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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.
A G E N D A

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

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

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

4. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 9)
   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>2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Land North of High Street Ketteringham</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/0214/F</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>The Dog Inn Main Road Swardeston</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/0247/LB</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>The Dog Inn Main Road Swardeston</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/0451/O</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>Land South Of The Homestead Church Road Wreningham</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/0702/F</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Grange Farm Lundy Green Hempnall</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/0827/O</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land West Of Myrtle Cottage Little Melton Road Hethersett</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/0973/A</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land North Of Shotesham Road Poringland</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/1089/A</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. 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.

6. Planning Appeals (for information); (attached – page 51)

7. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wed 22 July 2015
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following guidelines are to assist Members to assess whether a Site Panel visit is required. Site visits may be appropriate where:

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;
(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;
(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;
(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

Members should appreciate that site visits will not be appropriate in those cases where matters of fundamental planning policy are involved and there are no significant other material considerations to take into account. Equally, where an observer might feel that a site visit would be called for under any of the above criteria, members may decide it is unnecessary, e.g. because of their existing familiarity with the site or its environs or because, in their opinion, judgement can be adequately made on the basis of the written, visual and oral material before the Committee.

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Applications will normally be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda. Each application will be presented in the following way:

- Initial presentation by planning officers followed by representations from:
  - The town or parish council - up to 5 minutes for member(s) or clerk;
  - Objector(s) - any number of speakers, up to 5 minutes in total;
  - The applicant, or agent or any supporters - any number of speakers up to 5 minutes in total;
  - Local member
- Member consideration/decision.

TIMING: In front of you there are two screens which tell you how 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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNDP</td>
<td>Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S.</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAAP</td>
<td>Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D.</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAP</td>
<td>Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.

Does the interest directly:

1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.

Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

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

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

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

YES

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

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

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

Agenda Item No. 4

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Applications referred back to Committee

1. 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.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
1. Full planning permission
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials to be approved prior to commencement of development
4. Residential occupation of the site restricted to Gypsies and Travellers
5. Maximum 1 static and 1 touring caravan on site
6. Keeping of horses for personal use only not commercial use.
7. Upgrading of access
8. Provision of turning area
9. Boundary treatments to be approved and installed prior to first occupation for residential purposes.
10. Foul sewage system to be installed prior to the first occupation of the site for residential purposes.
11. Surface water drainage details to be approved and installed prior to first occupation of the site for residential purposes.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

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 17: Small rural communities and the countryside
Policy 16: Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
Policy ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
Policy IMP 2: Landscaping
Policy IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
Policy IMP 9: Residential amenity
Policy LEI 14: Keeping of horses for leisure purposes
Policy HOU 22: Mobile homes
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
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.4 Gypsy and Travellers sites
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. Planning History

2.1 1980/3524  2 Stables and Tack Room and Adjoining 3 Hay Stores  Approved 21/1/81

2.2 1981/1854  Erection of Loose Box Range for Horses (Application To Relax ‘Temporary’
Condition)

2.3 1986/1035 Residential Development Refused 11/6/86

2.4 1989/1027 Erection of 3 or 4 dwellings Refused 20/7/89

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Object:
• Location outside of development boundary
• The proposal would increase flood risk
• Impact on local water supply
• Concern about the visual impact of the [original] gates.
• No development sites have been allocated within the local plan
  process due to the lack of public transport and infrastructure
• Concern about horses escaping from the site
• The planning application is not in accordance with the LDF
  process through which East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish
  Council agreed to consider affordable housing developments.
  The site was not considered as part of this process.
• Ketteringham has its fair share of heavy traffic
• Concern at the future intention for the land

If the application is to be approved, a number of conditions should
be added, including:

• Sewage treatment not to be via septic tank
• Drainage ditches to be reinstated on the site
• No further development allowed on the site in the future and the
  site should be restricted to a single, personally named pitch
• Restrictions on external lighting
• Gates to be replaced with traditional five-bar gates
• Site to have no business use
• Electricity supply to be upgraded
• Installation of electric fence to control horses
3.2 District Members

Cllr Legg: The proposal is outside the village development boundary. It will be visible from the adjacent public footpath. There are important principles to be addressed regarding development in the open countryside.

Cllr Herbert (no longer a Councillor): This must be determined by the committee because of numerous issues including public concern, development outside defined boundaries, not in accordance with Gypsy and Traveller policy.

3.3 Highways England
No objection.

3.4 Network Rail
No comments.

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No comments received

3.6 NCC Ecologist
Given the scale and nature of the application, ecological impacts are likely to be minimal. The existing hedgerows should be maintained.

3.7 Environmental Services
No objections

3.8 Flood Defence Officer
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.

Whilst we recognise that the report [from Professor Hey] identifies existing flooding and drainage issues at No 5 High Street we do not believe that the recommendations made above will increase flood risk at the proposed site or elsewhere. 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 you were minded to approve this application we would request 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.

3.9 NCC Highways
No objection to the use of the site for equine purposes. The existing access should however be upgraded.

With regard to the proposed residential use, the site is considered to be remote from local services which would render the residents reliant on the use of motorised vehicles. This aspect of the proposal conflicts with guidance in the Local Transport Plan for Norfolk and the NPPF.
3.10 Representations
40 letters of objection. Concerns regarding:

- Poor drainage at the site / increased flood risk
- Increased traffic on narrow country lanes
- Visual impact of development
- Site is outside of development boundary
- Impact on private water pipelines
- Out of character with the village
- Concern applicant is not a bona fide traveller
- Site unsuitable due to lack of public transport, local services, no footpaths or street lighting
- Concern that it will develop into a larger traveller site
- Concern about overlooking, loss of privacy and intervisibility

Further letter of objection received from Ketteringham Residents Group. Concerns regarding:

- the accuracy of the description of development
- status of applicant
- development in open countryside
- proximity to neighbouring properties
- concern regarding drainage
- proposal does not constitute sustainable development
- the Highway Authority has objected to the residential use of the site in terms of its location
- In the event that permission is granted, conditions should be attached including: temporary permission only, personal permission only, landscaping scheme to be implemented, fencing to be erected, appropriate measures agreed for surface water drainage and sewage treatment

4. Assessment

Introduction

4.1 This application was previously reported to the Development Management Committee on 29 April and was deferred because Councillors wished to have more information regarding the status of the applicant. Further information has been received and this matter is addressed in sections 4.7-4.10.

Proposal

4.2 The application is for the change of use of land previously used for equestrian purposes to the use for equine and residential purposes for a gypsy/traveller, including a concrete pad for the standing of one residential caravan, erection of a day room and the erection of gates.

4.3 The site is a field which is accessed from High Street and has a stable block on the land. To the south and west are a number of residential properties. To the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that there are further residential properties. The site is opposite the village hall and there is also a war memorial adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs north-south adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

4.4 The main issues to be considered are: the principle of development, the need for traveller sites, the gypsy/traveller status of the applicant, the suitability of the location for the proposed use, the impact on residential amenity, the visual impact of the proposal, highways impact, the impact on drainage and flood risk, and the impact on the public right of way.
Principle of Development

4.5 Planning law requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for South Norfolk comprises the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. In addition some weight can be attached to the emerging policies of the documents contained within the new South Norfolk Local Plan, which includes the Development Management Policies document and the Site Allocations and Policies document. Local Planning Authorities must also have regard to government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. Policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan strictly controls development within the open countryside, however in assessing the application, regard has been had to Policy DM 3.4 of the emerging Development Management Policies document, which sets out criteria for the consideration of gypsy/traveller development both inside and outside of development boundaries.

Need for traveller sites

4.6 The ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ document requires local planning authorities to have regard to the existing level of local provision and need for sites, the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicant and other personal circumstances of the applicant. The Council currently does not currently have a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites for travellers. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, published in 2014, contains a target of 35 traveller pitches between 2014 and 2031. Within the first five years (2014-2019) the target is 8 pitches. At the time of writing only 1 pitch has been permitted therefore there is a clear shortfall in available pitches. In terms of the circumstances of the applicant, Mr Austin requires a base where he can live with his partner and young son.

4.7 The Council is currently at an early stage in the preparation of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan. Consultation on the Issues and Options stage was carried out last August, which included a call for sites to be put forward for consideration. The criterion to be used in the assessment of the sites was due to be considered by Cabinet on Monday 15 June, with the Preferred Options document scheduled to be considered by Cabinet in September. Given its early stage, the emerging Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan does not materially affect the determination of this application, and the information is provided for background purposes only.

The status of the applicant

4.8 During the application process, concern has been raised by objectors regarding the traveller status of the applicant. The Government’s ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ states:

“For the purposes of this planning policy "gypsies and travellers" means:

Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.”

4.9 In terms of evidence, following the deferral at the last Development Management Committee more comprehensive information has been received regarding Mr Austin’s background and lifestyle. This is attached as an Appendix to this report.

4.10 To summarise, the report states that Mr Austin is an ethnic Romany gypsy who is a blood relation of the Leveridge’s, a known gypsy family within Norfolk. It is further stated that he was born into a family that is of mixed race, and that his mother is a gypsy, whilst his father is from the settled community. He lived in a house for the first fourteen years of his life; however, he was taken by his mother travelling for about six months of every year of these fourteen years. It is stated he has lived in a caravan for the last 10 years, at various locations. He travels to attend gypsy Fairs, along with his partner and young son.
4.11 The Council’s Housing Access and Standards Manager has spoken to Mr Austin and Mr Austin has confirmed that he has gypsy ancestry. The names provided to the Housing Access and Standards Manager by Mr Austin are known by the Council to be gypsy families, and elders within the gypsy community have confirmed in discussion with the Housing Access and Standards Manager the family connection and the relationship between those families and Mr Austin. Based on this information, the Housing Standards and Access Manager is of the opinion that Mr Austin does have a gypsy heritage.

4.12 Having assessed all of the information available, Officers are satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the applicant is a genuine gypsy/traveller.

Consideration of the location for the proposed use

4.13 National policy states that local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Sites in rural areas should respect the scale of and should not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure.

4.14 Ketteringham is identified as an ‘Other Village’ by policy 16 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS). It does not currently have a development boundary but is due to have one within the emerging Site Allocations and Policies document, which is due for adoption later in 2015. Under policy 16 of the JCS, the village is to accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings and small-scale business or services, subject to form and character considerations. The site is adjacent to the proposed development boundary, and therefore is well related to the existing settlement. It is for one pitch and in this sense would not dominate the settled community.

4.15 Policy DM 3.4 of the emerging Development Management Policies document states that the site should not be so isolated from settlements that the occupiers cannot gain convenient access to schools and facilities to meet their daily needs. There should be adequate capacity available in local infrastructure and services, and the site should have a suitable route of access for the occupiers.

4.16 Concerns have been raised by local residents and the County Highway Authority that the site is remote from local services and public transport. The closest bus stops are on Norwich Road, 1.8km from the site. Other facilities, such as the Infants and Junior School in Hethersett are approximately 2.6km away. The Highway Authority considers that the proposed occupiers would be reliant on transport by private motor car, contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Transport Plan.

4.17 Whilst it is recognised that there are very limited services within the village itself, the site is well related to the existing built up area of the village which has been designated as suitable for infill and small scale residential development within the JCS. In addition the town of Hethersett and city of Norwich are both within relatively close proximity and contain a number of services. For these reasons, it would be difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal on sustainability grounds.

4.18 In terms of equine development the site already benefits from permission for equestrian use. Permission is sought to keep horses for recreational purposes and the applicant has confirmed that no business use is proposed. Policy LEI 14 supports the use of land for the keeping of horses for recreational purposes providing there are no adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, important wildlife habitats, highway safety and residential amenity. The site is considered suitable for continued use for the keeping of horses for recreational purposes.
Impact on residential amenity

4.19 Concerns have been raised that the development would harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The main objections relate to the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy and the potential for increased flood risk to neighbouring properties. The houses in closest proximity that have the potential to be affected are the three immediately to the south and west of the site, no’s 4 and 5 High Street, and ‘Amathus’.

4.20 The proposed site plan shows that the concrete slab for the siting of the residential caravan and day room would be positioned to the north of the existing stable building, and the garden area would be to the west of this area. The day room and caravan would therefore be approximately 30 metres from the boundary with no’s 4 and 5 and 15 metres from the boundary with Amathus. The day room and caravan would be approximately 50 metres from the houses at no’s 4 and 5, whilst being approximately 47 metres from the house at Amathus. These are considered to be adequate separation distances, with the stable block providing a physical buffer that would further reduce the impact.

4.21 The site benefits from a degree of existing fencing and hedgerows that provide some privacy however a condition is recommended to ensure that a suitable fence is erected between the application site and the neighbouring occupiers no. 5 High Street and Amathus where appropriate, to ensure adequate privacy is achieved.

4.22 Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal accords with policy IMP 9 of the Local Plan in that it would not have a materially adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Design and visual impact on the character of the area

4.23 Initially, a set of large solid wooden gates 2.16 metres high had been installed by the applicant at the site access. These were not sympathetic to the character of the rural area and during the course of the application have been replaced with a traditional 5 bar wooden gate which is in keeping with the character of the area. The other main physical changes are the erection of the day room, the laying of the concrete slab and the siting of a residential caravan. The day room would accommodate a kitchen, shower room and laundry room and would be 16 square metres in size. It would be single storey with a pantile roof and feather edge boarded walls.

4.24 The building, pad and caravan would be sited further into the site, away from the road and would be partly screened by the stable building. For these reasons, and given the size and scale of development proposed, the design and appearance and impact on the character of the area is considered acceptable and in accordance with policy 2 of the JCS and emerging policy DM 3.4 and 3.9 of the Development Management Policies Document.

Highway impact

4.25 Vehicle and pedestrian access would be via the access onto High Street. The Highway Officer has stated that the visibility at the access is acceptable. There is room on the site for four parking spaces which is sufficient for a development of the size proposed. Conditions regarding the upgrading of surface of the existing access and the provision of a suitable turning area within the site are recommended. The proposal accords with policy IMP 8 in that it would not impede the safe and free flow of traffic within the vicinity of the site.

Flood risk and drainage

4.26 The site lies within the Environment Agency flood zone 1 which is the area of lowest flood risk, where residential development is considered compatible. However concerns have been raised by local residents that the site is subject to localised flooding, and there are concerns at both the suitability of the site for residential use and the potential for it to
increase flood risk. The application advises that sustainable drainage systems would be used for the disposal of water from roofs and hard surfaces, and that foul drainage would be dealt with via a package treatment plant. The Council’s Flood Defence Officer is satisfied that should a system be installed that drains flood water away from the caravan and discharges in the meadow to the east, then there would be no increased flood risk to the site or elsewhere.

4.27 A further report has been submitted by Professor Hey on behalf of the objectors which calls into question the drainage information provided. At the time of writing further information from the applicant has been invited and will be reported to committee if received on time. However, Officers are satisfied that foul and surface water drainage issues can be dealt with via condition and that the proposal would not lead to a material increase in flood risk.

Impact on public right of way

4.28 The right of way is on the opposite side of the field from where the residential area is proposed. Given that the path is approximately 70 metres away from this area, there would be no materially adverse impact on the public right of way.

Other matters

4.29 Concerns have been raised about the position of the site in the middle of the village, and the fact the site is close to the village hall. The location of residential and equestrian uses in this location within the village is considered acceptable. Given the small scale of development proposed, the existing presence of other residential properties in close proximity to the village hall, and the separation distance between the village hall and the residential part of the site proposed, it is considered no adverse impacts would occur.

4.30 Objectors have requested that a condition be added restricting the development to a named person/family. There is not considered to be a valid planning reason to restrict permission in this way, however a condition is recommended restricting the residential occupation of the site to an occupier who is able to demonstrate gypsy/traveller status and also restricting it to 1 pitch. It has been further raised by objectors that the permission should be for a temporary period of time; however if the proposal complies with relevant planning policies there is considered to be no grounds to reasonably require this.

4.31 Concerns have been raised that approving the application would set a precedent for further similar development. However such proposals would require a planning application and would be assessed on their planning merits. Concerns have been raised regarding potential business use, however no business use is proposed and a condition is recommended preventing any commercial equestrian activities.

4.32 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.

4.33 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. Non-planning matters, such as loss of value to property and potential impacts on private water supplies are not planning matters which can be taken into account in the consideration of the application.
The application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) based on the size of the day room.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Officers are satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the gypsy/traveller status of Mr Austin. In considering the application, weight has been attached to needs of the Applicant and his family, the lack of a 5 year land supply within the District for gypsy and traveller sites, and the location of the site adjacent to a village identified within the Joint Core Strategy as being suitable to accommodate small infill or small groups of dwellings. Although a number of strong objections have been received from local residents, Officers are satisfied that subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would not cause material harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with relevant development plan policies and national guidance and is recommended for approval.
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Further information on Michael Austin (Romany Gypsy) for Planning application at Ketteringham (SNDC)

At the last Planning Committee Meeting (29th April 2015) the Councillors requested further proof of the applicant's Gypsy Status in 'planning terms'.

For the purposes of Planning Policy for traveller sites, Gypsy / Travellers are identified as being:

'Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.'

Michael Austin is an ethnic Romany Gypsy. He is related by blood to the Leveridge's who have sites passed by three Norfolk Councils (NNDC, Broadland and yourself at SNDC). A letter of support was supplied, and Tony Cooke (lead officer for Gypsies and Travellers) confirmed this.

There is a 'presumption' based in Planning Law, and through legal channels that Gypsy's have a 'cultural aversion to bricks and mortar', live longer, and are much happier and are certainly healthier in caravans with land around them. By returning to this 'way of life' many are able to openly express themselves as the ethnic minority, that they are.

Michael Austin was born into a family that is of mixed race. His mother is a Gypsy, whilst his father is from the settled community. Michael Austin lived in a house for the first fourteen years of his life. However, he was taken by his mother travelling for about six months of every year of these fourteen years. Michael Austin left Broadland High School at 14 having been identified as a Traveller, and went to work with his father, and was trained in 'cer dealing'.

Michael continues to attend all the Gypsy Fairs (Appleby, Stow, Watton, Dereham, Wisbeach, Peterborough and Kenilworth), and does so with his partner Jessi, and their young son Ruben.

In 'Planning Terms' the applicant must demonstrate that they are nomadic.

Nomad is identified by the Oxford Dictionaries as being a noun, and means 'a member of a community that moves with its animals from place to place'.

Gypsy / Travellers since the 16th Century have found it progressively difficult to be able to move freely from place to place in England and Wales, due to the 'commoditisation' of land, and have been required to settle since the 1940s to access common good benefits (i.e. health, education, welfare) provided by the system of social organisation adopted after the Second World War. It is entirely arguable that any Gypsy / Traveller awarded planning consent ceases to be a Gypsy / Traveller once they secure a settled base. However, the Gypsy community maintain their cultural identity through the Gypsy Fairs. They are no longer able to move freely apart from to these Fairs. The Gypsy / Traveller community is one that you have to be born into to be a member and its members are recognised to experience difficulties in accessing services of common good.

Michael Austin is a well known 'horseman' in the Gypsy community, he has been taught to 'drive' his horses and attends the Gypsy Drives that run regularly. It was on such a local drive that he met the previous owner of the field he now owns. Michael is nomadic, and has an aversion to living in houses. Land owned by Gypsy / Travellers tends to be sold only to members of the Gypsy / Traveller community.

Over the last ten years Michael Austin has lived in a caravan. This was between 2005 – 2010 on his father's land at Sprowston. This can be confirmed by the next door neighbour PC Keith
Lambert (1120) based at Wroxham Road Police station. PC Lambert is also a local parish Councillor at Sprowston and is happy to confirm this living arrangement. He has known Michael over many years.

Following a death in his family Michael was forced to leave Sprowston and lived in a caravan at Fethorpe for two and a half years until being required to move. Michael then stayed on land owned by friends in a caravan in the Ringland area, until purchasing the land in Ketteningham. These moves account for the last 10 years and have simply reinforced Michael's need and desire to live in a culturally appropriate accommodation.

The application must of course be viewed against your Council's lack of a 5 year supply of suitable land for Gypsy sites. As the Council have not identified suitable land Gypsy / Travellers have to source it themselves. This your officers have already stated is a suitable site.

This remains an obvious site for all the right reasons for a Gypsy/Traveller site. Low impact, water and electricity already in place and hard standing and stables. Any Planning Inspector would, and has on many occasions, accepted my input and evidence that I have provided here. Neither a 'parish' or a 'Council' can alter National Planning Guidance on Gypsies and Travellers, this must and will come from Parliament and will occur over a long consultation period and process. All parties must adhere to what remains in place now.

This application remains for one single pitch for a man who is a Romany Gypsy and needs a base so that his young son can be brought up in a culturally acceptable way, and not be excluded from services of common good. There are hundreds of families who could be offered this land, who cannot locate such suitable land. I have a personal waiting list of over 100 such families and this would be ideal for any of them, especially with its close proximity to the A11. The land will and should be developed for Gypsy / Travellers occupation. If required it can be sold to families who also meet the definition of nomadic in Planning terms. Any future applicant if there is to be one, will be well known to the Norfolk Gypsy service. But Michael remains very clear that this is ideal for him and his young family.

There are now very few truly 'nomadic Gypsies' as there are no stopping places or enough transit sites to actually operate this lifestyle from. Those that are truly nomadic normally come into conflict with the settled community. Viewing this application from the 'single word of nomadic' does it no justice. It must be set against the 1994 legislation that encouraged Gypsies to locate and find land for sites, against the lack of provision from this council of such identifiable land and a clear five year land supply.
Also weight must be given to the low numbers that have progressed through the planning process and of course the huge 'unmet need' still not catered or even factored in by this and other Councils.

This application must be viewed from 'Planning Merit' and weight must be given to the following points:

It is a suitable site next to your own 'Development Boundaries'.
It has no 'Flood risk or drainage issues'.
It has services within 3 miles and the applicant has local connections.
There are no objections from any 'agencies or consultees'

This issue of Gypsy Status has been fulfilled.

Candy Sheridan
Gypsy Council
Other Applications

2. **Appl. No**: 2015/0214/F  
   **Parish**: SWARDESTON  
   Applicants Name: Production Bureau Ltd  
   Site Address: The Dog Inn Main Road Swardeston Norfolk NR14 8AD  
   Proposal: Change of Use from Public House to Office Building and Internal and External Alterations  
   Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
   1. Full planning permission  
   2. In accord with submitted details  
   3. Archaeological work to be agreed  
   4. Landscaping

3. **Appl. No**: 2015/0247/LB  
   **Parish**: SWARDESTON  
   Applicants Name: Production Bureau Ltd  
   Site Address: The Dog Inn Main Road Swardeston Norfolk NR14 8AD  
   Proposal: Change of Use from Public House to Office Building and Internal and External Alterations  
   Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
   1. Listed Building Time Limit  
   2. In accord with submitted drawings  
   3. External materials  
   4. Joinery details  
   5. External joinery finishes

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 08: Promoting Healthy Communities  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   EMP 6: The retention of rural employment and services (Part consistent)  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
   TRA19: 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
DM2.2 Protection of employment sites
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and the setting of Listed Buildings:
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. Relevant Planning History

2.1 2009/1045 Retention of additional external lighting, perimeter fence, hanging baskets, trough planters and decking. Proposed cabinets to house cooling units and replacement or rear window. Approved

2.2 2009/1044 Retention of additional external lighting, perimeter fence, hanging baskets, trough planters and decking. Proposed cabinets to house cooling units and replacement of rear window. Approved

2.3 2009/0809 Replacement of double sided swing sign, illuminated wall mounted advertising sign, illuminated individual free standing sign and entrance sign Approved

2.4 2009/0673 Proposed external lights & replacement signs (externally) Approved

2.5 2008/1971 Demolition of existing outbuilding/store. Replacement windows (timber) to replicate the original style. Fire escape balcony, stairs and handrail to rear of property. Kitchen extractor system to flat roof at rear. Lime based render to internal walls. Approved

2.6 2008/1970 Replacement windows (timber) to replicate the original style. Fire escape balcony, stair and handrail to rear of property. Kitchen extractor system to flat roof at rear. Approved

2.7 2008/1969 The siting, design and external appearance of 3 dwellings to be erected from approved permission 2007/2384/O, together with precise details of type and colour of materials to be used. Means of access to the site and parking. Approved
Development Management Committee 24 June 2015

2.8 2007/2385 1) Subdivision of restaurant into 2 guest rooms
2) Demolition of outbuilding

2.9 2007/2384 1) Change of use from Public House to combined Public House and Guest House including subdivision of restaurant to form 2 guest rooms
2) Outline permission to erect 3 dwellings with parking

Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Did not wish to comment on whether or not they support or object to the proposal

3.2 District Members:
Cllr Herbert (no longer a Councillor)
Cllr Legg
To Committee due to loss of a public house.
Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways No highways objections or recommendations

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection but recommendation for restricted use between 07.30 and 19:00

3.5 Historic Environment Service No objection but requested programme of historic buildings recording

3.6 Representations Four responses received - two in support, one neither in support or objecting and one objection. The objection is against the loss of the public house.

4. Assessment

4.1 These applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for change of use from Public House to offices. The proposal involves some minor internal alterations together with changes to door/window openings and a new small porch at the north entrance. The proposal also includes new surfacing for the parking/turning areas and some landscaping to improve the appearance of land and provide some screening. The proposed office use is for an existing local business in Swardenston, which needs to expand.

4.2 The site is within the village development boundary in an area of residential dwellings, shops and commercial car sales. The property is a grade II listed building dating from the 18th century and is situated in the centre of Swardenston fronting the main road through the village to the west side. The building is particularly prominent in views being at a 2.5 storey height with Dutch gable ends. It is constructed in soft red brick with sash windows and classical door case at the front elevation. There is a 19th century single storey extension to the south side which until relatively recently was a large function room but has been subdivided to provide guest accommodation, planning permission having been granted in 2007. To the rear is a single storey flat roof extension. There is a large car park area also to the rear beyond which there is a relatively new terrace of 3 houses, which were granted planning permission in 2008. These dwellings share the same access from the road as the public house. The property has been unoccupied and out of use for some time.
4.3 For these applications the main issues to be considered are the impact of the loss of the public house on the local community, the impact of the proposed works on the listed building, the impact on neighbouring occupiers and the highways. For the listed building consent application the considerations are the impact on the impact on the special historic/architectural interest of the building and on its setting.

The proposed change of use

4.4 The most up-to-date relevant planning guidance is in the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 7 recognises that public houses enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments and requires planning authorities to ‘guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the communities ability to meet its day to day needs.’

4.5 As the site is within the development boundary of the village the proposed change of use is considered under the requirements of policy EMP 6 of the Local Plan regarding which allows for the alteration and extension of existing business premises subject to meeting requirements regarding scale, design, landscaping, parking, servicing and access.

4.6 Under the requirements of national policy guidance the Council requires that the applicant demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect of the permitted use being continued and this would normally be demonstrated by providing evidences of a previously carried out marketing exercise. Policy DM3.17 from the emerging Development Management Policies re-states this aim and sets out a 3 stage requirement for evidence, which includes six months of marketing for the permitted use; confirmation that it has been offered on a range of terms considered to be reasonable by an independently qualified assessor; and that the proposal has regard to further plans for the area, including community led plans. However, at this stage the emerging policies carry little weight because they are still under consideration by the inspector.

4.7 Marketing information has been submitted for the period 9th May until 10th September 2014. The property was marketed at £249,500 and placed on four sites, Rightmove, Invest in Norfolk, Move Hut and the Estate agents website. Property details were also sent to all agents in Norfolk and north Suffolk. There was a viewing by a prospective purchaser on 2nd July who was interested in the property for its current permitted use. An offer of £195,000 was made but rejected. The prospective purchaser pointed out that the building would need £50,000 to £100,000 spending on it due to its run down condition. It was also pointed out that the recently built dwellings to the rear of the car park and loss of the function room compromised the current use. There was further interest shown from another prospective purchaser between 17 July and 6th August. It was felt that the costs to provide the necessary standards for the current use were too high in view of competition from other similar business nearby such as The Bird in Hand at Wrenningham, The Marsh Harrier on the Ipswich Road south of the city and the World’s End in Mulbarton. The loss of the function room again was an issue. There was a further viewing on 21 July for use as a restaurant although no offer was put in, issues having been raised with the suitability of the layout. Marketing details were amended on the 7th August at the revised figure of £225,000. After being informed of the price change the first prospective viewer was not prepared to increase his offer due to the costs of refurbishment. A third prospective purchase viewed the property in August for use as a restaurant but did not make an offer, again, due to issues with the layout and the extent of repair works required to the building. On 21st August the first prospective purchaser increased their offer to £210,000. The applicants viewed the property on 4th September and highlighted their intensions to use the property to expand their successful business in Swardeston and offered £235,000. The prospective purchaser who made the previous offer was informed of this but decided not to take matters further. The applicants exchanged contracts on 3 October at the price offered.
Advice was sought from the Property Section of the Council on the marketing schedule, who confirmed that they were satisfied that the four month marketing exercise was sufficient to test the market. Based on the submitted schedule it was not considered necessary that the property should be marketed for a further two months.

Only one letter of objection has been received from a local resident who does not wish to see the loss of the public house. Another local resident does not wish to support or object to the proposal and two other residents have expressed support. The Parish Council does not wish to comment on whether it supports or objects to the application. None of the formal consultees have objected to the application although conditions have been recommended for archaeological recording and restricted hours of use and these have been included on the decision notice.

Taking the responses into consideration together with the information provided on the marketing exercise as described above, the Council is satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the public house use returning. Whilst the proposal will result in the loss of a public house the employment use of the site is still continued by an existing expanding business in the locality. It is considered that due consideration has been given to the policy requirements of the NPPF regarding the loss of a public house, the principle of which is acceptable, subject to meeting the requirements of other policies listed above.

Design and heritage issues

In terms of the internal alterations, the proposal provides some additional partitioning within the rear flat roof extension and subdivision of rooms in the main building at the first floor. Externally 3 new windows are proposed on rear elevations with another new window at the north side to replace an existing door. There is a small porch roof at the north entrance of the building with fire escape provided to the rear of the building.

The proposed internal changes at the first floor will have a slight adverse impact on one of the main rooms by the level of subdivision but it is considered this is justified because of the benefit the overall changes will make in terms of facilitating the new business use. These works are new partitions and therefore they could easily be removed in the future. Other internal changes will not harm the significance of the building. Externally, the proposed changes will not harm or enhance the significance of the building and some landscaping of land to the rear, details of which are to be agreed under conditions, provide an opportunity to provide some degree of enhancement. The proposal therefore satisfies the requirements of sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF regarding heritage assets. Whilst there is some very small degree of harm to the internal character of the building this is justified in view of the overall benefits of the scheme and therefore due consideration has been given to the impact of proposals on the potential for harm to the special historic/architectural character of the building as required under Section 66 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The setting of the building will not be harmed by the proposal, new landscaping providing some enhancement of the setting, all of which satisfies the requirements Section 66 regarding setting.

In view of the above the proposal also accords with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy regarding design as well as with the requirements of policies IMP13 and IMP15 of the Local Plan regarding listed buildings and their setting.

Residential Amenity and Highways

Although none of the immediate neighbours have objected to the scheme concern has been raised about the parking for 30 vehicles stated in the application. The occupier of 2 Horse Shoe Cottages has also raised concern about overlooking from the new rear windows and the neighbour at Ashley House to the southeast side has raised the issue of the new rear balcony area which will overlook their property.
4.15 The Council’s parking standards require provision of 10 car parking spaces for the floor area involved but there are on-site parking spaces already available well in excess of this figure. The Highways Officer has not objected to the proposal and has not recommended any conditions regarding parking provision. The proposal therefore accords with the requirements of policies IMP8 and TRA19 of the Local Plan.

4.16 With regard to overlooking, the balcony in the original proposal has been omitted to address potential overlooking onto Ashley House. In view of the distance between 2 Horse Shoes Cottages and the new windows to the rear of the building any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity is not considered to be significant enough to require the application details to be amended in this respect. Therefore with the rear balcony omitted from the scheme it is considered that the proposal accords with policy IMP9 of the Local Plan with regard to overlooking.

Environmental issues

4.17 The Environmental Services Team have commented on the application and although they have no objection to the scheme they have recommended that the proposed use is restricted to between 7:30 and 19:00 on week days only. However, in view of the existing lawful use of the premises as a Public House and Guesthouse without hours restriction, I do not consider that a restriction on the hours of office use would be reasonable.

Other Issues

4.18 The Historic Environment Service has not objected to the proposal but has requested that a programme of Historic Building Recording be carried out in accordance with policy guidance in the NPPF. A condition regarding this has been included in the decision Notice.

4.19 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.

4.20 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as there is no increase in internal floor space

5 Conclusion

5.1 Whilst the proposal will result in the loss of an existing public house the Council is satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to adequately demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect for the continuation of the current permitted use. There will be no loss of employment opportunity within the village as this is continued by a new business which is looking to expand and remain in the local area. It is acknowledged there will be a small level of adverse impact on the historic interest of part of the interior of the building but overall the scheme will not cause any harm to the special historic/architectural interest of the building or its setting. The original scheme design has been amended to take into account overlooking issues. It is considered that the proposal meets all the requirements of the above policies and therefore it is recommended that the application be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Philip Whitehead 01508 533948
and E-mail: pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2015/0451/O  
**Parish**: WRENINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Graham Roberts  
Site Address: Land South Of The Homestead Church Road Wreningham Norfolk  
Proposal: Proposed 2 no. new build cottages

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1 Outline planning permission  
2 Reserved matters required  
3 In accordance with plan  
4 Access to be upgraded  
5 Visibility splays  
6 Access/turning area to be retained.  
7 Reporting of unexpected contamination  
8 Water efficiency  
9 Boundary treatments to be agreed

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 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of 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 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  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant.
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  
- The public footpath should not be encroached upon
- The access point should be placed at the other end of the plots as this would be safer
- The access to the two plots should remain as a single vehicle entry point
- The difference in level between the two plots needs to be properly graded
- There is a preference for smaller dwellings

Should permission be granted, light pollution should be minimised from the development.

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 NCC Highways  
No objection subject to conditions.

3.4 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)  
No objection subject to condition ensuring that any contamination is dealt with.

3.5 NCC Ecologist  
No objection.

3.6 SNC Flood Defence Officer  
No objection.

3.7 NCC Public Rights Of Way  
No objections. Wreningham public footpath 8 runs along the southern boundary of the site, however the footpath does not appear to be directly affected by the proposals. The footpath should not be impinged upon by the development.

3.8 The Ramblers  
No comments received

3.9 Representations  
Three letters of objection received. Concerns regarding:
- Loss of green space
- Additional traffic
- Overlooking of 5 Glebe Close and Spinney to the east
- Access point could be better located

One letter received making no comment on the application but stating that any development should be in keeping with existing properties and consideration should be given to the impact on neighbours and local roads.

4. Assessment

Proposal

4.1 The application seeks outline consent with all matters reserved for the erection of two dwellings on land to the south of The Homestead, a detached dwelling on Church Road in Wreningham. The application site comprises part of the large garden of The Homestead and access would be directly onto Church Road. There are further residential properties on the opposite side of Church Road to the west, a public footpath and woodland to the south, and further woodland to the east.
4.2 The application was originally submitted as an outline application with appearance and landscaping as reserved matters, however it was amended during the application process so that all matters are now reserved.

Principle of Development

4.3 Wreningham is classed as a ‘Service Village’ within the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS). As such, under policy 15, land is being allocated within the village and the development boundary is being amended to allow for small-scale housing development.

4.4 The site lies outside of the development boundary within the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. However, the site is within the development boundary within the submission version of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD, which when adopted will form part of the new Local Plan. Because this has been submitted to Government, subject to examination and no objections have been received in respect of this particular adjustment to the development boundary, the proposed change to the boundary is a material consideration, and it is considered an exception to local plan policy ENV 8 can be made. The development boundary has been adjusted to allow for small-scale development, and the proposal is consistent with this aim. The principle of development is therefore considered to be acceptable, in accordance with policy 15 of the JCS and policy 1.3 of the emerging Development Management Policies DPD.

Impact on the character of the area

4.5 The indicative plan submitted shows two houses side by side facing the road. The character of the street is generally one of detached dwellings facing onto Church Road and the proposal would be in keeping with this character and be of a similar density to the pattern of development in the surrounding area. It is considered the site could accommodate single storey or two storey dwellings; however this matter would be determined and assessed at reserved matters stage. Subject to the consideration of the reserved matters, the development of the site would comply with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and guidance on design within the NPPF, as well as guidance within the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD.

Impact on neighbours

4.6 A small number of objections have been received raising concerns at the loss of green space within the village and overlooking of 5 Glebe Close due to the orientation of that property. It is considered the proposed dwellings could be set back within the plot to reduce the level of overlooking to an acceptable level. Although some harm to visual amenity would occur from the loss of green space, there would be a benefit in terms of helping to meet housing need and the site has been incorporated within the proposed development boundary to accommodate a small level of development.

4.7 The occupier of Meadow View has raised concerns about overlooking of his ‘Spinney’ (woodland) but this is not part of the residential curtilage and it is already overlooked from the existing garden. The relatively modest increase in traffic that would occur is not considered to justify a reason for refusal. Overall, subject to the imposition of conditions and consideration of the reserved matters, there would be no materially harmful impact on residential amenity, in compliance with IMP 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Impact on Highways

4.8 Although access is a reserved matter, indicative access arrangements have been shown. No objection is raised by the Highway Authority in relation to this and therefore I am satisfied that a suitable access can be provided at reserved matters stage. The scheme complies with policy IMP 8 in this regard. The Parish Council has expressed a preference for the access to be moved further to the north; however there is no requirement for this given the position of the Highways Authority on the indicative access arrangements.
Ecology/Trees

4.9 The site is mainly laid to lawn as part of a garden, and as such is anticipated to have relatively low ecological value. No objection is raised by the Ecologist. There are a number of trees along the boundary and an Arboricultural report is likely to be required at reserved matters stage regarding trees to be retained. There are no TPO trees on the site. There would be no material harm to ecological features, in accordance with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Impact on Right of Way

4.10 Public Footpath 8 runs along the southern boundary of the site and some concern has been raised from residents after the footpath was initially included within the site boundary. This has since been rectified with the site boundary being amended to exclude the footpath. The applicant has confirmed that they have no intentions to encroach on the public right of way. No objections are raised by the Norfolk County Council Rights of Way Officer.

Drainage/Environmental considerations

4.11 Foul drainage would be disposed of via the main sewer. No objections are raised by the Flood Defence Officer or Environmental Services subject to a condition requiring the submission of a land contamination assessment should one be required.

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.

Community Infrastructure Levy

4.13 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because it is an outline application. It will be liable for CIL at reserved matters stage.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The site is within a proposed development boundary as identified by the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and therefore the principle of development is considered acceptable. All matters are reserved, however it is considered the site is capable of comfortably accommodating two dwellings in such a way that would be in keeping with the character of the area and ensure that residential amenity and highway safety are safeguarded. The application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2015/0702/F  
**Parish**: HEMPNALL

**Applicants Name**: Mr Richard Buck  
**Site Address**: Grange Farm Lundy Green Hempnall Norfolk NR15 2NX  
**Proposal**: 100kWp Solar PV array.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF 12: 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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**
- ENV 15: Species protection
- UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

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

1.5 **Development Management Policies**
- DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
- DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
- DM4.2 Renewable Energy
- 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 2013/0114 Replacement of 6 windows Approved
2.2 2013/1619 Two new poultry units Approved

2.3 2014/1519 Discharge of Conditions 3, external materials and 8, highway works, of permission 2013/1619/F - Two new poultry units Approved

2.4 2014/2626 Discharge of Condition 5 External lighting Example along with Condition 8B confirmation of highway Passing Places completed to Highways satisfaction of permission 2013/1619/F Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approval.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) Recommend condition restricting hours of construction to control impact of piling works.

3.4 Ecologist No objection subject to condition covering mitigation during construction works.

3.5 Representations 2 letters of support from residential occupiers.

4 Assessment

Site Description

4.1 The application site forms part of a poultry and pig farm which is on the west side of Steppings Lane at Lundy Green and is outside of any development limits. The farm comprises of a range of modern farm buildings and the farmhouse itself, to the east of the application site, is a grade II listed building.

Proposal

4.2 This application proposes an array of 400 solar PV panels to be sited immediately to the south of the main group of agricultural buildings and to the east of the listed farmhouse. They would be double-mounted and aligned in rows which would be orientated east to west. The proposed development would cover a total area of 20.2m x 20.2m. The panels would have a maximum height of 2.3m and a lower height of 0.6m above ground level. The proposed panels are required to produce energy for new poultry units to the south east of the application site.

Principle of development

4.3 Policy UTL13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, policy DM 4.2 of the emerging local plan, policy 3 of the JCS and the requirements of the NPPF seek to support renewable energy projects subject to no adverse harm to the surrounding landscape, nature conservation, historic assets or loss of amenities to neighbouring properties. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of this development may be acceptable subject to no adverse impacts being identified.

Impact on landscape character

4.4 The site is currently overgrown unused land ancillary to the farm which is bounded to the north and east by existing agricultural buildings. There is an established hedgerow along
4.5 A condition is included in this recommendation which would require the removal of the PV panels and mountings if they are no longer required for electricity production. This is considered necessary as there would no longer be any benefit from the development that would justify the presence of these structures in the countryside.

Ecology

4.6 There is a pond approximately 65 metres to the south east of the application site and there are other ponds in the vicinity. Therefore, great crested newts may be a consideration. NCC Ecology considers that, given the nature and size of the proposed development, a condition should be imposed to mitigate against any potential impact on great crested newts during the construction period. On that basis, this proposal would accord with policy ENV15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Setting of listed building

4.7 The proposed array would be sited 70m to the west of Grange Farmhouse which is a grade II listed building and would be separated from it by an existing modern agricultural building. Given the degree of separation and the low overall height of the proposed development, it is considered that this proposal would not harm the setting of this listed building.

Impact on residential amenity

4.8 The nearest residential properties are more than 100 metres to the east of the application site. Therefore, the development once constructed would have no direct impact on residential amenity. However, the applicant anticipates a two week construction period and the proposed panels would be mounted on a pile-driven ground mounted system. The noise associated with these construction works would have the potential to harm residential amenity. Therefore, Environmental Services have recommended a condition to restrict the hours of the pile-driving works to between 8am -6pm on Mondays - Fridays, 8am - 1pm on Saturdays with no working on Sundays and public holidays. This has been discussed with the applicant who has no objection to this restriction.

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 not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 The scale and siting of the proposed development would allow the farm to benefit from renewable energy without detriment to the character of the surrounding landscape, nature conservation, the setting of the nearby listed building and residential amenities. The scheme therefore accords with policies ENV 15, UTL 13, IMP8, IMP9 and IMP 15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policies DM3.12, DM3.14, DM4.2 and DM4.11 of the emerging local plan.
Development Management Committee

24 June 2015

   Parish : HETHERSETT

   Applicants Name : Mr G Martin
   Site Address : Land West Of Myrtle Cottage Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk
   Proposal : Sub-division of residential curtilage and erection of detached
dwelling and garage.

   Recommendation : Refuse

   1 Conflict with ENV8 – development in the open countryside
   2 Harm to character and appearance of the area

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2 : Promoting good design
   Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
   Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

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

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

1.5 Development Management Policies
   DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable
development in South Norfolk
   DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
   DM3.9 Design Principles
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
   Refuse:
   Outside the development boundary - insufficient justification reason
to justify an exception in this case.

   Concern re access on sharp bend.
3.2 District Member To be determined by Committee - the location would in no way be detrimental to the countryside. In fact it would enhance the area.

3.3 NCC Highways Support conditionally - subject to: Upgrading of access onto Little Melton Road, parking and turning within the site, and any access gates to be set back.

3.4 Flood Defence Officer No objection subject to condition for disposal of surface water and foul sewage.

3.5 Representations 1 Letter received -

   Raises no objection to the sub-division of the land however raises concern that the existing drainage system will be kept in good working order through the proposed build and thereafter.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is an outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of a detached dwelling and garage at Myrtle Cottage, Little Melton Road Hethersett. The site is located on a corner of Little Melton Road and sub-divides the garden of Myrtle Cottage.

4.2 The main issues in this case are the principle of development and policy considerations, the impact of the proposed development on highways, and residential amenity.

4.3 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development overall, however relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. In the past a five year land supply did not exist within the Norwich policy area and as such planning permission was granted for dwellings in locations which otherwise would have been considered contrary to policy in accordance with the principles of the NPPF in this regard.

   Principle of development

4.4 As of 1 December 2014 the Council has reached the target of a 5 year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area and as such the shortfall of housing land supply is no longer an issue for consideration within the determination of this planning application. policy and therefore the erection of a new dwelling in this location is contrary to that policy. In terms of policy the site is outside any development boundary or village limit and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under this

4.5 An exception to the above is assessment criteria is paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:
   • the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work
   • cases where development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets
   • re-use of redundant or disused buildings which would lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting
   • or where the dwelling would be a design of exceptional quality or would be innovative in the nature of its design which should:
- Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural area
- Reflect the highest standards in architecture
- Significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
- Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area

4.6 The submitted outline application makes provision for a dwelling and garage. No indication of agricultural need is offered as part of the proposal, and without details (the application is in outline) the proposal has not demonstrated that it would be an exceptional design or meet any of the other bullet points above.

4.7 The application suggests that permission should be granted because the site is within a cluster of dwellings and should be considered as part of Hethersett Village rather than ‘countryside’. It is also suggested that the location is sustainable because of the range of services accessible by public transport in nearby Hethersett and Little Melton. The District is characterised by many such outlying clusters of dwellings and these have been consistently excluded from development boundaries to prevent their consolidation and the erosion of the character of such areas which is distinct from the generally closer knit built form of the main settlements. The arguments put forward do not outweigh such harm and do not justify granting permission in breach of the Development Plan.

Residential amenity

4.8 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 dwelling. While the scheme is for outline, a dwelling of sensitive scale and design could be achieved which would protect the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring properties. The loss of privacy is not a reason for refusal.

Impact on highways

4.9 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. While the access to the site is on a bend in Little Melton Road, a ‘pull in area’ already exists in front of the existing dwelling which also provides access to the proposed site. Subject to conditions the Highway officer has raised, the scheme is considered to accord with IMP8.

Impact on open countryside

4.10 Given the context of the site, which has scattered dwellings of a mixture of designs and styles around it, I do not doubt it is possible to design a property which could be sympathetic to other dwellings in the vicinity. However, as noted above, the consolidation of this loose-knit group by sub-dividing and developing gardens would harm the character and appearance of the area.

Surface water and Foul sewage disposal

4.11 Subject to appropriate conditions for the disposal of both surface water and foul sewage no objections are raised by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer.
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 and while a new dwelling would attract CIL the harm to the open countryside outweigh the benefit of CIL.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is contrary to the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations, including assessment against paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which justify approval or outweigh the harm the development would cause. In these circumstances the application should be refused.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

7. Appl. No : 2015/0973/A
Parish : PORINGLAND

Applicants Name : Mr Renata Garfoot (South Norfolk Council)
Site Address : Land North Of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk
Proposal : Display of advertisements to include main development board, entrance direction boards, show home external sign, visitors car parking, external sales office sign, flag poles

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
  1-5 Standard advert conditions
  6 Removal of signs
  7 In accord with submitted drawings

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 19: Advertisements (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
DM3.10 Advertisements and signs
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0393 Reserved Matters application for 57 dwellings and 3539m2 (GIA) office accommodation, associated parking and green spaces
Approved

2.2 2014/0319 Residential layout including all house details and landscaping for next phase following planning permission 2011/0476/O
Approved

2.3 2011/0476 Residential & Commercial (office) Development
Approved

2.4 There are also a number of planning applications for the discharge of conditions on both 2014/0319 and 2014/0393, but no applications relating to Advertisement Consent.
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council
Recommend approval but express concern about noise nuisance from flag poles

3.2 District Members:
   - **Cllr Overton**
     Can be delegated - providing safe for vehicle movements and boarding does not create or impair driver's visibility.
   - **Cllr Neal**
     To be reported if appropriate.
   - **Cllr Roger Smith (County Councillor)**
     Are flags on highway land? If so wishes to object. Consider Highway Officer's recommendation. Flag noise, request applicant to consider this and remedy the same or withdraw flag poles from display

3.3 NCC Highways
No objection in principle however signs and flag poles should be set back 2.5 metres from road edge.
Detail on amended plan satisfactory.

3.4 Representations
2 letters of objection
   - Noise from flag poles
   - Need to concentrate on speeding traffic
   - Cannot accept position of advert boards and flag poles, should be set further back

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the erection of advertisement boards and flag poles on the frontage of an approved development site in Poringland with work having recently commenced on site including the show house. The application seeks advertisement consent for a number of elements, these are as follows: signs attached to the show house and the adjacent garages, free standing office showroom swing board sign, free standing visitor parking signs, a directional sign within the site and two main development boards and four flag poles at the entrance to a secondary access to the serving 6 dwellings, one being the show home.

Principle of development

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the development of a prosperous economy whilst more specifically Policy IMP19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to ensure that advertisements and other signs are well designed and appropriate in scale for their purpose. Policy IMP08 aims to protect the safety of highway users and the free flow of traffic whilst Policy IMP09 seeks to ensure that development does not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

4.3 Regulation 3 of the Advertisement Regulations 2007 requires that the local planning authority control the display of advertisement in the interest of amenity and public safety. Unless the nature of the advertisement is in itself harmful to amenity or public safety consent cannot be refused.

Design and scale

4.4 The proposed signs are not excessive in size, are of a reasonable scale and are appropriate for their use. The proposed flag poles are 3 metres in height which does not appear excessive. Due to their design, scale and position the advertisements will not have a significant impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area and are considered to comply with policy IMP19 of the local plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.
Highways

4.5 The Highways Officer recommended that the main development boards and flag poles are sited a minimum of 2.5 metres back from the road edge in order that satisfactory visibility is maintained from the entrance. The agent has submitted amended plans with the boards and flag poles relocated at this distance back from the highway. The Highways Officer is satisfied with the amended location and the proposals are considered to comply with policy IMP8 of the local plan to ensure the safe and free flow of traffic.

Residential amenity

4.6 There have been two letters of objection from neighbouring occupiers and a letter of concern from the County Councillor for the area. The concerns with regard to the position of the main development boards and flag poles have been partially overcome by the amended plan received although this is not as far back as suggested. It has been commented on that the flags and flag poles could cause additional noise.

4.7 Although this issue is acknowledged, due to the distance of the poles from the residential dwellings with a highway in between it is not considered that the noise level would be significant enough to warrant refusing the application or requiring further amendments to the position of the poles. The advertisements are not a permanent fixture and therefore I do not consider that the proposal would result in significant long term harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

4.8 The County Councillor raised concerns as to if the flag poles are on highway land and that the comments from the Highways Development Management Office be considered. The flags are on land owned by the applicant and the amended plans overcome the need for the suggested condition. As stated above any noise from the flag poles is not considered to be significant enough to refuse the application.

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 not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new floorspace has been created by the application.

Conclusion

5.1 The erection of the advertisements on the site is considered to accord with Local Plan policies IMP08, IMP09 and IMP19 and more generally with the economic development principles of the JCS and NPPF due to its direct relationship with new residential development under construction on the site. The proposal is also considered to accord with the Advertisement Regulations 2007 in regard to the interests of amenity and public safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533848 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No:** 2015/1089/A  
**Parish:** LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name: Mrs Renata Garfoot (South Norfolk Council)  
Site Address: Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2UY  
Proposal: Proposed advertising hoarding boards.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1 – 5 Standard advert conditions  
6 In accord with submitted drawings  
7 Removal of signs

Subject to no new significant objections to the proposal being received after expiry of re-consultation period

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 19: Advertisements (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
   DM3.10 Advertisements and signs  
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0265 Outline application for the demolition of Cygnet House and development of up to 50 residential units (class C3) and up to 800 square metres (class B1) floor space, together with associated highway works
   Approved

2.2 2014/2278 Variation of conditions 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31 of planning permission 2013/0265/O to enable demolition prior to commencement of development and variation of condition 29 to vary red line for alterations to access
   Approved
2.3 2015/0385 Reserved Matters Application of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 50 dwellings (Class C3), 800sq.m. of Office (Class B1(a)), together with the discharge of conditions 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 30 relating to outline consent 2014/2278

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council To be reported

3.2 District Members To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Amended proposal: To be reported

Original proposal: No particular objections to the proposed hoardings however the following revisions are requested:

Hoarding 1: will need to be re-sited behind the line of the visibility splay at the main entrance into the new site.

Hoarding 2: fine

Hoarding 3: Swan Lane frontage should be set back a minimum of 3 metres from the road edge of Swan Lane to ensure adequate visibility is maintained at the busy entrance. Details of precise pictorial for hoarding 3 to be confirmed.

3.4 Representations No comments received

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is for the erection of advertising hoarding on the frontage of an approved development site in Long Stratton. Works have recently commenced on the demolition of the site formerly referred to as Cygnet House, Swan Lane. This application seeks advertisement consent for separate sections of hoarding boards around the site and has been amended during the course of the application to increase the number of hoarding sections to four small sections. These are located along the east corner of the site, the junction with Swan Lane and the main entrance into the site.

4.2 An amended drawing showing the revised positions of the hoarding boards has been submitted by the applicant and at the time of report preparation is currently subject to a period of re-consultation. Any comments received in response to this re-consultation will be reported to the Development Management committee as appropriate.

Principle of development

4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the development of a prosperous economy whilst Policy IMP19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to ensure that advertisements and other signs are well designed and are appropriate in scale for their purpose. Policy IMP08 of the South Norfolk Plan seeks to protect the safe and free flow of traffic on the district's highway network.

4.4 Regulation 3 of the Advertisement Regulations 2007 requires that the Local Planning Authority controls the display of advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety only, subject to material provisions within the development plan.

Design and scale

4.5 The revised application proposes four separate sections of display hoarding to mark the entrance into the Maple Park site, as well as the junction with Swan Lane and the south
east corner of the site. Three sections of hoarding will advertise the development, as set out in the submitted documents, whilst hoarding 2 (closest to Swan Lane) will show artwork prepared by local schoolchildren. An indication of the final design has been submitted at this time although this is still to be finalised. Further details will be provided to committee members at the time of the Development Management Committee.

4.6 The proposed signs are of an appropriate size and scale for their purpose and are appropriate for their use. Due to their size, scale and design it is not considered that the hoardings will have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area and they are considered to comply with Policy IMP19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Highways

4.7 In terms of the original proposal the Highways Officer requested that the hoardings (in particular original boards 1 and 3) were set back from their proposed positions by a minimum of 3 metres to ensure that satisfactory visibility splays were maintained around the site.

4.8 In addition, the Highways Officer also sought clarification on the final appearance of the competition hoarding although it is unlikely that an objection would be made based upon the indicative illustrations that have been supplied at this time. This information will be presented to the Development Management Committee.

4.9 An informal discussion with Highways Officer at the time of preparing this report suggests that the revised hoarding locations are likely to be acceptable although a further update to the Development Management committee will be provided as appropriate.

Amenity issues

4.10 The hoarding will not cause significant disturbance to either the residents or occupiers closest to the application site due to its distance from the nearest buildings. At the time of preparing this report no comments had been received from members of the public regarding this proposal.

Other considerations

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

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion, the proposal to erect advertising hoardings on this site is considered to accord with Local Plan Policies IMP08 and IMP19 and more generally with the economic development principles of the JCS and the NPPF due to its direct relationship with the construction works on the site.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher 01508 533960 kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
**Appeals received from 21 May 2015 to 15 June 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/1851</td>
<td>Wymondham Land Behind 1 Cantley Villas Station Road Spooner Row Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr N Binks</td>
<td>Sub-division of site, demolition of outbuildings, erection of 7 dwellings, garages and ancillary works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
**Appeals decisions from 21 May 2015 to 15 June 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>2014/0474</td>
<td>Brooke Land South And East Of Mereside Brooke Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Peter Sabberton</td>
<td>Outline application for residential development (17 dwellings total) and associated works including access.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/9999</td>
<td>Denton Grove Farm Middle Road Denton Norfolk IP20 0AH</td>
<td>Mr Christopher Elliott</td>
<td>Conversion of barn to dwelling</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Declined to accept application</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>