Development Management Committee 3 June 2015

Minute No 205

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014/2495/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Decision: Members voted 10-0 (with one abstention) for REFUSAL

Refused

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

Updates
Correspondence from the agent dated 27th May raised comments in respect of the description of the development in the committee report, the accuracy on the plan attached at Appendix 1, the summary of NCC comments and comments within the assessment section of the report. In light of the above, the following comments are made:

To clarify the description of the proposal at the start of the report (page 21 of the agenda) should state 335 as opposed to 375 in order to reflect the amended plan as referred to in the assessment section of this report.

The plan published in the committee agenda did not reflect the amended site plan as the site area was reduced through the course of the application. The amended site plan was shown to Members in the presentation to committee as an additional update.

It is considered NCC do have concerns in respect of a lack of secondary school education places to meet with demand from this scheme and as such the objection as recorded at paragraph 3.14 is accurate of NCC's position.

Despite concerns from the agent that paragraph 4.48 is misleading, it is considered that Para 4.48 accurately highlights a situation that could occur as a consequence of the lack of secondary school places in Wymondham.

Having regard to the comments of the agent, it is considered that paragraph 4.75 should confirm that the Inspector responsible for the local plan examination has indicated in his letter of the 17th of December that 2200 will not be a limit. However, officers would wish to confirm...
that this does not materially change the report in respect of prematurity (paras 4.72 to 4.76).

Paragraph 3.13 is from the Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group and this is not a department/group within South Norfolk Council.

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.

Decision : Members voted 7-0 (with three abstentions) to APPROVE

Approved 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
29 Restrict size of retail unit – 300 sq m

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
Updates
Paragraph 4.30 confirms that an update will be provided in respect of the trigger point for delivering off-site highway improvements. No specific updates have been received and therefore the recommended trigger point for delivery of the off-site highway works is to be prior to first occupation of the first dwelling.

In respect of Paragraph 4.87 it can also be confirmed that the tenure mix is to be 85%rent and 15% intermediate tenures (shared ownership and/or shared equity)and this approach is policy compliant.

Richard Bacon MP has submitted representations on the application and this has been forwarded to all Development Management Committee Members. This has also been uploaded onto the Council’s website.

SNC Design Officer has confirmed that the scheme achieves a score of 9 greens and 3 ambers as part of the Building for Life assessment for the scheme.

Easton Parish Council – indicate that they wish to withdraw their land from the proposal, permission will not be given for a footpath or other access through jubilee playing field and do not accept the land offered for the village heart.
Officer response: Notwithstanding the above, the application remains valid in its current form and can be considered as recommended. In the event that the Parish Council do not wish to take on the village heart, alternative arrangements could be agreed as part of the S106 agreement.

Costessey Town Council – Object, on the following grounds, although it is acknowledged that this application is an improvement on the previous one.

Overview of 5 miles around Longwater, Easton, Bawburgh, A47 network should be undertaken.
Easton roundabout is not currently able to cope, this roundabout needs to be redesigned to increase capacity. The Longwater interchange and surrounding roads are operating at over capacity, road improvements currently underway may help in the short term but additional movements from the development will adversely affect traffic flows.
Proposed traffic lights on the A47 slip roads are essential, but pedestrians need robust barriers to protect them from heavy traffic flows.
Proposed slip road lights need to be integrated with others locally into a single computerised system.
The proposed zebra crossing at the top of William Frost Way is inadequate, this should have traffic lights.
The proposed crossing on the Dereham Road by the showground and restaurant is dangerously near a bend. The proposed bridge footway has no provision for cyclists. Shared cyclist and pedestrian provision is not satisfactory and dangerous to both.
New footways should be fully accessible with appropriate surfaces.
Showground has monthly events with adequate wide foot and cycleways needing to be provided to cater for youngsters.
This scheme would conflict with the additional traffic generated by the construction of NDR.
Although medical/health services are not funded by S106 agreements, the JCS does expect adequate facilities to be available. Medical services in the area under strain given that central funding follows an increase in population sudden surges in population deprive medical services of resources they are entitled to.
Marlingford and Colton Parish Council would also wish to expand on their concern in relation to volume of traffic by the following:

The Council is seriously concerned that there will be a considerable increase in traffic on Marlingford Road, between Easton and Marlingford, such traffic is likely to use either Mill Road or Barford Road, Marlingford, to link with the B1108, Watton Road. The Council has already drawn the attention of the Highway Dept (NCC) to the problematic nature of the road junction at the Marlingford Bell.

They would also wish to highlight that they feel that as they will experience adverse effects from the development they should receive some of the CIL money generated by the scheme.

Bawburgh Parish Council confirm there is no objection to amended documents although comments that ongoing problems with the A47 roundabout and access will continue to be an issue until better bridges or an underpass is provided. They do not believe the paths will provide adequate access as the bridge is too narrow to deal with peak demands.

Third party representations Further objections have been received as a result of the re-consultation process referred to in the committee report, and there are now in excess of 500 letters of objection, in addition to the separate petition and the comments of Easton Against Development. It is considered that these have re-iterated a number of concerns raised previously and addressed in the committee report, and as such it is not necessary to re-address these.

It is considered beneficial to make the following comments in respect of the recently received responses:

Highways issues - Concern at suitability of trod’s and St Peters Path for mobility vehicles/disabled. By way of clarification, the existing trod which runs from the village to the Longwater Interchange is to be replaced by a 3m wide pedestrian/cycleway. The proposed development does not necessitate the upgrading of St Peters path in accordance with planning policy.

By way of clarification, a trod is defined as follows:

“Historically, trods have developed through pedestrians wearing out the turf across a grass verge or field to create a visible track. We have formalised or created “engineered” trods by placing and compacting unbound materials. This creates an improved, level surface often with greater width and improved drainage. This allows pedestrian access to be provided at relatively low cost and often in a sustainable way using recycled materials.”

Concerns raised surrounding the suitability and safety of the proposed highway upgrades, these will not help alleviate existing problems and only make the current situation worse, highway data/statistics are difficult to understand. As reported in the committee report these have been assessed by the Highway Authority (NCC) and Highways England and there are no technical objections.

Ecology issues - Not fully identified bat implications and concern at content of surveys in respect of great crested newt surveys. The submission has been assessed by the Council’s ecologist and these are fit for purpose and it is concluded that subject to the production of an ecological management plan as highlighted as condition 14 of the report.
Policy issues - Inconsistent application of Council policy when having regard to the recommendation of refusal for Wymondham (2014/2495 item 1 on this agenda). By way of clarification, the assessment confirms that it is necessary to have regard to emerging policy (EAS1) and the contents of the NPPF in reaching a decision, notwithstanding the conflict with adopted policies (HOU4 and ENV8) as set out in the assessment.

Other matters - Concern has been expressed at the agent incorrectly stating that there are 1084 dwellings in Easton. The application has been considered in the full knowledge of the size of Easton (circa 600 dwellings), notwithstanding the above.

Consultation issues - Concern has also been expressed at the lack of time to comment due to the re-consultation letters taking 8 days to reach residents and this being compounded by problems with accessing details on the Council’s website over the bank holiday weekend. Officers, consider that notwithstanding the above, sufficient time has been available for individuals to make representations in advance of the committee meeting and will also be raised with committee before the consideration of this item.

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.
Decision : This item was WITHDRAWN

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.
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans
3. Hours of operation:10am – 10pm Mon-Sat only
4. Retention of existing car parking
5. Installation and retention of internal extraction equipment.
6. Provision of litter bin outside property
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.

**Decision**: The item was **DEFERRED** to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee at the applicant’s request.

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.

**Decision**: Members voted 10-0 for **APPROVAL**

Approved 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
9. Details of wash water disposal

**Updates**

**Further Comments from Cllr Gray**: Please note that the report does not include all my consultation comments. The most significant point I made was that the "application needs to be assessed against existing policies aimed at retaining rural village shops (NPPF para 28, and SNC emerging policy DM3.17)". I do not believe that the report fully does this. I’ve been informed that the farm shop closed not because it wasn’t viable at then rental levels, but because the rent was significantly increased. I believe that it could continue to operate as a farm shop that would be of benefit to the village community. That's the reason that both government and SNC have planning policies that seek to retain local amenities including shops and pubs and prevent them from being changed into uses that have little benefit to local communities. For this reason, I do not support this application.

**Flood Defence Officer Comments**:  
Further to our discussion I would wish to offer the following advisory note:

**Vehicle Wash Down Water – Advisory**  
The applicant should ensure that adequate and suitable provision is made for the dirty water disposal from any vehicle washing facilities. Wash down water from vehicle washing facilities is not suitable to be discharged to surface waters and should either drain to a sealed sump and periodically be tankers away or discharged to the foul sewer, subject to consent from Anglian Water.
Development Management Committee  
3 June 2015

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

Decision  :  Members voted 7-2 (with one abstention) for REFUSAL  
Refused

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

Updates
Comments received from MP:
Mr and Mrs Bye of 72 Common Road, Bressingham,IP22 2BB have contacted me about their planning application reference number:2015 I 0564.  
Their application has been referred to the Development Management Committee for consideration on 3rd June 2015.  
As I understand it, there have been no objections from the Parish Council, Environmental Services nor Norfolk County Council Highways Department and the proposed development is in keeping with South Norfolk District Council's own "Vanguard" scheme.  
I would be very grateful on behalf of my constituents if you would take these points into account and give the application your most favourable consideration.

Additional comments received from former Cllr Weeks:
I am unable to be present to speak to the committee but I do wish to make the following points, and would be very grateful if you could bring them to the attention of the committee.

As the report makes clear Common Rd, has a wide and varied mix of houses and bungalows to then say that the application would conflict with advice in the South Norfolk Place-making Guide is a perversion of the facts. Bressingham does not fit into any case study, the mix is too eclectic.  

This dwelling will fit in as well as any other.  
This can be considered as in fill, it will fill the space reserved for No.70, never built.  
It is true that many properties have long rear gardens, but not all. Notably No,s 4,6,3,&5 have very small plots, whilst due to approval given by this Council No.2 has recently demolished one property to build two bungalows each within minute plots. That was a far more extreme situation than this; to refuse this application will show a lack of constancy in decision making.  

Wells Cottages on Common Rd, could not be more cramped, but have happy residents. They have no garden worth a mention.  

I find it surprising that no mention within the report makes it clear that this application is for a Self-build; our own M.P forced a private members bill through parliament to encourage Self-build and this authority rushed to accept cash to promote through the Vanguard scheme. The applicant is a builder, it is for his son, it would be on his land it would be a good example of this authority once again leading the way, and yet your officers are advising refusal.  
Do the right and honourable thing and vote for approval.
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.  
Decision: Members voted 10-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Provision of parking (define customer parking)  
4. Surface Water  
5. Details of foul water disposal  
6. Disposal of water from car washing  
7. Car washing only ancillary to car sales  
8. Landscaping

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.  
Decision: Members voted 10-0 for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Materials to accord with  
4. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
5. Slab level to be agreed  
6. Foul drainage to main sewer  
7. Surface Water  
8. New Water Efficiency  
9. New Access Construction over verge  
10. Provision of parking, service  
11. Reporting of unexpected contamination

**Updates**  
**District Member**: Supports the recommendation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/0771/H</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones</td>
<td>Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA</td>
<td>Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Members voted 10-0 for <strong>APPROVAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  Full permission - three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2  In accordance with plans and drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3  Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4  Samples of materials to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5  Window in west elevation to be obscure glazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/0772/LB</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones</td>
<td>Corfe Lodge Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA</td>
<td>Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Members voted 10-0 for <strong>APPROVAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  Listed building time limit - three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2  In accordance with plans and drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3  Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4  Samples of materials to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/0848/H</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Mr P Hill</td>
<td>30 Brecon Road Brooke Norfolk NR15 1HS</td>
<td>Retrospective planning application for a balcony railing over sun room and outside main bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> Members voted 10-0 for <strong>REFUSAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  Unacceptable design and siting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2  Detrimental to residential amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members authorised enforcement to action be taken, subject to legal advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications on land where South Norfolk Council has an interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/0892/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Ms Caroline Davison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Venta Icenorum (Roman Town) Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Installation of interpretation scheme panels, to replace existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 for <strong>APPROVAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approved with conditions**

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Interpretation to be located at least 5 metres from the river bank

**Updates**

Applicant has confirmed that Scheduled Monument Consent has now been granted and clarified which plan is the correct one.