scale development will be accepted if within the Development Boundary. The application site is within the existing development boundary, and the proposed development limits of the emerging Local Development Framework. The site is not infill as it lies to the front of the existing dwelling, but does fall within the development limits.

Character of area

4.3 Common Road comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached properties which vary in terms of size and design. The general pattern of plot sizes is generous, the semi-detached properties all benefit from long plots albeit narrow in nature. The plot being considered for this development is tucked into the corner of the front garden of No 72 resulting in a plot of
limited width and depth. Although the plot is within the Development Limits of Bressingham, the size of the plot if developed would result in a cramped form of development out of character with the locality and having a poor relationship with the existing dwelling number 72 that would partly face the rear of the new plot. This layout would not relate well to the existing development and would harm the character and appearance of the area.

Impact on neighbour

4.4 Concern has been raised by the neighbouring property to the potential of overlooking, however, with sensitive design, this could be avoided, and any loss of privacy given the distance and orientation of the proposed plot would be limited. The potential for overlooking does not in itself justify refusal and could with a sensitive design accord with IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Highways

4.5 No details of the access have been provided, the Highways Officer raises no objection in principle but requires full details of visibility splays, access, parking and turning to be submitted as part of the reserved matters application. With the details required by Highways the proposal could accord with IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Financial

4.6 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.

4.7 The dwelling would generate CIL, but the above considerations raise significant concerns which must be weighed against the benefits of CIL monies.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Notwithstanding the fact the plot is within the development limit for Bressingham, the development would result in significant harm to the character of the immediate area. This would conflict with the advice in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and would not represent good design as required by the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2015/0697/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

**Applicants Name**: Mr Iain Reid  
**Site Address**: Storage Land (Citygate Developments) William Frost Way  
**Costessey Norfolk**

**Proposal**: Change of use of land to allow second hand car sales, including the resurfacing of the existing hardstanding area and installation of a modular portable office building.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
**NPPF 10**: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic

1.3 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 summer 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.

1.4 Development Management Policies  
- DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
- DM2.1 Employment and business development

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2004/1175**  
Resubmission of W07/04/0051/CU for change of use from depot to outside storage with the erection of a storage & administration building

Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**

- Refuse
  - Unless mitigation is provided on William Frost Way either extension of new dedicated slip road provided by Next along the site or a S106 contribution is provided to extend the slip road, or land is granted to Norfolk CC to allow them to construct the third lane on William Frost Way in future.
  - It was noted County Councillor has been in contact with City Gates Development and the difference in levels between the site and road is only 2 metres and not 4-5 metres suggested by the applicant.

3.2 **District Members**

- **Clr East**
  - To be determined by Committee
  - Require S106 improvements to William Frost Way
  - Extra slip road as part of Next needs to be extended
  - Hope application is not for second hand scrap yard and is it a very high profile and prominent location
  - Office accommodation needs to be more than a modular building as the design conveys to me the very temporary nature for the change of use.

- **Clr Bell**
  - To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **NCC Highways**

- Support with conditions
  - Second hand car sales is a relatively benign use in traffic terms and this is reflected in the low projected traffic figure in the Design and Access Statement
  - Proposed use of land will not materially affect traffic levels in the area
  - The site has an existing and acceptable access to the adopted highway suitable for all modes of transport

3.4 **Environmental Services (Protection)**

- No Objection
  - Disclaimer on contamination

3.5 **Flood Defence Officer**

- Support with conditions
  - Surface water drainage via soakaways - run off from roads and car parking areas must incorporate appropriate pollution prevention measures and infiltration drainage must have a series of treatment steps to prevent the pollution of groundwater.
  - Any drainage from vehicle wash down is not suitable to discharge of surface water and should drain to a sump and tankered away or discharged to the foul sewer subject to consent from Anglia Water
  - Foul drainage is proposed to be package treatment plant there is a main sewer in William Frost Way and this should be the first option unless it is not reasonably practical
  - If a treatment system is proposed that offers a more sustainable solution to the overall water management of the site that might be acceptable

3.6 **Other Representations**

- One letter of support
4 Assessment

4.1 The application is to use the currently vacant site to the north of the new Next building and to the west of William Frost Way for second hand car sales. A modular building is also proposed on site. The site was last used for the hire and storage of mobile buildings. There is an existing bund with some landscaping along the west and south sides of the site.

4.2 The site is within the development limit and has previously been used as an employment site and is within a retail/employment area. There are no policies which restrict car sales in this area.

4.3 The District Member and Town Council have requested that a new slip road provided by Next is extended in front of this development or a financial contribution is made to provide it. Any financial contributions or obligations can only be required if they are necessary as a result of the development. The Highway Officer considers that second hand car sales is a relatively benign use in traffic terms and this is reflected in the low projected traffic figure in the Design and Access Statement. He considers that the proposed use would not materially affect traffic levels in the area, it also has an existing and acceptable access to the adopted highway suitable for all modes of transport in accordance with policy IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan. As a result it is not possible to require the extension of the slip road or a financial contribution towards it.

4.4 In terms of drainage further information has been conditioned, the use of soakaways is acceptable, however, run off from roads and car parking areas must incorporate appropriate pollution prevention measures and infiltration drainage must have a series of treatment steps to prevent the pollution of groundwater.

4.5 It is proposed to deal with foul drainage via a package treatment plant. There is a sewer on William Frost Way which in accordance with the Planning Policy Guidance should the first choice in dealing with foul drainage, unless it is not reasonably practical. The Flood Defence Officer has however said that if a treatment system is proposed that offers a more sustainable solution to the overall water management of the site that might be acceptable, the details of foul drainage have been conditioned. Details have also been conditioned on how dirty water from washing cars will be dealt with.

4.6 It is expected that ancillary vehicle washing will occur on the site. A condition has however, been imposed restricting vehicle washing on a commercial basis on the site, as this may have a significant impact on traffic generation.

4.7 Concern has also been raised over the use of a modular building on the site and that the site may be used as a scrap yard. Firstly there is no indication that the site would be used as a scrap yard and that is in fact a sui generis use so would require a new planning permission. The proposed modular building is set back from the road which has a bund with landscaping. It is not considered that this would have an unacceptable visual impact on the area. The existing landscaping on the bunding could do with being enhanced and a condition has been imposed to enhance this in accordance with policy IMP2 in the SNLP.

4.8 It is not considered that the proposed would adversely affect any of the surrounding commercial uses.

4.9 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 are of greater significance.

4.10 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5 Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion there are no policy reasons for not allowing car sales on this site within an employment area within the development limit. The proposal would not increase traffic levels within the area and has a safe highway access in accordance with policy IMP8 in the SNLP. Subject to condition the development does not raise any significant visual, highway or drainage issues in accordance with polices IMP8 and the Planning Policy Guidance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No** : 2015/0698/F  
**Parish** : EARSHAM

Applicants Name : Mr D Talbot  
Site Address : Subdivision Of Garden Of Sunrise Church Road Earsham Norfolk  
Proposal : Two bedroom bungalow and garage.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
TRA 19: Parking standards  
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 summer 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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.”

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.”

2. Planning History
2.1 No relevant planning history

3. Consultations
3.1 Parish Council Approve
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
3.3 NCC Highways Support with conditions
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) To be reported
3.5 Flood Defence Officer Advisory comments on provision of soakaways
3.6 Other Representations One letter of support

4. Assessment
4.1 This is a full application for a single storey dwelling and garage within the garden of Sunrise. The site is on the corner of Church Road and The Street in Earsham. A new access is proposed off Church Road. The site lies outside the defined Development Boundary for the village of Earsham.

Principle of development

4.2 Policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek to ensure that new dwellings are within sustainable locations, are of a good design and do not adversely affect residential amenity of surrounding properties.

4.3 The site lies outside the existing designated settlement boundary for Earsham and as such the principle of residential development would be contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Notwithstanding this, Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy identifies Earsham as being suitable for further residential development. Furthermore, the emerging Local Plan has identified the site for inclusion within the preferred settlement boundary for
Earsham and no objections have been raised to the site as part of the consultation process which should be given material weight in the consideration of this application. The principle of a residential dwelling in this location is considered acceptable in this instance.

Design, scale and character

4.4 NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 (promoting good design) seeks to ensure that development proposals respect local distinctiveness, including landscape setting and character and use of sustainable materials. Additionally, design guidance is also provided through the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD.

4.5 The proposed single dwelling is considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and relationship to the surrounding properties. Furthermore, its scale would reflect the character of the existing development in the vicinity of the site and is in keeping with the established linear pattern of development along this Church Road. It is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Residential amenity

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

4.7 The dwelling and garage have been positioned so they would not have any significant detrimental impacts on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in respect of privacy, light and noise. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and emerging Policy DM3.14.

Highway safety

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

4.9 The application proposes a new access off Church Road to serve the proposed dwelling, with on-site parking and turning proposed to serve the dwelling. The Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and, subject to conditions, raised no objection to the development. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices IMP8 and TRA19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and emerging Policies DM3.12 and DM3.13.

Drainage

4.10 The Planning Policy Guidance gives preference to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to deal with surface water. It is proposed to use soakaways which the Flood Defence Officer has no objection to. This has been conditioned accordingly.

Other issues

4.11 Ecology the site forms part of an existing garden. It is not considered that the development would raise any significant ecology issues.

4.12 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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5 Conclusion

5.1 The site is located in a sustainable location and has been identified for inclusion within the preferred boundary for Earsham within the emerging Site Specific Allocations. It is therefore considered that the requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development can therefore be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8.

5.2 The design, scale and layout of the scheme are also considered appropriate for its context. The development will not adversely affect the character of the area, will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties or highway safety. The scheme would therefore accord with sections 6, 7 and 12 of the NPPF, Policies ENV8, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and Policies 1, 2, 3 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy. On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2015/0771/H  
    **Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
    **Applicants Name**: Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones  
    **Site Address**: Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA  
    **Proposal**: Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.  
    **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
    1. Full permission - three years  
    2. In accordance with plans and drawings  
    3. Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved  
    4. Samples of materials to be approved  
    5. Window in west elevation to be obscure glazed

11. **Appl. No**: 2015/0772/LB  
    **Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
    **Applicants Name**: Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones  
    **Site Address**: Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA  
    **Proposal**: Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.  
    **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
    1. Listed building time limit - three years  
    2. In accordance with plans and drawings  
    3. Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved  
    4. Samples of materials to be approved

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
    NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
    NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
    IMP 2: Landscaping  
    IMP 9: Residential amenity  
    IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
    IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas  
    HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
    HOU 21: Annexes

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 summer 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.
Development Management Committee  
3 June 2015

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.5 Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
DM3.8 Residential annexes
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

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.”

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.”

2. Planning History

2.1 1995/1559 Proposed demolition and rebuilding of wall adjoining A140 Approved

2.2 1995/1558 Proposed demolition and rebuilding of wall adjoining A140 Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received

3.2 District Member No comments received

3.3 Landscape Officer No objection to the removal of the trees, as their condition is not good.

3.4 Other Representations No third party representations received.

4. Assessment

4.1 Planning permission and listed building consent is sought for a two storey extension and the erection of a porch at a Grade II listed residential property in Long Stratton. The building is located next to the A140, on the opposite side of the road to Saint Mary’s Church. The two storey extension would be to the rear of the property, whilst the porch would be at the side.

4.2 The materials proposed are orange clay pantiles for the roof and lime rendered blockwork for the walls, which would be painted off-white/stone colour. Windows and doors would be timber framed double-glazed and painted white. The rear extension would provide a family room and study to the ground floor and a bedroom and shower room to the first floor. It is intended that the applicant’s mother would live in the new part of the building. The application is being reported to committee because the applicant’s mother is a member of South Norfolk Council.
4.3 The site is within the development boundary for Long Stratton and also a conservation area. The main considerations are the design and impact of the proposal on the listed building and conservation area, the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, an assessment of the annexe form of accommodation proposed, and the impact of the proposal on trees.

Impact on listed building and conservation area

4.4 The house is described as being of 17th century origin, with 18th and 19th century frontage alterations. The principle elevation faces the road behind a rendered/painted boundary wall, with the church opposite. The list description focusses on this part of the house, the rear wing on the west elevation is a later addition. The main extension proposed would be connected to this rear gable and follows the form of the existing gable. The ridge height would be slightly set down from the height of the existing building, and the walls would be set within the footprint of the existing, which assists in making it appear subservient to the main dwelling. The porch would be small single-storey extension, with a pitched roof on the side of the building.

4.5 In consultation with the Conservation Officer, the design, form, scale and appearance of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the character of the listed building. The extension would not be particularly prominent within the conservation area and would preserve its appearance and character. The proposal complies with relevant guidance in the NPPF in relation to heritage assets, policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, and policies IMP 15 and IMP 18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.6 In assessing the application the Local Planning Authority has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, in accordance with section 66 (1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990. In addition special attention has been paid to preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area, in accordance with section 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.

Impact on residential amenity

4.7 No objections have been received from neighbouring occupiers. No overlooking would be caused as a result of the one window which could affect neighbours being obscured glazed, and a condition is recommended to ensure this is retained in perpetuity. The extension would be a sufficient distance from the boundaries of the property to ensure no material harm would be caused from overshadowing or loss of light. The proposal complies with policy IMP 9 in terms of impact on residential amenity.

Assessment of the proposed annexe accommodation.

4.8 Policy DM 3.8 of the emerging Development Management Policies document supports residential annexes where they are designed in such a way that they can continue to be used as part of the main dwelling, without creating an independent dwelling unit. In this case the annexe would have a scale, shared facilities (kitchen) and close spatial relationship to the main dwelling. A condition is recommended to restrict occupation of the annexe to persons related to or closely linked to the occupants of the main dwelling, and to prevent the annexe being occupied as an independent unit.

Impact on trees

4.9 Three beech trees would be removed to make way for the larger extension. The Council’s Landscape Officer has assessed the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and is satisfied that this is acceptable, due to the poor condition of the trees and their limited visual amenity.
Other matters

4.10 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) due to the proposed floorspace being less than 100 square metres.

5. Conclusion

2015/0771/F

5.1 The proposed development would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the listed building and conservation area, and subject to the imposition of conditions would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The annexe form of development would be well related to and share facilities with the main dwelling. It complies with relevant national guidance and local planning policies and is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

2015/0772/L

5.2 The proposals would preserve the listed building and its setting and comply with relevant policies in relation to development affecting a listed building. It is therefore recommended that listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2015/0848/H  
    **Parish**: BROOKE  

Applicants Name: Mr P Hill  
Site Address: 30 Brecon Road Brooke Norfolk NR15 1HS  
Proposal: Retrospective planning application for a balcony railing over sun room and outside main bedroom  

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Unacceptable design and siting  
2. Detrimental to residential amenity

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM3.5 Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0454 Proposed first floor extension. Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Recommend refusal  
- Proposal is not suitable in this location as it would adversely impact the residential amenity of 28 and 32 Brecon Road.  
- Would create a balcony area at first floor level which would overlook the rear gardens of adjacent dwellings.  
- A balcony would be potentially more intrusive than a first floor bedroom window as it could be used for recreational use with longer periods of time spent enjoying the views from an elevated position.

3.2 District Member To be determined by Committee  
- The tension between the effect of neighbourhood amenity needs to be balanced between the right of the owner to adjust his home.  
- Proposals to retrofit balconies have a history of being brought to Committee and this is a case where this precedent should also be followed.
3.3 Other Representations

1 letter of objection received
- Balcony will have major implications to the amenity of number 32.
- Will compromise the privacy at the rear and at the side of the front of number 32.
- Find it intimidating outside the front door.
- Feel the amenity space of the property should be protected.
- If the application is approved, ask if screening can be installed at the side railing outside the front of number 32.

4 Assessment

4.1 The property is a detached chalet situated on a residential development, with open fields at the rear. It is within the development limits of Brooke. The dwellings within the vicinity are a mix of design, with the properties either side of the application site being gable end to the road. Planning permission was granted in 2010 for dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations on the western end of the dwelling and included a Juliet balcony with full length doors serving a bedroom.

4.2 The application seeks retrospective consent for railings around the top of an existing flat roof sun room, outside the full length doors of the bedroom, on the rear elevation of the dwelling. The applicant has stated the railings are for cosmetic purposes only as the sun room roof is not of suitable construction to be used as a balcony. The plans show the Juliet balcony as approved under planning permission 2010/0454.

4.3 The main issues for consideration are the visual appearance of the development and its impact on the amenities of the neighbours.

Visual Appearance

4.4 The enclosure is approximately 1 metre high and comprises of light Greenwood posts and horizontal rails top and bottom, with vertical, curved black iron railings between. Due to the height of the flat roof, approximately 2.6 metres, the railings can be seen clearly from the adjacent dwelling and the side of the railings can also be seen from the road when approached from the west. The dormer, windows and fascias are finished in white, I consider the introduction of wood and iron railings, at this height, appear out of character with the existing dwelling, in conflict with policy HOU19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and emerging Policy DM3.5

Residential Amenity

4.5 Notwithstanding the fact that the applicant has stated the railings are for cosmetic purposes only, and that the flat roof cannot be used as a balcony, it would be difficult for the planning authority to control that the area could not be used as a balcony by way of the imposition of conditions.

4.6 The adjacent dwelling, number 32 to the west, is gable end on to the road, with a number of windows and main entrance door on the ground floor side elevation facing the application site. The flat roof sunroom is approximately 500mm from the side boundary and approximately 7m from the windows. I acknowledge that a level of overlooking has been created by the Juliet balcony, however, should the current, or any future occupier, have access to the area, they would have views directly into the ground floor windows of number 32. I therefore consider that, on balance, the enjoyment and benefit for the applicants of a balcony in this siting results in an unacceptable loss of privacy, detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants of number 32, in conflict with Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and emerging Policy DM3.14.
4.7 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 the floor space does not exceed 100 square metres

5. Conclusion and Reasons for Refusal

5.1 I consider the development is unacceptable in this location due to the siting and materials used for the enclosure, which results in an adverse impact on the character of the dwelling and its setting, and, results in a detrimental impact on the existing privacy and amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling due to the close proximity and nature of the development. I therefore recommend that the application be refused.

5.2 As this application is for retrospective consent of the railings, it is requested that, subject to legal advice, enforcement action be authorised for the removal of the railings.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Rachel Flaxman 01508 533821
and E-mail: rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications on land where South Norfolk Council has an interest

Parish : CAISTOR ST EDMUND
Applicants Name : Ms Caroline Davison
Site Address : Venta Icenorum (Roman Town) Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund
Norfolk
Proposal : Installation of interpretation scheme panels, to replace existing.
Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 14: Habitat protection

1.3 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 summer 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.

1.4 Development Management Policies
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

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.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/0892 Installation of interpretation scheme panels, under consideration
to replace existing.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve

3.2 District Member Can be delegated decision
3.3 Historic England

No Objection
- Works are beneficial for the presentation and public enjoyment of the monument,
- The unavoidable ground disturbance can be mitigated by condition
- The effects of the works on the setting of the monument have been assessed and are not considered to be an overriding factor in this instance.

3.4 Historic Environment Service

No Objection
- An archaeological work shall be secured via conditions on the Schedule Monument Consent.
- Plans appear to be inconsistent this need to be clarified

3.5 Community Assets Team

No Objection

3.6 County Ecologist

No Objection
- Recommend that posts 9 and 7 which are close to the river bank that there is a buffer zone of 5 metres left between the bank and the panels to avoid damage to water vole burrows

3.7 SNC Conservation Officer

No Objection
- Signage appears to be carefully thought through
- Oak posts more in keeping with rural natural of the site

3.8 Other Representations

None received

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is for new interpretation boards within Venta Icenorum (Caistor Roman Town) which include 10 lectern style interpretation panels, two panels within the entrance shelter and one notice board. The site is managed by South Norfolk Council. There are a number of listed building surrounding the site including St Edmunds Church.

4.2 A separate Schedule Monument Consent application has been submitted to Department Culture Media and Sport. Historic England have raised no objection to the application and consider that the works will be beneficial to the presentation and public enjoyment of the monument. In their consultation response they have detailed they have set out a number of conditions that they have recommended are attached to the schedule monument consent including archaeological monitoring. There is no need to repeat these on the planning permission.

4.3 Historic England do not consider that the interpretation boards would adversely affect the setting of the monument as required by section 12 of the NPPF.

4.4 S66 (1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires that: “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.” In this instance the setting of the surrounding listed buildings will not be adversely affected by the proposal which is also in accordance with section 10 of the NPPF and policy IMP15 in the South Norfolk Local Plan.
4.5 Clarification is being sought on the exact location of the boards as there are some inconsistencies.

4.6 The ecologist has requested a condition that the boards are at least 5 metres from the river to prevent damage to water vole burrows.

4.7 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 In conclusion the proposed interpretation boards would enhance the visitor experience at the monument without significantly adversely harming the setting of the monument or surrounding listed buildings.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Agenda Item 7

**Planning Appeals**

**Appeals received from 18 April 2015 to 21 May 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/0799</td>
<td>Wymondham Rugby Club and Land West of Elm Farm Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>WRFC, Landstock Estates Ltd And Landowners Group Ltd</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1358</td>
<td>Hethersett Land At 38 Grove Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr David Feltham</td>
<td>Outline for 4no 2/3 bed bungalows, 2 affordable 2 bed houses and 2no 4/5 bed houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1724</td>
<td>Stoke Holy Cross Land East Of Sherbrooke Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Darren Hawkshaw</td>
<td>Proposed change of use from agricultural land (overgrown grazing paddock) to development site, to provide two one-half storey three bedroom bungalows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2033</td>
<td>Gillingham Grove Sheds (Gunners Lodge) On Track Off Rectory Road Gillingham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr A Witham</td>
<td>Application for prior determination notification of a proposed change of use of agricultural buildings to 1 no dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2117</td>
<td>Bergh Apton West Five 1 Mill Road Bergh Apton Norfolk NR15 1BQ</td>
<td>Mrs H Lewin</td>
<td>To use one room in house as a hairdressing salon - retrospective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2186</td>
<td>Wymondham 2 Cantley Villas Station Road Spooner Row Norfolk NR18 9JR</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs P Dimoglou</td>
<td>Proposed construction of two semi-detached cottage style dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2531</td>
<td>Roydon Breckland High Road Roydon Norfolk IP22 5RB</td>
<td>Mr David Feetham</td>
<td>Erection of single storey detached dwelling and garage, with improved access, alterations and refurbishment to existing bungalow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Appeals**

*Appeals decisions from 18 April 2015 to 21 May 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>2014/0288</td>
<td>Shelton Land At Cricket Field Alburgh Road Shelton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J Groen</td>
<td>Proposed family house at Cricket Field.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0535</td>
<td>Tacolneston Subdivision Of Garden Of 53 Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr S Mills</td>
<td>Proposed 2 storey dwelling (revised application)</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>