Members of the Development Management Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Mooney</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs A Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acting Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Minshull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr V Thomson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pool of Substitutes

- Mr P Broome
- Mrs V Bell
- Mr L Dale
- Mr J Hornby
- Dr N Legg
- Mr B Riches
- Mr G Wheatley

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 22 July 2015

Time

10.00 am

Place

Colman and Cavell Rooms
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact

Sue Elliott tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

PLEASE NOTE that any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee’s attention.

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 7, and arrive at 1.30pm if you intend to speak on items 8 to 15.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance.

Large print version can be made available.
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 8)

4. Minutes of the Meetings of the Development Management Committee held 3 June and 24 June 2015
   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 29)

To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014/2041/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>49 High Green Brooke</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/2380/F</td>
<td>BIXLEY</td>
<td>Land East of White Horse Lane Trowse</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/0130</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>1A – 1B Farrier Close Wymondham</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/00132</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>1A – 1B Farrier Close Wymondham</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/0436/O</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Land West of Norwich Road Scole</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/0595/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Deal Farm Kenninghall Road Bressingham</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/0707/F</td>
<td>ALPINGTON</td>
<td>Land South of Wheel Road Alpington</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2013/1630/F</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Springwood Spring Lane Hempnall</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/0084/F</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Land to Rear of 133 High Road Wortwell</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/0321/F</td>
<td>BROCKDISH</td>
<td>Land South West of Red Barn Farm Brockdish</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/0582/F</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE</td>
<td>Church of All Saints Hardley Road Chedgrave</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/0712/F</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>Hill Farm Redenhall Road Harleston</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/0901/F</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Land North of Bush Farm Stubbs Green Loddon</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015/0961/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Unit 1-3 78 80 and 82 Dr Torrens Way Costessey</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2015/0385/D</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

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

7. **Enforcement Reports** (attached – page 190)

8. **Other Reports** (attached – page 193)

9. **Planning Appeals (for information)** (attached – page 259)


11. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wed 19 August 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire alarm</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

NO

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

NO

Related pecuniary interest

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

YES

NO

Related pecuniary interest

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

YES

NO

Other Interest

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?

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
203. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interest in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1) 2014/2495/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Thomas</td>
<td>Other interest – member is a Governor of Wymondham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>Other interest – member is a subscribing member of English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2) 2014/2611/O</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>Other interest – member was Chair of Costessey Town Council when this matter was considered but did not take part in vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>Other interest – member is a subscribing member of English Heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
204. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee dated 1 April 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

205. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism. The officers presented applications listed in the report and representatives from Parish/Town Councils and members of the public addressed the Committee on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (Item 1) 2014/2495/O | WYMONDHAM | Cllr R Savage, Town Council  
Ms C Riccardi, Objector  
Mr M Hare, Agent for Applicant |
| (Item 2) 2014/2611/O | EASTON | Mr D Wildon, Marlingford and Colton Parish Council  
Mr P Milliken, Easton Parish Council  
Mr Winch, Objector  
Ms P Singleton, Objector  
Mr I Chism, Objector  
Mr K Cooper, Agent for Applicant  
Ms B Carey, Agent for Applicant  
Cllr M Dewsbury, Local Member |
| (Item 4) 2014/2576/CU | DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL | Mr A Goodman, Parish Council  
Mr E Verner, Objector  
Ms T Knowles, Objector  
Ms J Sprague, Objector  
Mr I Budak, Applicant  
Cllr M Wilby, Local Member |
| (Item 6) 2015/0445/CU | WORTWELL | Mr J Stokes, Applicant  
Mrs S Foulds, Applicant  
Cllr B Spratt, Local Member |
| (Item 7) 2015/0564/O | BRESSINGHAM | Mr S Bye, Applicant |

The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.
206. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

(The meeting closed at 2.50 pm)

____________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

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

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

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

Refused

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2  
| Appl. No | : 2014/2611/O |
| Parish   | : EASTON      |
| Applicants Name | : Easton Landowners Consortium Joint Venture LLP |
| Site Address  | : Land North And South Of Dereham Road Easton Norfolk |
| Proposal     | : The erection of 907 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works. |

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

Approved with conditions

1. Outline time limit
2. Reserved matters to be approved, including location and design of village hall
3. Amended plans
4. Off site highway works – Dereham Road right hand turn
5. Off site highway works – Marlingford Road/Hall Road new spine road
6. Off site highway works – Bawburgh Road new spine road
7. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
8. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway phase T and road narrowing
9. Off site highway works - footway/cycleway and road narrowing phase Z
10. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
11. Submit green infrastructure strategy – wider ecological corridors
12. Landscaping scheme to be agreed
13. Noise mitigation – earth bund as required
14. Submission ecological management plan
15. Contamination reports required
16. Reporting of unexpected contamination
17. Fire hydrants
18. Written scheme of investigation for archaeology
19. Surface water strategy
20. Foul water strategy
21. Minerals and waste safeguarding
22. Requirement for design code
23. Water efficiency
24. Renewable energy - submission of details
25. Standard highway specification – details
26. Future management and maintenance of estate roads
27. Construction worker parking
28. Wheel cleaning facilities
29. Restrict size of retail unit – 300 sq m

Subject to the completion of a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, open space, land for primary school extension, green infrastructure, ecology mitigation and travel plan, and Community Infrastructure Levy.
Updates
Paragraph 4.30 confirms that an update will be provided in respect of the trigger point for delivering off-site highway improvements. No specific updates have been received and therefore the recommended trigger point for delivery of the off-site highway works is to be prior to first occupation of the first dwelling.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>: 2014/1743/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>: BROOKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>: Regency Care Homes Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>: Brooke House Care Home Brooke Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1JH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>: Erection of extension to current dementia unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>: This item was <strong>WITHDRAWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>: 2014/2576/CU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>: DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>: Mr Ismail Budak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>: 9 Rectory Road Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>: Change of use from a Doctor’s surgery to a Fish &amp; Chip shop together with a new ventilation extract outlet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>: Members voted 10-0 for <strong>APPROVAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans
3. Hours of operation: 10am – 10pm Mon-Sat only
4. Retention of existing car parking
5. Installation and retention of internal extraction equipment.
6. Provision of litter bin outside property
5  
Appl. No : 2015/0186/CU  
Parish : ALBURGH  
Applicants Name : Mr Nigel Bond  
Site Address : South Farm Tunbeck Road Alburgh Norfolk IP20 0BS  
Proposal : Change of use from a firewood processing site to the standing of 6 self-storage cargo containers, for general public rental.  
Decision : The item was DEFERRED to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee at the applicant’s request

6  
Appl. No : 2015/0445/CU  
Parish : WORTWELL  
Applicants Name : Mr J Stokes  
Site Address : Waveney Farm Shop High Road Wortwell Norfolk IP20 0EN  
Proposal : Change of use from Farm Shop to Car Sales to include take out of light beverages and refreshments  
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. Amended plans  
3. Car washing of vehicles for sale only  
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and implemented  
5. Restriction on hours for vehicle washing  
6. Parking for staff and customers  
7. Hours of use 8am to 6pm 7 days/week  
8. No on-site cooking of hot food unless agreed  
9. Details of wash water disposal

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

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

Vehicle Wash Down Water – Advisory  
The applicant should ensure that adequate and suitable provision is made for the dirty water disposal from any vehicle washing facilities. Wash down water from vehicle washing facilities is not suitable to be discharged to surface waters and should either drain to a sealed sump and periodically be tankers away or discharged to the foul sewer, subject to consent from Anglian Water.
Applicants Name: Mr S Bye
Site Address: Subdivision Of Garden Of 72 Common Road Bressingham Norfolk
Proposal: Erection of 1no dwelling

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

Refused

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

Updates

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

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

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

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

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

I find it surprising that no mention within the report makes it clear that this application is for a Self-build;
our own M.P forced a private members bill through parliament to encourage Self-build and this authority rushed to accept cash to promote through the Vanguard scheme. The applicant is a builder, it is for his son, it would be on his land it would be a good example of this authority once again leading the way, and yet your officers are advising refusal.
Do the right and honourable thing and vote for approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appl. No</strong></th>
<th><strong>Parish</strong></th>
<th><strong>Application Details</strong></th>
<th><strong>Decision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10  Appl. No  : 2015/0771/H  
Parish     : LONG STRATTON  
Applicants Name  : Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones  
Site Address  : Corfe Lodge  Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA  
Proposal     : Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.  

Decision  : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL  

Approved with conditions  
1  Full permission - three years  
2  In accordance with plans and drawings  
3  Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved  
4  Samples of materials to be approved  
5  Window in west elevation to be obscure glazed  

11  Appl. No  : 2015/0772/LB  
Parish     : LONG STRATTON  
Applicants Name  : Miss Eloise Ellis-Hackett-Jones  
Site Address  : Corfe Lodge  Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2TA  
Proposal     : Proposed two storey rear extension and porch.  

Decision  : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL  

Approved with conditions  
1  Listed building time limit - three years  
2  In accordance with plans and drawings  
3  Details of windows, eaves and gable to be approved  
4  Samples of materials to be approved  

12  Appl. No  : 2015/0848/H  
Parish     : BROOKE  
Applicants Name  : Mr P Hill  
Site Address  : 30 Brecon Road Brooke Norfolk NR15 1HS  
Proposal     : Retrospective planning application for a balcony railing over sun room and outside main bedroom  

Decision  : Members voted 10-0 for REFUSAL  

Refused  
1  Unacceptable design and siting  
2  Detrimental to residential amenity  

Members authorised enforcement to action be taken, subject to legal advice
Applications on land where South Norfolk Council has an interest

13 Appl. No : 2015/0892/F  
Parish : CAISTOR ST EDMUND

Applicants Name : Ms Caroline Davison  
Site Address : Venta Icenorum (Roman Town) Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund  
Norfolk

Proposal : Installation of interpretation scheme panels, to replace existing.

Decision : Members voted 10-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

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

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 24 June 2015 at 10.00 am.

Committee
Members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, L Neal, A Thomas and V Thomson

Apologies: Councillor B Stone

Substitute Members: Councillor N Legg (for B Stone)

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Planning Decisions and Enforcement Team Leader (C Trett) and the Senior Planning Officer (T Lincoln)

Also in Attendance: (Two members of the public were in attendance)

207. CLLR DEREK BLAKE

The Chairman was saddened to report that the Vice Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Derek Blake, had recently passed away. Members stood for one minute’s silence in his memory.

208. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2) 2015/0214/F</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3) 2015/0247/LB</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7) 2015/0973/A</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest Applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8) 2015/1089/A</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Other interest Applicant is South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
209. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism. The officers presented applications listed in the report and representatives from Parish/Town Councils and members of the public addressed the Committee on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6) 2015/0827/O</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Mr G Smith, on behalf of Applicant Cllr D Bills, Local Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.

210. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

(The meeting closed at 11.37am)

_________________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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.  
Decision : This item was deferred to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.

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  
Decision : Members voted 9-1 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to:  

Approve with conditions  
1. Full planning permission  
2. In accord with submitted details  
3. Archaeological work to be agreed  
4. Landscaping  
(subject to receipt of amended plans detailing roof terrace)

Updates  
Recommend Approval subject to receipt of amended plans to delete roof terrace but retain fire escape (to avoid loss of privacy for neighbours)  
Resident’s concerns:  
- Loss of public facility (1 letter)  
- Concern about traffic and safety of access  
- Query extent of parking available  
- Concern about overlooking from flat roof balcony  
Comments on hours of use and unwelcome Saturday opening
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  
Decision: Members voted 10-0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to:  

- Approve with conditions  
  1. Listed Building Time Limit  
  2. In accord with submitted drawings  
  3. External materials  
  4. Joinery details  
  5. External joinery finishes  
   (subject to receipt of amended plans detailing roof terrace)  

**Updates**  
Recommend Approval subject to receipt of amended plans to delete roof terrace but retain fire escape (to avoid loss of privacy for neighbours)  
Resident’s concerns:  
- Loss of public facility (1 letter)  
- Concern about traffic and safety of access  
- Query extent of parking available  
- Concern about overlooking from flat roof balcony  
Comments on hours of use and unwelcome Saturday opening  

---  

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  
Decision: Members voted 10-0 to **APPROVE**  

- Approved 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Mr Richard Buck</td>
<td>Grange Farm Lundy Green Hempnall Norfolk NR15 2NX</td>
<td>100kWp Solar PV array.</td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 to APPROVE Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Full planning permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 In accordance with submitted plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hours of pile-driving: 8am–6pm on Mon-Fri and 8am–1pm on Sat only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Protected species mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Removal of panels if no longer required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Mr G Martin</td>
<td>Land West Of Myrtle Cottage Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>Sub-division of residential curtilage and erection of detached dwelling and garage.</td>
<td>Members voted 6-3 (with one abstention) to REFUSE Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Conflict with ENV8 – development in the open countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Harm to character and appearance of the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Mrs Renata Garfoot (South Norfolk Council)</td>
<td>Land North Of Shotsesham Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>Display of advertisements to include main development board, entrance direction boards, show home external sign, visitors car parking, external sales office sign, flag poles</td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to: Approve with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 Standard advert conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Removal of signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 In accord with submitted drawings (subject to no objections being received to A frame sign)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Updates**
The application has been amended to delete a hanging sign that was proposed to the front of the garage (temporary office) and instead to be replaced with a free standing A frame sign that will be placed outside daily. As such the application has been subject to a 14 day re-consultation which will expire on 30th June. The recommendation is therefore amended to instead delegate authority to approve subject to no new objections from consultees or residents in respect of the A frame sign.

8  Appliance 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.  

Decision : Members voted 7-1 (with two abstention) to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to:

1. Approve with conditions
2. 1 – 5 Standard advert conditions
3. 6 In accord with submitted drawings
4. 7 Removal of signs
   (Subject to no new objections to the amended plans in respect of the additional section of hoarding).

**Updates**
The Highway Authority has confirmed no objection to the amended plans.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No :** 2014/2041/F  
   **Parish :** BROOKE

   **Applicants Name :** Mr Anthony Spurgeon  
   **Site Address :** 49 High Green Brooke Norwich NR15 1JA  
   **Proposal :** Demolition of piggery buildings and erection of 13 dwellings, extension and alterations to 49 High Green, alterations to 49a High Green and replacement outbuilding serving 49 and 49a High Green.

   **Recommendation :** Approval with conditions  
   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. In accordance with amendments  
   3. External materials to be agreed  
   4. Standard Estate Road - Details of roads  
   5. Standard Estate Road - management  
   6. Standard Estate Road - implement design  
   7. Standard Estate Road - timing of work  
   8. Visibility splay dimension in condition  
   9. Construction Traffic (Parking)  
   10. Wheel Cleaning Facilities  
   11. Restrict garage to ancillary use  
   12. Surface Water  
   13. European Protected Species Licence reqd  
   15. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
   16. Water efficiency  
   17. Renewable Energy - Decentralised source  
   18. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
   19. Retention trees and hedges  
   20. Tree protection  
   21. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
   22. Scheme to ensure ditch is not affected

   Subject to securing S106 for affordable housing

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
   NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   Policy 15: Service Villages
   Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
   ENV 14: Habitat protection
   ENV 15: Species protection
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 5: Streetscape
   IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
   TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
   TRA 17: Off site road improvements
   TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to
   the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage.
   Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Autumn 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
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM3.1 Housing Quality
   DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
   DM3.9 Design Principles
   DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
   DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
   DM4.1 Building Fabric Energy Efficiency, Carbon Compliance and Allowable Solutions
   DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
   DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
   DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
   DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
   DM4.11 Heritage Assets
1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
BKE2 Land at High Green Farm
The site comprises a former farm and is characterised by a number of redundant agricultural structures. There is also the former farmhouse which remains in residential use. Land amounting to some 0.92 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. The allocation could accommodate approximately 8 dwellings.
The developer of the site is required to ensure the following:
- all former agricultural structures (other than the farmhouse) should be removed prior to the commencement of works on any of the new dwellings.
- Local highways improvements and the provision of safe access.

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Consultations

2.1 Parish Council
Object - Whilst the site is the preferred development site in the proposed site allocations it was only proposed for 8 dwellings, not the 16 proposed which would be an over development of the site.

2.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

2.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
Have capacity for waste water and sewage and raise no objection.

2.4 SNC Design Officer
Supports the scheme as amended – BFL 7 Greens, 3 Ambers
Comments summarised:
The design principles for the proposal have been developed out of a desire to provide a scheme that responds to Brooke’s rural character by proposing traditional building forms and detailing. Where materials and details are used to reflect traditional detailing, then materials should be carefully selected to ensure they relate well to the articulation of the building and are durable and high quality. The materials palette should be conditioned in this respect. In terms of layout, whilst the principle of a cul-de-sac is acceptable, it is felt that the turning head at the end of the site struggles to create a distinctive space with a clear purpose other than to serve a highways requirement. Amendments to the layout have since helped to better define this space by repositioning buildings around the square to create a stronger feeling of enclosure.
The layout has been informed by the retention of most existing landscape features within the site boundary, including hedgerows and trees along the boundaries. The scheme has responded positively to the existing cottages on the site by integrating them into the overall development.
Information has been provided that shows how consideration has been given to the enclosure of spaces formed by buildings to help define and enhance streets and spaces. The layout shows how buildings could be orientated to compliment the layout of the site by turning corners and creating attractive focal points.

The development proposals recognise the need for car parking that will provide spaces in-curtilage and in direct relationship to the property they serve. However, the relatively high density of units along the principle access into the site, results in a high volume of parking bays in front of dwellings that dominate the street scene. Additional landscaping has been introduced along the access drive up to the first bend to try and ‘green’ the entrance, although it is still felt that parking dominates the street in this location.

2.5 Ecologist
No objection subject to conditions

2.6 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)
No objection subject to conditions in respect of contamination

2.7 NCC Highways
Original comments
Holding objection for the following reasons:

Comments on amended plans:
Whilst the amended drawings address the majority of the concerns raised in my letter of 18 November 2014 suitable pedestrian crossing points will need to be provided between the new and existing footway on High Green to enable safe pedestrian access between the site and local services. The Highway Authority is willing to address this at the detailed design stage and accordingly hereby withdraws the holding objection. Conditions required include details of management and maintenance of the streets; detailed plans of the roads and footways; construction in accordance with highway technical specification and timing of works; visibility splay to be provided; scheme for on-site parking of construction workers; details of wheel cleaning facilities during construction.

2.8 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
No objection - The amended scheme of 13 dwellings proposes 4 affordable homes. The number and mix are acceptable and accord with JCS policy 4. Tenure is to be agreed through the S106.

2.9 SNC Environmental Waste Strategy
No comments received

2.10 Flood Defence Officer
No objection subject to conditions

2.11 Environment Agency
No comments to make, the permeable area will be significantly reduced to below 1Ha. There are no other constraints. Anglian Water should confirm there is sewage capacity.

2.12 SNC Conservation Officer
No objection subject to the following key comment: The character of the conservation area is very much influenced by trees and hedges and I would ask that the scheme should emphasise this green approach in the boundaries and open spaces.
### Development Management Committee

**2.13 SNC Landscape Officer**

Comments on original plans:
- Further information on tree constraints needs to be submitted.
- Consideration of anticipated growth in relation to the location of the access and housing needs consideration.

Comments on amended plans and AIA are awaited.

### 2.14 Historic Environment Service

No objection. The proposal does not have any implications for the historic environment and no recommendations for archaeological work are required.

### 2.15 Police and Community Architectural Liaison Officer

Suggestions made for the design and layout should the applicant wish to achieve the secured by design award which is a voluntary scheme.

### 2.16 Other Representations

9 letters of objection on original plans (summarised):
- 43 and 45 High Green have run off into a deep drainage ditch on the northern boundary of the development and this would be at risk
- Concern number of dwellings as there is already issues with foul water sewer capacity
- Poor drainage area
- loss of privacy
- impact on Conservation Area
- Noise and light nuisance from the proposed dwellings.
- 45 High Green is Grade II Listed
- Unacceptable impact on traffic, poor access and traffic impacts
- Junction with High Green would be inadequate for the proposed number of dwellings- poor visibility
- Over-development of the site and significant increase in the number of dwellings proposed in the site allocation which is for 8.
- As a service village we are required to build between 10-20 homes. 12 are already accounted for in Brooke and so Brooke has already met its obligation with no further developments required for the village.
- The village is not part of the Norwich Policy area and this size of development is not therefore required
- Land which is not included in the area of the site allocation is being proposed as garden for the existing 49/49a. There is concern that land further to the south i.e. adjacent to the rea of 53 High Green would be later developed.
- Rear boundaries to plots 14 and 15 should be hedging.
- Poor design – access road is very close to 49/49a
- An access is reserved between plots 14 and 15 – this should be stopped up to avoid further development of the land to the rear
- The proposed workshop and tool shed adjoining 49 High Green should be restricted to ancillary residential.
- Designs are lacking in detail – no details of materials have been submitted and this should be conditioned
- Proposal is large scale development more suited to an urban environment.
- Loss of view of fields and this will be exacerbated by the proposed 16 dwellings
- The land should be used for agriculture
- Existing hedging along the road is in third party ownership and will not be consented to cut back if required for visibility.
There is no need for the allocation given an oversupply of housing provision with the Rural policy Area of the district
Adverse landscape impact
The shape of the allocation site should be re-considered as unnaturally extends the built form into the countryside.
The development is urban in character and inappropriate for a small village
The nature and size of the access road will further reinforce the urban nature of the design and layout
Comprehensive screening of the northern/eastern boundaries should be undertaken.
The FF window on the northern elevation of plot 6 should be obscure
Restrictions should be placed to form any alterations or alter windows on the north elevation of plot 6.
Would the development meet the governments proposed green targets for the use of hydrocarbon (oil) possibly being used to heat these properties.

One letter of comment on the original plans with the following comments:

Agree building permission in principle subject to two requirements: 1 – Surface water drainage needs to be adequate; 2 – checks must be made that there is sewerage capacity.

One letter of support on original plans:

My property is adjacent to access road so well qualified to comment. The development should be welcomed as it will improve a very run down area which includes the existing farm buildings.
The proposal may be in excess of the original plan but it is really the potential extra traffic flow that may be an issue.
The suggestion by the highways authority of putting in a ramp close to the junction with High Green would seem to make matters worse due to the noise of traffic rumbling over it. A 20mph speed limit would be just as effective and much less intrusive to close neighbours.

Objection on amended plans –

All original objections stand
Brooke is not part of the GNDP and therefore this size of development is not needed nor required in a small conservation village. There already are 12 new homes being built at this time in Brooke. A further 13 dwellings would be excessive. This is demonstrated in the way that the proposed dwellings are not suited to the size of the plots proposed and are more suited to an urban location.
Heavy clay soil so drainage issues
As a service village Brooke would only require 10-20 new dwellings. 12 are already being built therefore already meeting the requirements of a service village. It is my understanding that this site has been given an allocation of 8 dwellings in the past, doubling this allocation is not suited to this area.
Overdevelopment
Speeding is already a problem on this road and this will exacerbate these problems
Overlooking
• Loss of view
• Impact on Conservation Area
• There are known Bats roosting in the sheds which should be protected.
• The number of dwellings is significantly more than that agreed in the outline plan for that site
• It takes the total number of new dwellings in Brooke significantly higher than that needed to meet the requirement for Brooke
• The matter of access from High Green has not been reconsidered
• Concern with location of ramp on access and potential noise and disturbance – would want this to be a smooth surface and ideally set further back into the site
• the proposed development of 13 new dwellings would result in 60% more dwellings than the original number planned for this site, and 25% more than the total number of new dwellings proposed for Brooke
• if consent granted the rear boundary of plot 13 should be a hedge not a chain link fence
• the layout of plots 5 and 13 includes a large gap between the two houses - this is unsatisfactory as it allows the possibility of access being created to the rear agricultural land in the future, which would be inappropriate for two reasons: 1. it could enable further residential development on the agricultural land at the rear; 2. it would provide access to agricultural land via a residential estate road
• Concerns that the proposed new residential use will encroach onto includes part of the agricultural field at the rear of 49/49a High Green
• Concern that some of the proposed landscape planting will affect an existing drainage ditch on the site

3 **Assessment**

The site and proposal

3.1 The application site lies on the eastern side of High Green and is located in the western side of Brooke. The whole site (approx. 0.92 Hectares) forms the proposed site allocation for Brooke known as BKE2

3.2 The site comprises a former farm and is characterised by a number of redundant agricultural buildings. There is also the former farmhouse which is in residential use. The application is a full application and proposes the erection of 13 dwellings together with the extension of the dwellings already on the site

3.3 A single point of access is proposed on to High Green to serve the development.

3.4 The application has been amended to address the Highway Authority’s requirements regarding visibility splays and technical highway details, to amend the layout of the development to ensure better enclosure of the street and the courtyard area and additional information in respect of the landscaping and impact on existing trees.

3.5 Key issues for consideration are the principle of the development; acceptability of extending the existing dwellings on the site; highways and parking; drainage; landscaping; layout, appearance and scale; heritage assets; residential amenity; affordable housing; ecology; contamination; sustainable construction and renewable energy

Principle of the development
3.6 The site is located outside the current development boundary in an area of open countryside as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, the application is consequently contrary to saved local plan policy ENV8. The proposal should therefore be refused unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise. The following material considerations need to be taken into account in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) in which Brooke is defined as a Service Village makes provision for small scale housing growth for between 10-20 houses subject to form and character considerations.
- The Local Plan Site Specifics Allocation document allocates this 0.92 Ha site as suitable to accommodate approx. 8 dwellings. The Inspector during the recent examination of this plan raised no soundness objections to this proposed allocation and there are no modifications proposed to the allocation.

Therefore whilst the site is not formally allocated until the Council receives the Inspector’s binding report, given the advanced stage of the examination and that no concerns were raised by the Inspector, nor is it subject to any proposed modifications, it is considered that this emerging policy therefore carries significant weight as a material consideration.

3.7 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. In this case there are no outstanding objections to the site and there were no issues raised during the examination or by the Inspector. Therefore whilst the Inspectors report is not due until Autumn 2015, it is considered that consent on this site could be released prior to the Inspectors binding report. Accordingly the principle to develop the site for housing is established subject to compliance with other development plan policies.

3.8 In respect of the number of dwellings proposed on the site, consideration needs to be had as to whether allowing a number greater than the allocated ‘approximately 8’ is acceptable.

3.9 The application site includes the whole area of land allocated for residential development by Policy BKE2 of the emerging site allocations policy.

3.10 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Brooke as a Service village in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth in the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2026, within the range of 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

3.11 Two residential allocations in Brooke are therefore proposed to respond to the growth identified in Policy 15. Allocation BKE1 on land at Norwich Road allocates approx. 12 dwellings and allocation BKE2 on land at High Green Farm subject to this application allocated approx. 8 dwellings, and acknowledged the existing farmhouse would be retained.

3.12 Whilst the proposal for 13 new dwellings and the retention of the two existing on site which form the farmhouse, on BKE2 would exceed the proposed 8 dwellings and the overall 20 allocated for Brooke in total, the numbers for BKE2 were approximate and the acceptability of more dwellings on the site than was envisaged needs to be assessed against its impacts on the form and character of the area in addition to servicing constraints.

3.13 Given the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need to maximise housing delivery on allocated sites as identified in para 58 of the NPPF, and that as set out in the paragraphs below that this development would not be detrimental to the form and character of the area, would have an acceptable density of approx. 16 dph, and would (as exceeds 10 dwellings threshold) deliver 4 affordable homes, it is not considered that allowing a greater number of dwellings than the envisaged 8 in the allocations policy would cause any harm to form and character of the area nor undermine the overall growth strategy in the district, and the proposal is on balance therefore considered acceptable in terms of number.
Extensions to 49/49a and new garages

3.14 The existing dwellings on the site (49 and 49a) are to be retained. There was a clear expectation that this would be the case with the site allocation which makes specific reference to all buildings on the site (except for the farmhouse) to be demolished prior to the commencement of works for the dwellings.

3.15 An existing flat roof front extension is to be demolished to make way for the new access into the site and a new two storey extension proposed to the rear of 49. In addition a single storey garage building which proposes a garage and a workshop for each of those dwellings would be erected to the east of the existing dwellings.

3.16 In respect of the design of the proposed two storey rear extension, the design, scale and materials are considered acceptable for the host dwelling and would in fact improve its appearance by removing the existing flat roof two storey front extension.

3.17 The proposed garage/workshop building is of a suitable height, bulk and scale and would sit comfortably within the streetscene. Subject to the submission of materials and a condition restricting its use to ancillary to the residential use of the dwellings it is acceptable.

3.18 In respect of amenity of the two storey projecting extension on the rear of existing 49 High green – objection has been raised by the introduction of a first floor window on the rear elevation to serve a bedroom and the overlooking this would introduce. In the opinion of Officers the oblique angle to 51 and screening would ensure no significantly adverse loss of privacy would result. All other properties are of sufficient distance and screened by boundary screening to ensure no adverse loss of privacy.

Highways and parking

3.19 Saved policy IMP8 requires the safe and free flow of traffic, ensuring highway safety is maintained and the free flow of traffic on the highway network. Saved policy TRA1 also requires the provision of pedestrian links to ensure the connection of new development to existing services.

3.20 A single point of access is proposed on to High Green to serve the development

3.21 Amended plans have been submitted to address the technical design amendments required by the Highway Authority. Based on these amended plans the Highway Authority indicate they have no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions which include details of management and maintenance of the streets; detailed plans of the roads and footways; construction in accordance with highway technical specification and timing of works; visibility splay to be provided; scheme for on-site parking of construction workers; details of wheel cleaning facilities during construction and details of safe pedestrian access between the site and local services.

3.22 Concern has been raised locally as to the impact of the number of dwellings proposed on the junction with Norwich Road, in addition to the added pressure on the road which already has a large numbers of cars parked in the area of the access. The Highway Authority has however raised no objection to the number of dwellings proposed in relation to the safe and free flow of traffic.

3.23 Dropped kerbs will be included to facilitate safe crossing from the development to the northern side of High Green.

3.24 The proposal is therefore, subject to the imposition of conditions, considered to provide safe access and ensure the free flow of traffic and provides appropriate pedestrian links and safe crossing towards the village, in accordance with policies IMP8 and TRA1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
Drainage

3.25 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is low risk probability and as such the key issue for this site is the means of surface water drainage. The surface water from the development is proposed to be addressed by the use of soakaways. Both the Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Officer have confirmed that this approach is acceptable subject to a condition for a detailed surface water scheme to be agreed prior to the commencement of development including further infiltration testing and design.

3.26 Concern has been raised by local residents regarding the impact of the development on an existing drainage ditch which runs along the northern boundary of the site. No details have been submitted with the application in this respect. The drainage for the proposed development is to drain to soakaways, based on a scheme to be agreed by condition, and this will be required to ensure that the development does not increase flood risk off site. A condition is deemed appropriate to require submission of details of the ditch in relation to the proposed boundary planting to ensure that this does not affect the integrity of the ditch to serve its drainage function.

3.27 In respect of Foul Water, Anglian Water has confirmed there is capacity to accommodate the development.

3.28 Subject to the imposition of conditions as set out above the proposal is therefore considered acceptable and accords with policy 1 of the JCS.

Landscaping

3.29 SNLP Policy IMP2 and emerging DM policies DM4.9 and DM4.10 have regard to landscaping and trees.

3.30 The scheme proposes the retention of existing trees on site which are largely located along the northern boundary of the site. Additional native hedge planting with trees interspersed are proposed around the field edge of the development to ensure that it provides and appropriate landscape setting to the village and the Conservation Area.

3.31 In terms of within the site, further planting is proposed at the entrance of the development to ensure this responds to the green character of the Conservation Area.

3.32 A boundary treatment plan has been submitted which details some further hedge planting within the site but also some wire mesh fencing. Officers consider that more appropriate boundary treatments in these areas need to be sought and this will be secured by condition.

3.33 The Council’s Landscape Officer, whilst confirming no objection to the scheme, had asked for further information in respect of impacts on the existing trees on the site particularly in relation to the proposed access running alongside the trees and the siting of plot 6. Additional information has been submitted to demonstrate how any impacts have been mitigated. Subject to no objection from the Council’s Landscape Officer, whose comments are awaited at the time of this report, the scheme is considered acceptable. Members will be updated at committee in this respect.

3.34 Therefore subject to conditions and no objection from the Landscape Officer in respect of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), it is considered that the proposals are acceptable from a landscape perspective.

Layout, appearance and scale

3.35 Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF requires all development to achieve good design.

3.36 The scheme has been amended in response to officer comments.
The design principles for the proposal have been developed out of a desire to provide a scheme that responds to Brooke’s rural character by proposing traditional building forms and detailing.

The entrance of the development has a relatively higher density with semi-detached dwellings which sit adjacent to the existing farmhouse building. This then opens out in the rest of the development to larger detached properties in large spacious plots which terminates in an open square which is well enclosed and framed by the position of the dwellings around it. Buildings are located close to the road on the main route into the site to ensure rural character of buildings against roads is achieved.

Materials and details are used to reflect traditional detailing, and as such materials will need to be carefully selected to ensure they relate well to the articulation of the building and are durable and high quality. A condition is considered therefore necessary to agree the materials palette.

In terms of layout, whilst the principle of a cul-de-sac is acceptable, it was felt that the turning head at the end of the site struggled to create a distinctive space with a clear purpose other than to serve a highways requirement. Amendments to the layout have helped to better define this space by repositioning buildings around the square to create a stronger feeling of enclosure.

The development proposals recognise the need for car parking that will provide spaces in direct relationship to the property they serve. Amendments have been made to the entrance of the development where the relatively high density of units along the principle access into the site, results in a high volume of parking bays in front of dwellings. Additional landscaping has been introduced along the access drive up to the first bend to try and 'green' the entrance, on balance this is therefore acceptable.

The overall density of the site at approximately 16 dwellings per hectare is considered suitable for its context at the edge of village location. The higher density properties are located within the heart of the development and the lower density to the edge which is appropriate.

Overall, the scheme as amended responds well to the shape and context of the site with a locally inspired rural character that relates positively to its surroundings and Brooke. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Heritage assets

The impact of the development on the conservation area requires consideration under saved policy IMP18 of the Local Plan. The NPPF Section 12 also requires the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset to be considered.

The Council’s Conservation Officer has confirmed subject to the greening of the entrance to the site to reflect that of the green character of the Conservation Area, that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Furthermore as the scheme would result in the demolition of the existing redundant agricultural buildings and large areas of hardstanding within the Conservation Area, it is considered that this in addition to the redevelopment of the site with an appropriate layout, design and scale and appropriate landscape planting to the edge to provide a good green landscape edge to the Conservation Area, will in fact result in an enhancement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would accord with policy IMP18.

In addition to the Development Plan policies, S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
3.48 In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, that the proposal would not adversely harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity

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

3.50 Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties largely relate to those properties which are immediately adjacent to the north and west of the site.

3.51 In respect of privacy, all dwellings proposed are two storey, however they are of a sufficient distance away from existing residential properties to the west with sufficient intervening landscape planting to ensure that there would be no adverse loss of privacy as a result of the dwellings proposed.

3.52 To the north again given the distance and oblique angles and existing boundary screening of trees, it is not considered that the proposed two storey dwellings would result in any direct window-window overlooking. Furthermore in respect of loss of privacy of private garden areas, there are existing trees along the northern boundary and a native hedgerow proposed along part of its length. It is considered that subject to a condition requiring gapping up with hedging along the remainder of the northern boundary, no significantly adverse loss of privacy would result.

3.53 Concern has been raised in regards to the potential impact of noise of the proposed ramp which is set approx.10m back into the site entrance along the access road, were this to be brick paved. Whilst the design of the access road and the ramp is yet to be detailed, as this would be completed as part of the technical design approval with the Highway Authority, the Highway Authority has confirmed that this would likely be an asphalt surface. Officers consider that this would be a reasonable solution and given the relatively low speeds likely along this access drive serving a limited number of dwellings, that there would be no undue impact on the neighbouring properties in this respect.

3.54 Concern has been raised regarding the suitability of some of the boundary treatments proposed in respect of the poor level of screening they offer and their suitability at the edge of the village. Some of these are chain link fencing on timber posts to the rear boundaries. Officers consider that the chain link fence would not be a suitable solution and precise details of more suitable boundary treatments in this respect will be secured by condition.

Affordable housing

3.55 JCS Policy 4 requires 30% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. The application as amended proposes 4 affordable dwellings in accordance with the policy. The Council’s Strategic Housing Officer has confirmed that the proposed mix is acceptable. Subject to a S106 to secure the affordable housing the proposal would accord with policy 4 of the JCS.

Protected species

3.56 The application is supported by an ecological survey which indicates that ecological impacts of the site primarily relate to the presence of roosting bats and the possible presence of herpetofauna (reptiles and amphibians).

3.57 The Council’s Ecologist has confirmed that the barns are used by bats and there is a possibility of reptiles and amphibians being present on site. Subject to a conditions in respect of the need for an EPC licence, completing of works in accordance with ecology report recommendations and mitigation in line with the submitted report there is no objection to the proposal.
It is therefore considered that subject to condition that the proposal would result in no adverse impact on protected species or habitats and would accord with policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the SNLP.

Contamination

Saved Local Plan policy UTL15 has regard to development and contamination. Subject to a condition requiring a full contamination survey and risk assessment to be submitted together with associated remediation strategy and a note to advise the applicants of their legal requirements in respect of any asbestos, the Council’s Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed no objection in this respect.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of the building, the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

An Environmental Impact Assessment screening has been undertaken as part of this application. This concluded that there would not be significant impacts to require a full Environmental Statement to accompany the application. All other matters raised are addressed in this report.

S106 and CIL

The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted.

Also, a S106 would be completed to cover the affordable housing requirements.

Financial considerations

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.

Conclusion

Given the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need to maximise housing delivery, that this development would not be detrimental to the form and character of the area, would have an acceptable density of approx. 16 dwellings per hectare, and would (as exceeds 10 dwellings threshold) deliver 4 affordable homes, it is not considered that allowing a greater number of dwellings than the envisaged 8 in the allocations policy would cause any harm to form and character of the area nor undermine the overall growth strategy in the district, and the proposal is on balance therefore considered acceptable in principle.

It is evident that the scheme has due regard to reducing the impact on the local landscape, conservation area, residential amenity, highway safety and the free flow of traffic, surface water drainage and ecology and the impacts of the development in these respects are acceptable or can be made acceptable through the imposition of conditions.

On balance therefore and subject to the conditions as set out and securing a S106 for affordable housing, it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in planning terms and is therefore recommended for approval.
Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2014/2380/F  
**Parish**: BIXLEY  
**Applicants Name**: IGP Solar Plant Number 5 Limited  
**Site Address**: Land East Of White Horse Lane Trowse Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Development of a ground mounted solar farm including associated infrastructure which includes inverters and transformers and a substation.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Temporary permission for 25 years removal of all equipment from site before expiry of time period. Not less than 12 months prior to the expiry or within 3 months of the cessation of electricity production a decommissioning plan shall be submitted. Decommissioning shall be in accordance with a decommissioning statement.

2. In accordance with plans

3. Construction traffic management plan

4. Visibility splay dimension in condition

5. New access – construction details and specifications

6. Construction Traffic (Parking)

7. Traffic Regulation Orders

8. Private Access Road – details of upgrade

9. Measures to protect and enhance the Scheduled Ancient Monument

10. Archaeological work to be agreed

11. Ecology Mitigation

12. Submission of Construction Environment Management Plan

13. Surface Water Noise control management plan

14. Dust control management plan

15. Restrict hours of construction

16. No loud speakers or warning devices

17. Landscaping scheme to be submitted

18. Landscaping management plan

19. Replacement of dead or defective landscaping within 25 year time period.

20. Retention trees and hedges

21. Tree protection

22. No external lighting unless agreed

23. Details CCTV to be agreed including colour finish of poles

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 historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
**Policy 1**: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
**Policy 2**: Promoting good design  
**Policy 3**: Energy and water  
**Policy 17**: Small rural communities and the countryside
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)
EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Autumn 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
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.7 Landscape Setting of Norwich
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide

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

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”
2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2014/2002**  
Screening Opinion for a proposed solar farm  
Environmental Impact Assessment Required

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Bixley Parish Council**  
Refuse  
- Verbal promise that construction traffic would go via access gate/track on Stoke Road but plans show it going via White Horse Lane.  
- Causing disturbance to residents  
- All surrounding roads are narrow with no or few footpaths and already busy with traffic  
- Construction traffic needs to be limited to off peak times  
- Geophysical survey reports significant archaeological activity question whether further investigation is required or at least that construction is carried out in such a way that it would not disturb existing archaeological features  
- Ecologist considers that further work is required red kites hunt on the site and oyster catchers nest on the site  
- Condition if granted  
- Planted should be done to mitigate the impact on residents of White Horse Lane  
- The development being restricted to the most easterly limit and siting the substation further east  
- Further investigation is needed into any possible remaining rights of way alongside White Horse Lane and connecting what is now the northern end of Boudicca's Way with paths on the south side of the southern bypass

3.2 **Poringland Parish Council**  
Object  
Comments on original scheme (summarised)  
- Highway safety  
- Concerns regarding the ability of the B1332 to take increased activity to the Fiveways roundabout in Poringland/Framingham Earl as traffic is already heavy due to the schools, shops, ongoing development in the villages, as well as commuter traffic travelling to and from Norwich  
- questions whether the village of Stoke Holy Cross is appropriate to take that volume and type of traffic, and whether the junction at the bottom of the hill is suitable for a right hand turn with the types of loads that the vehicles will have  
- effect on buses on these routes  
- would want conditions to restrict times for deliveries

Comments on amended scheme (summarised):  
- Objects to the amended proposals regarding access to the site which suggest that the farm track can be used.  
- The junction is unsuitable and dangerous when making a right hand turn from the north, and an approach from the south would result in the same issues that already exist in the original proposals in respect of vehicular movements through the village.
The short section though Arminghall Lane is unsuitable for heavy or large vehicles even for half a kilometre as it is narrow and will affect the environmental and residential amenity of those living in that area.

Articulated vehicles are likely to break up the roadway when turning right into the farm track, and the gradient of the existing access means that a significant amount of levelling would need to take place to prevent low-loaders grounding out.

The track passes over an embankment, and it is unclear whether this is suitable for the volume of lorries of considerable weight that would be passing over it during the construction phase.

3.3 Caistor St Edmund Parish Council

Object

Comments on original scheme (summarised):
- The majority of the suggested construction traffic route does not meet the NCC standard of 5.5m and so will result in damage to verges and pedestrian safety.
- Junction at bottom of Long Lane is dangerous and will be exacerbated by a large number of HGVs
- There are already problems adjacent to the school where two buses cannot pass.

Comments on amended plans:
- Probably the best option for construction traffic but right turns from B1332 into Arminghall Lane and at both points on Stoke Road will be hazardous.

3.4 Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council

Object with the following comments:
- Concerns with the route to the site for HGVs. With weight restrictions and bridge heights around the area we can very easily find our village being used as he access to the site from the B132 to Stoke via Long Lane and Norwich Road
- The site is totally unacceptable. The sloping nature of the site will make the panels visible from many vantage points on the southern bypass, the Trowse bypass and from White Horse Lane and further afield
- The site is outside of the settlement boundary and the natural break between the urban and countryside should be maintained.
- Grave concerns of the traffic route – road network is not suitable.
- If approved restrictions on HGV movements during peak times would need to be applied.

Comments on first amendments:
- Visual impact from three roads around the site and the creation of a semi industrial edge to a picturesque village
- Will be difficult to screen the development from these roads due to the north west facing aspect of the application site.
- NCC Highways have confirmed the access on White Horse Lane is rejected due to poor road width through the village.
- PC considers that Stoke Road access is unsuitable.
- Road widths along traffic route are not sufficient and will cause highway safety and congestion problems.
A traffic management plan should be a condition to control timing of deliveries and a layby to enable lorries to wait.
Suggest that lorry loads could be split to enable access via Lakenham Bridge to be considered.

Comments on final amendments
Maintain objection and original comments with the following additional comments:

- The siting of the solar farm will cause a sever blot on the landscape on rising ground and even with its reduced size will be visible from all surrounding roads.
- The placing of this farm outside the natural boundary between the village and open is undesirable.
- Pleased that should this application be approved that the haul road will be over private land rather than through Stoke Holy Cross or one of the other villages.

3.5 Trowse with Newton Parish Council

Object

Comments on original scheme (summarised)

- Overarching objection – the National Solar Centre sets out that solar farms should avoid affecting landscapes, maintain natural beauty and be predominantly flat, well screened and not cause undue impact. This scheme does not meet these recommendations.
- Overarching objection – see confirmation that the application has been assessed against the EIA regs.
- Overarching objection – adverse effect on Trowse landscape character and cumulative impacts with housing development.
- Overarching objection – concerns that a ‘gift’ of £40K to the primary school will put the PC in an impartial position.
- The construction traffic impact on Trowse with Newton as a thoroughfare will be significant and completely impractical.
- The alterative access point suggested in view of the scale and road construction is also not an option. This alternative access point (Long Lane) is a byway with pinch points with existing issues with bus traffic. There is also no footway from lower to upper Stoke along this road so increased heavy traffic would present a pedestrian safety concern.
- The environmental and amenity impact will be material.
- Seek confirmation that an ecology assessment was undertaken and will be considered as part of the process, in addition to consideration against the NPPF.
- Potential for crime activity – Trowse with Newton is a low crime village and placing large numbers of expensive PV panels in a relatively isolated location without adequate protection will attract criminals. If permission is granted a condition to ensure the proposed CCTV is installed is required.
- Landscape/visual impact – NPPF Para 17 and 109 recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and these should be a firm basis for the application to be rejected.
- Emphasis should be placed on the recent oral statement of Nick Bowles MP planning Minister.
- Adverse impact on landscape character
• All existing vegetation should be retained and maintained.
• Consideration of drainage and flood risk should be had in line with the EA advice.
• Loss of arable land for 25 years
• The land does not constitute low grade agricultural land

Comments on final amendments:
Maintain objection with the following comments
The application should be refused as despite the modifications made Trowse reiterates its previous comments and recommends the use of brownfield sites instead.

3.6 Cllr Neal – Poringland and Farminghams Ward (Adjacent Parish)

Request determination by committee unless officers are minded to refuse. Reasons: concerns over traffic and highways and the scale of the development in the open countryside.

3.7 District Member
Cllr Lewis -

Concerns raised on scheme -
Contrary to policies aimed at protecting landscape character
Highway impact
Construction traffic impacts
Impact on residential amenity
Consideration of the scheduled ancient monument need to be had
Further planting on white horse lane required
Time restrictions on deliveries need to be imposed

Requests call in to committee and comments on the amended scheme:
Note the following improvements –
• The reduction of the total area, reducing visual impact
• The upgrading of planting for screening
• The change of route for construction traffic to a farm track bypassing Arminghall village
• Site access now from the SW end
These all address significant issues (I await NCC Highways appraisal of the construction traffic route now proposed. Can this track physically cope with so many HGV movements?)
I nevertheless remain of the view that the benefits of solar farms generally are here still outweighed by the impact of this proposal on the river valley and A47 landscape zone, to which South Norfolk Council grants added protection.

To be determined by committee
Large scale and conspicuous development on farm land
Contrary to policy ENV3 and ENV6 site would be unavoidably visible from A47 and White Horse Lane
The government has said that it wishes to although I’m not aware of what is actually proposed
Road through Trowse not suitable for HGV use
Effect on properties in White Horse Lane
Schedule Monument is excluded from site would be better protected if it were included within the house
Further hedge planting is required along White Horse Lane
Why is the angle of elevation of the panels far shallower than the optimum 30%.
Comments on original scheme (Trowse routing) - Object
- Deliveries during construction are proposed to go through Trowse which would result in high number of HGV during this period
- Regular and continuous on street parking along The Street, which result in a large and small vehicle being able to pass therefore not considered suitable route as high possibility of highway safety hazards with parked vehicles, the number of pedestrian in the area and the location of the play area.
- Also possible disruption to a regular bus route
- Also environmental issues with the routing of large vehicles through an unsuitable area.
- Alternative solution with vehicles going to the west is required

Comments on second routing scheme (Stoke Holy Cross routing)
- Technical assessment shows this route is safe however route is not designated HGV route
- Whilst generally Long Lane is acceptable for two large vehicles to pass, there are narrow sections
- Concerns with impact on road surface so a construction traffic management plan would be required
- Whilst highway safety may be acceptable, there is a clear potential impact on residential amenity on the route that the LPA will need to take a view on
- The route passes Stoke Holy Cross Primary School and so restricted delivery times would need to be put in place in this respect
- Would suggest a temporary site access on the southern boundary rather than the suggested existing access near the Trowse flyover
- Suggest on environmental/amenity grounds alternative options with one way routing could be considered thus reducing impacts.

Comments on final route proposed (from B1132 Bungay Road along farm track and access on to site from Stoke Road)
- The revised submission now includes for a construction traffic route from the B1332 across to Arminghall Lane using a private track.
- The revised route using the private track is considered as generally fine and is the best solution for the construction traffic that has so far been put forward. Avoiding the construction traffic having to go through the residential areas of either Trowse or Stoke Holy Cross. The proposals include for the improvement to the entrance onto the B1332 and Arminghall Lane. You may wish to consider whether the track is suitable itself for the large delivery vehicles.
- Arminghall Lane is subject a 7.5 tonne weight restriction. This is acknowledged in the revised construction traffic statement. As the weight limit is imposed under a traffic order, a temporary traffic order will need to be applied for by the development company to rescind the weight limit on the section of Arminghall Lane that will be used by construction traffic for the construction period.
• Should the LPA be minded to approve a number of conditions are requested which include the need to submit a construction traffic management plan and access route incorporating provision for addressing abnormal wear and tear of the highway; compliance with the construction management and access plan; provision of visibility splays at the three junctions; upgrading of the three junctions prior to their use; provision of the on-site parking and turning areas; in addition to securing a temporary traffic order for the relevant section of Arminghall Lane.

3.10 Environment Agency

No objection subject to a condition to secure surface water scheme.

• Drainage strategy should demonstrate run off will not be more than an undeveloped site
• Consider using infiltration trenches or swales
• Avoid ground raising in flood zone 2 and 3 and protect equipment
• Notes regarding restrictions on cabling and protection of the water environment

3.11 Natural England

No objection

• Close to The Broads Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Broadland Special Protection Area (SPA)
• Needs to be an assessment on the impact of SPA by LPA
• Raises no issue that the ES concluded on impact on SPA
• No impact on Caistor St Edmund Chalk Pit Site
• Consideration needs to be given to local site, the local landscape character and local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species.
• Have not assessed the impact on protected species
• Need to consider biodiversity enhancements
• Site is not large enough to comment on the loss of BMV agricultural land need to consider in the light of the NPPF

3.12 Ecologist

No objection subject to conditions and the following comments:

• The site has low ecological value with limited semi natural habitat
• Report identifies that the site is likely to be used by commuting and feeding bats with buildings adjacent to the site and trees have the potential for roosting bats.
• Also the possibility that the site could be used by commoner reptiles and great crested newts
• No surveys have taken place so unable to assess the potential impact and suggest mitigation or enhancement
• Suggested used by farmland birds but no surveys skylark territory may be an issue
• Mitigation appears in line with guidance but with no surveys
• Existing semi natural habitat should be retained
• Semi natural habitat need to be protected during construction with Construction Environment Management Plan
• Surveys required for bat use, reptiles and breeding birds can be conditioned
• Habitat Management Plan taking into consideration surveys can be conditioned
3.13 Historic England

Original comments (summarised):
- Site contains schedule monument same monuments includes other sites outside the area.
- Main concern is the impact of the monument within the site but also the setting of the monuments on the adjacent fields.
- Monument within site is under the plough and on the Heritage at risk register.

Our concern here is that the harm, the justification for causing the harm is not clearly stated, and any corresponding benefits to the monument are not clearly presented. We are therefore concerned that the proposal does not provide sufficient heritage gain to offset the harm caused. We therefore consider that the applicant needs to provide further enhancement and additional information in relation to the scheduled monument. This needs to make specific references to the policies in the NPPF in paragraph 132, 134 and 137, in particular the nature of the enhancement and the public benefits. We would like confirmation that the reversion to pasture will be permanent, and we are also seeking confirmation of the details for the on-going management of the monument area during the project and a proposal for its long term maintenance. Specifically who will maintain the site and what will happen to the land at the end of the permission period? We are also looking for confirmation of the interpretation scheme for the site, including location of the information panel and a strategy for intellectual access in relation to the site. We are looking for confirmation of the public access arrangements to the monument and further interpretation on the footpath. We are also looking for a more a detailed plan of the reversion area, showing the monument, the buffer zone, the hedging and fencing, and location of interpretation. This will enable a decision to be made as to whether this is sufficient public benefit to offset the harm to the setting of the monument, as established in the NPPF (paragraph 134).

Comments on amended scheme: no objection subject to conditions and comments (summarised):

We have concluded that this application would be harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset and would consider it appropriate for the LPA to assess the application under the terms of para 134 of the NPPF. We accept that the applicant has made concessions towards offsetting the harm and that these measures would reduce the overall impact on the monument and provide a degree of public benefit through improved access and interpretation. We would therefore be happy for the LPA to determine the application in accordance with your policies provided that the key enhancements to the monument can be secured by appropriately worded conditions.

3.14 SNC Landscape Officer

Object to original scheme:
The submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) has been produced in accordance with recognised guidelines. The LVA provides much useful information; whilst it demonstrates that parts of the site will have limited visual effect from most of the selected viewpoints it is also clear that sections of the proposed scheme will be visible and will result in change to some views of the site. It is also clear that the scheme presents an opportunity to influence the management of the site and could have longer-term benefits.
for example, in terms of hedgerow improvement, but this will take some time to establish and have an effect, and well into the proposed lifetime of this scheme.

The site is predominantly within the Yare Valley Urban Fringe Local Landscape Character Area; the 2001 description of this was reviewed in 2012 and found fit for purpose. The Landscape Strategy for this is to “maintain an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich to provide a ‘green buffer’ between the city and its rural hinterland.”

Following comments on the LVA
- The development on the valley side will be visible from additional locations above those identified by the applicant; viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 12. The proposed planting should eventually screen the views into the site from viewpoint 1, but possibly not for 10 years or longer.
- It will not be possible to fully screen the scheme as presented (see notes above). Where the proposed planting will be able to screen parts of the site, it will not be for many years into the life of the scheme.
- It is not clear as to how the panels follow the contours, which implies that the lines would be across – not down – the slopes. The panels’ rows are seemingly parallel across the whole site, with no variation to reflect the contours’ fluctuations.
- At 3 metres, the proposed and enhanced hedgerows will be taller than many of the hedgerows elsewhere in the Character Area, which in itself arguably reduces the openness of the landscape.
- the proposal will be beneficial ecologically.
- Approach taken to exclude the area of the SAM is supported
- Panels on Field 4 and will be visible too when viewing from the westbound carriageway. The restrictions imposed by the presence of the power lines mean that it is not possible to fully screen the views.
- the proposal appears to be contrary to the identified Sensitivities and Vulnerabilities of the Yare Valley Urban Fringe in that it would increase the perception of the level of development surrounding the valley, which would therefore weaken the current perception that the River Yare is unconnected to a major city; it would be a development that intrudes into the landscape, including views from the Norwich Southern Bypass

Visual assessment
Comments of viewpoint 1 – Junction between Stoke Road and Old Stoke Road
The rise of the valley side is apparent here and as such the panels will be clearly visible until the proposed and restored vegetation matures. The existing hedge along White Horse Lane has been trimmed since the exiting photo was taken, so 1a gives a better indication of the present situation. To the right of the image, at the western end of the site, can be seen the planting associated with the Southern Bypass’s construction; this is approximately 20 years old, so is a good indication of how the proposed planting could look towards the end of the life of this proposed installation. The proposed planting is shown at 10-15 years that is at between two and three fifths through the lifetime of this proposal. The VVM for
viewpoint 1a shows the winter view which will not afford complete screening. It can also be noted that the panels will break across the ridgeline here.

Comments of viewpoint 2 - Boudicca’s Way long distance footpath to the west of the site
It is accepted that the existing substation presents an intrusion, and the proposed panels could be argued to be acceptable in light of this. The VVM illustrates how, whilst being close to the existing electrical infrastructure, the effect is to extend development into the background which in turn would increase the perception of the level of the development.

Comments of viewpoint 3 - Stoke Road Railway Bridge
From this point the proposed array appears as two blocks due to the effect of the existing vegetation. The section nearest the substation is less congruous, however almost reads as a separate entity, quite separate from the existing development. Again, this would increase the perception of the level of the development in the Valley.

Comments of viewpoint 5 - Long John Hill
The channelled distant view from Long John Hill is a rural one. The introduction of panels to this view this would increase the perception of the level of the development in the Valley.

Comments of viewpoint 7 - A146 above the railway bridge
Again the rise of the valley side is apparent in these two views and as such the panels will be clearly visible – some until the proposed planting matures, and others for the lifetime of the installation. The proposed planting is shown at 10-15 years that is at between two and three fifths through the lifetime of this proposal. The VVM for viewpoint 7 shows that the panels in Field 2 might be screened during the summer months, but no image is provided for the winter. There is the potential for the panels to break across the ridgeline here as well.

Comments of viewpoint 12 - Norfolk County Council Building
I have not been to view the site from this viewpoint.

The assertion in section 5.3.7 of the LVA that the development will have “no adverse impacts of the Yare River Valley due to its limited visibility” is debatable as from many of the viewpoints it will be visible. The proposed landscape mitigation will not be fully effective for the initial years of this temporary installation (potential up to 10-15 years) and in some cases mitigation/screening will not be possible at all.

The submitted LVA recognises that “The change in character to the site itself and its immediate context will inevitably be high for the duration of the solar farm’s lifetime, particularly in terms of its appearance, with a moderate-major neutral significance of effect”. (5.6.35) That ‘neutral’ is used here is queried as appendix 5.2 sets how that the general assumption is that visual effects are generally assumed to be adverse.

Further comments:
- There are some significant gaps in the vegetation on white horse lane
- No AIA has been provided
- Need clearer information on what work is proposed to existing hedgerows
3.15 SNC Conservation Officer

No objection with the following comments:
HES and English Heritage can accept the proposal provided the SAM is not physically affected. There are no other heritage assets on the site or next to the boundaries; the nearest are the conservation areas at Old Lakenham and Trowse and listed buildings in those areas which are the other side of the railway and by pass/ A 146 respectively. These major structures mean that while the solar farm will have an impact on the landscape it would not be visible from either of these areas or the listed buildings and as far as I am concerned would not have an impact on their setting as per sections 66(1) and 72 of the 1990 Act.
In respect of Trowse I do not feel the setting of the conservation area could be seen to extend beyond the bypass or the A146. The major impact would be on the landscape and no doubt the Landscape Officer can advise on that issue.

3.16 Historic Environment Service

Support with conditions
- Archaeological desk based assessment and archaeological field evaluation (by magnetometer survey) that show the presence
of a number of heritage assets across the proposed development area.

- Programme of mitigation comprising of combination of avoidance, surface mounted panels and excavation.
- Mitigation is acceptable and needs to be subject to conditions.

3.17 Public Rights Of Way
No comments received

3.18 The Ramblers
No comments received

3.19 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)
No objection – Main issues are noise and dust. Conditions required for a noise and dust management plan, restriction in construction hours

3.20 Highways England
Comments on original scheme:
- Panels will be glimpsed from the A47 because of the low level plating below the overhead cables and pylons
- No hedge is proposed below the overhead lines
- Concern that view from A47 would be glimpsed they are likely to have a greater effect on drivers than something that appears gradually
- particularly concerned given the proximity to the Trowse junction
- Is planting possible below the overhead cables to a sufficient height to obscure panels

Comments on amended scheme:
- I previously had some concern regarding the appearance of the solar farm to A47 east bound drivers as they approach the Trowse off slip.
- Whilst I accept the need to restrict planting and growth below the overhead power lines, I note that the amended landscape drawings now indicate a proposed tree planting belt immediately to the north east of the overhead lines which should, on maturity, soften the appearance of the solar panels beyond it, thus lessening the possible distraction to the driver approaching the A146 off slip. I would expect that any landscape planting will occur early in the programme for this proposal and therefore that it will be established and growing by the time the solar panels are installed such that the view will be softened at the start of panel installation.
- I am aware that this is somewhat a subjective judgement but I confirm that I am content that the amended proposals are sufficient to raise no further objection to the application.
- I therefore have no objection subject to condition restricting panels in the agreed location, and for the area to be planted.

3.21 National Planning Case Unit
No comments received

3.22 Norwich City Council
No Objection
The development site is some 380 m from the Yare Valley Character area and relatively low profile. However, due to the size of the site in conjunction existing development in South Norfolk such as nearby electricity transformer station, such a new development could have a cumulative negative impact on the setting of the Yare Valley.
This could be due to the increasing presence of large scale developments eroding the rural appearance of the valley. It is noted that the electricity transformer station contains significant levels of mature landscaping which helps both screen the site and help it transition into the surrounding woodland of the Yare Valley. It is therefore recommended that officers explore reducing the scale of the development so that significant mature boundary landscaping can be incorporated within the site. Such mitigation would help reduce the impact on the City’s Yare Valley Character Area. It is noted that the development is within a flood zone and a ground source protection area. Although as the site is some 380m from the city boundary, it is unlikely that it would result in any significant harm to city assets or residents.

3.23 SNC Flood Defence Officer

No objection subject to a surface water scheme including swales and wildmeadow planting. Detailed comments (summarised):
- Most of development within flood zone 1
- Potential area for high risk is boundary with White Horse Lane boundary because of the Culvert under the road
- Concur with the Environment Agency recommendation that panels do not follow the contours and that buffer stripes or swales should be provided to intercept over land flows
- Topography show there may be some fall towards White Horse Lane, with swales recommended along this boundary to prevent run off from the site and channel flows to the water course. This may also act as storage should surface water flooding occur or the watercourse over tops.
- Avoid putting panels in the strip of Flood zone 2 or altering the ground levels.
- Confirmation received that the existing crossing point for the water course is unaffected.

3.24 Richard Bacon MP

Comments on original scheme (summarised):
- It is clear from the NCC Highway comments that Trowse simply cannot accommodate safely the necessary movement of Heavy Good Vehicles in order to construct the solar farm.
- Note the sensible rejection of consideration of imposing a temporary traffic order in order to clear White Horse Lane of residential parking.
- Any accesses to the proposed site faces insurmountable issues of inadequate road access and Trowse residents are already being asked to accept a great deal of additional development in their locality
- Given the likely movement of Heavy Goods Vehicles close to Stoke Holy Cross Primary School, great concern that any benefits derived from the renewable energy will be outweighed by the danger posed to safety and free flow of traffic in general and safety of school children in particular.
- Consider that the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy TRA13 (corridors of movement) and also Emerging DM policy 3.12 (road safety and free flow of traffic).

3.25 Cllr Roger Smith
(County Councillor)

Objects with the following comments (summarised):
- Irrespective of the merits of the application form a planning point of view, the access arrangements during the construction period are of great concern locally and in the wider area covered by
the 6+ strategic groups of parishes. Access by any means (except possibly across a field access off the B1332 near the Bixley end of the Trowse bypass), is totally unacceptable and dangerous from the point of view of local residents and road users.

- Should the route via Long Lane, Stoke Holy cross and past the Caistor Roman Town regrettably be perused then the following is essential –
  1. Further public consultation by the applicant to gain goodwill
  2. a firm commitment to keep agreed routing and delivery schedules
  3. police oversight of dangerous situations/disruption
  4. a holding layby in advance of the access route start to marshal delivery vehicles into delivery slots
  5. 24 hour local contact for the public to report problems
  6. a contractor roving traffic/convoy marshal to deal with congestion/road blockages on route
  7. consideration of goodwill payment by the applicant to fund local community projects in recognition of the burden communities will suffer from construction traffic

3.26 Other Representations

12 letters of objection received. Objections on the original scheme on the following grounds (summarised):

- The Trowse with Newton Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan published by SNDC September 2012 states in respect of White Horse Lane ........ The rest of the Conservation Area on this side of the road is still farmland. It is important that it should remain so, in order that the form of the 'model village' is not further 'blurred'.
- It is becoming increasingly apparent that access for hundreds of construction vehicles is also fraught with problems either through Trowse or Stoke Holy Cross.
- This is the wrong location for this large scale solar array.
- Fields opposite residential housing on White Horse Lane should be deleted from the scheme.
- If Trowse Primary School have been offered £40k in compensation from the developer- what about those residents on White Horse Lane who are directly affected?
- Far too close to a village
- This is the only green field lane left near to Trowse
- Adverse visual impact on Trowse and Norwich
- Loss of agricultural land in Trowse
- Access route proposed is unacceptable – number of vehicular movements, proximity to schools and residential properties, parking restrictions to remove cars from White Horse Lane is not workable.
- Concerns of a bribe of £40k to the school.
- If no suitable route is available the application should be refused
- Security concerns
- Trowse has already been negatively affected by 3 separate housing development plans.
- The scale of the solar farm on rolling land will not be able to be hidden by trees or bushes.
• Stoke Holy Cross Primary school raise concerns – HGVs along the traffic route intended would exacerbate existing congestion issues at peak times. Concern regarding pedestrian safety
• We now understand your policy – Lets trash Trowse. Leave what was once a beautiful model village alone
• Topography of the land
• Distance from cultural and historical assets
• Impact on landscape setting and landscape character
• Distance from settlements and residential properties
• Height and scale of the solar farm
• Staff parking for the development – where will this be?
• Concerns of noise impact from the substation on residential properties
• The field opposite Keepers Cottage on White Horse Lane should be deleted from the scheme.
• Given approvals for residential development in Trowse views of locals will be ignored

• Clearly visible from White Horse Lane, Stoke Road, the city, County Hall and A146
• Massive distraction due to typography of the site.
• Visible from dwelling
• distance from schedule moment
• Concern about the implication of the traffic going through Trowse
• Parking during construction
• No evidence to prove the substation will not cause a noise issue
• Site used by birds of prey
• Information submitted misleading visualisation should have been done in winter, no visualisation of keepers cottage
• Have not seen any other solar farms so close to houses or so visible from all directions because of the topography
• main driving force with this application is the length of connection to the grid connection

Objections on the amended scheme on the following grounds (summarised):

• Original objections and concerns still remain.
• Adverse visual impact particularly along White Horse Lane
• Will spoil the rural approach to Trowse and Norwich and will have an urbanising affect.
• Acknowledge the existing significant visual impact of the pylons and substation but this should be no reason to spoil the other side of White Horse Lane.
• The visualisations submitted do not accurately represent the slope of the site moving away from White Horse Lane.
• There are two privately owned properties that will be directly affected. Panels on the field directly opposite these houses on White Horse Lane should be deleted from the scheme.
• Will affect Buzzard and Kites which use the area.
• Access should not be allowed off White Horse Lane. The proposal is that access is from the gate off Stoke Road, so that should be the main access.
4 **Assessment**

The site

4.1 The application site covers an area of approximately hectares 47.37 hectares (117acres) located south west of the village of Trowse. Although only 24.5Ha would be covered by panels and other structures.

4.2 The proposed site comprises six agricultural fields to the southwest of the village of Trowse. The site is bounded by the A146 to the north, A47 to the east, White Horse Lane to the west and Stoke Road to the south. The site sits on the southern side of White Horse Lane and on the opposite side to a substation. There are multiple pylon lines traversing the site from east to west.

4.3 The topography is generally flat with some land rising towards the north east and south east corners of the site.

4.4 The site is bounded by the A47 to the south, the A146 to the north, White Horse Lane to the west and Stoke Road to the south.

4.5 The River Tas is located north west of the site and runs parallel with the mainline railway Norwich to Ipswich/London.

4.6 There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) within the site which is located alongside White Horse Lane and is referred to by English Heritage as “Arminghall, sites discovered by air photographs”.

4.7 There site is not within a conservation area but it does lie in proximity to three separate conservation areas. Further detail of these conservation areas and the listed buildings within them are set out in the heritage section of the report.

The proposal

4.8 The application has been amended to reduce the number of panels, the area covered by the solar panels, to add landscape planting, to add fencing and planting to secure the schedule ancient monument on the site and a new construction access route is proposed.

4.9 The red line of the application, as amended, which includes the access route to the site through the adjacent fields amounts to 49.81 Ha.

4.10 The site area covered by solar panels and other ancillary structures has reduced to 24.5 Ha. The total area of the site that is required including landscaping is 31.1Ha.

4.11 A total of 50,904 solar panels on a metal frame are proposed which would have a power output of 16.79MW (which is equivalent to powering 4701 homes). Each solar panel would measure approx. 1.96m x 0.99m which are mounted landscape orientation arranged in a 6 x 6 panel module. The height of the panels would be a max height of 3m (2.2m – 3m depending on site levels and ground conditions) and would be installed at 15 degrees from the horizontal. The arrays would be laid out in rows running from east to west across the site, with each row being set approx. 6.5m apart.

4.12 The mounting posts for the panels will be pile-driven approximately 1.6m into the ground to avoid the need for mass concrete foundations on the site. One area will need the frames to be mounted on pre-cast concrete anchors where there is a need to avoid ground disturbance due to the archaeological interest of the site.
4.13 A 2m high perimeter fence is proposed (of timber post and wire mesh construction) in addition to 38 CCTV cameras which would be pole mounted at 2.5m high. A total of 9 inverters and transformers in addition to 1 substation (max height 4.4m) are proposed. No floodlighting is proposed.

4.14 Grid connection will be via an existing overhead line pole within the site, this will be carried out under permitted development of the statutory undertaker.

4.15 The application indicates that between each row of cells and on the fringes of the site the land will be seeded with a wildflower mix.

4.16 Access to the solar farm and the construction traffic route has been amended. The original route was proposed through Trowse. This was amended to via Stoke Holy Cross via Long Lane. Both routes raised concern for Norfolk County Council Highways and local residents.

4.17 Access to the development has further been amended and this utilises an existing farm access point from Stoke Road. The construction traffic route now for consideration will be from the B1332 Bungay Road where an existing farm track on its western side is currently accessed. The construction route will follow this farm track through private agricultural land before joining Arminghall Lane. Traffic will follow a short stretch of Arminghall Lane before meeting Stoke Road where the access to the site is an existing farm access on the northern side of the carriageway.

4.18 A temporary construction compound is proposed towards the south east of the site, in close proximity to the proposed access point from Stoke Road.

4.19 The application is submitted with an Environmental Statement under the EIA regulations.

Policy

4.20 National Planning policy framework
In line with the Climate Change Act 2008 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies the Core Planning Principles these include supporting the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate including encouraging the use of renewable resources as well as the need to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

4.21 Paragraphs 93-98 of the NPPF set out the government’s planning policy on renewable energy.

4.22 Paragraph 93 makes it clear that it plays a key role in the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy which is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

4.23 Paragraphs 97 and 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework are supportive of renewable energy subject to the impacts being acceptable; it states “that local planning authorities should recognise all communities should contribute to energy generation from renewable energy or low carbon sources”. It does not require a need to be demonstrated for the energy they propose to generate. It also states that all applications should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise if the impacts are or can be made acceptable.
Planning policy Guidance

4.24 The publication of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in March 2014 gave further guidance on renewable energy and solar farm projects. Paragraph ID: 5-003 states “The National Planning Policy Framework explains that all communities have a responsibility to help increase the use and supply of green energy, but this does not mean that the need for renewable energy automatically overrides environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities. As with other types of development, it is important that the planning concerns of local communities are properly heard in matters that directly affect them.”

4.25 The PPG acknowledges that large scale solar farms can have a negative impact on rural landscapes particularly undulating landscapes, but also acknowledges well planned and well screened sites can have an acceptable impact on the landscape. It identifies a need to use previously developed and non-agricultural land where possible and if a proposal involves greenfield land, whether (i) the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary and poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land; and (ii) the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays.

4.26 The PPG also emphasises that the need for low carbon energy does not override environmental protections and consideration needs to be given to cumulative impacts of renewable energy development, there is also a need to consider local topography, protection of heritage assets, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as amenity.

4.27 Furthermore, the PPG emphasises that the need to address all planning considerations and stresses the need for renewable energy does not override environmental protection and concerns of local people need to be properly heard. It acknowledges well planned and screened solar farms can be acceptable provided the landscape impact can be addressed. It looks to provide solar farms on previously developed land where possible then lower grade agricultural land before higher grade agricultural land.

4.28 Other national guidance/Advice
Solar energy remains a key component of the Government Strategy to produce renewable energy. The Department of Energy and Climate Change Solar PV Strategy Part 1 published in October 2013 sets out 4 guiding principles for solar PV, particularly relevant to planning is principle 3 which states that “solar PV should be appropriately sited with proper weight being given to environmental considerations such as landscape and visual impact.

4.29 The Department of Energy and Climate Change Solar PV Strategy Part 2 April 2014 states that solar energy is the most supported renewable energy, that there is a move towards commercial roof space installations and that it should be well sited and designed. The key principles of solar energy are to appropriately site them, give proper weight to environment considerations such as landscape and visual impact, heritage and local amenity and provide opportunities for local communities to influence decisions that affect them and gain some community benefit.

4.30 In an oral Statement to House of Commons Planning Minister Nick Bowles stated that “the policies in the national planning policy framework are clear that there is no excuse for putting solar farms in the wrong places. The framework is clear that applications for renewable energy development, such as solar farms, should be approved only if the impact on the landscape – the visual and the cumulative impact – is or can be made acceptable. This is a very high test”.
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Local Policy

4.31 At a local level policy ULT13 in the South Norfolk Local Plan deals with renewable energy. This policy is generally consistent with the NPPF, but it does not provide a positive strategy and support for community led schemes as promoted by the NPPF. The key planning considerations relevant to the proposal include visual impact, pollution, highways, protection of heritage assets and other designations. For the purposes of considering this application the policy can be given substantial weight.

4.32 The emerging development management policy DM4.2 also takes a positive approach to renewable energy projects as long as the adverse impacts do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the benefits. This policy however, is not yet part of the Development Plan. It has been afforded little weight in making this recommendation.

4.33 The policy position is therefore generally supportive of renewable energy provision subject to the key issues being fully addressed.

4.34 In this instance the key consideration in determining the planning application are as follows:

- whether it is appropriate to provide this development on agricultural land including an assessment on agricultural grades,
- impact on local landscape,
- impact on residential amenity,
- impact on highway safety
- impact on heritage assets,
- impact on drainage; and
- impact on the biodiversity of the site.
- renewable energy and community benefits
- cumulative impact issues

Development in the open countryside and loss of agricultural land

4.35 Para 111 in the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing brownfield land that is not of high environmental quality, para 113 of the Framework states that ‘local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, Local Planning Authorities should seek to use areas of poorer agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality.

4.36 Para 103 ID:5-013-2040306 in the NPPG states ‘where a proposal involves Greenfield land, whether (i) the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary and poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land and (ii) the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays. This was reinforced in Greg Barker MP’s speech on 25th April 2013. Policy ENV21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan also prevents development on best and most versatile agricultural land unless it can be accommodated within development limits, previously developed land or poorer quality agricultural land or the need for the development outweighs the agricultural consideration.

4.37 In respect of the above policy test, the size of the development is considered to be significant. Where this is the case the PPG sets out a requirement that a sequential test is carried out to demonstrate why, and firstly, previously developed land cannot be used and secondly, lower grade agricultural land sites have been discounted.

4.38 In this case in respect of previously developed land, a sequential test has been submitted which looks at alternative locations for the development on previously developed land within a 3km radius of the site. No suitable available sites were identified.
The sequential test did not cover the whole of the District nor rooftops of existing buildings, however recent reports submitted for the Yelverton solar farm application (2014/0411), to which the current applicants rely, can be taken into consideration which demonstrated that there were no suitable sites within the district of south Norwich on previously developed land or rooftops and this therefore fulfils this requirement. It can therefore be concluded that there are not presently any suitable PDL sites within the vicinity of a grid connection that are available and free from planning constraints such as flooding or scheduled monuments.

4.39 With regard to agricultural land, an agricultural assessment including sampling has been carried out which identifies the site as largely being 3b with only a small percentage 4.8% being on the best and most versatile land (3b). As such in this case no further sequential approach is required as the site is not classified as the ‘best and most versatile land’.

4.40 Permission is proposed for a temporary period of 25 years. Therefore as this is a proposed temporary rather than permanent permission, the land will not gain brownfield status after decommissioning.

4.41 Biodiversity enhancements are proposed in line with the NPPG, precise details of this are discussed later in the report and will be secured by condition.

4.42 In accordance with the guidance in the PPG, Officers are therefore satisfied that an adequate assessment of previously developed land and agricultural land classification has been carried out and there is no policy provision that weighs against the proposal being considered acceptable in principle in this regard.

4.43 A small part of the site is located within a mineral safeguarding zone due to having sand and gravel deposits. There is however no objection to the principle of this development in this respect as the proposal is for a temporary permission and would not sterilise the underlying material on a permanent basis.

Landscape

4.44 Government guidance in the NPPF and policy 2 in the JCS place a strong emphasis on the protection of the landscape and the countryside. In addition to the renewable energy policies, para 17 of the NPPF requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and para 109 seeks to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

4.45 More locally the majority of the site is located within the Yare Valley Urban Fringe landscape character type as identified in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Designations review by Chris Blandford Associates in 2012. The Landscape Strategy for this is to ‘maintain an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich to provide a ‘green buffer’ between the city and its rural hinterland’. The site also lies in the southern bypass landscape protection zone.

4.46 Policy ENV3 of the SNLP seeks to protect and enhance the distinctive and local landscape character of the river valleys. It advises that “inappropriate development” will not be permitted within the river valleys in the Norwich area, and special regard will be paid to protecting all parts of these valleys which contribute positively to the historic setting of Norwich.

4.47 In respect of the landscape character and River Valleys, Emerging policy 4.6 requires all development to respect, conserve and where possible enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. It advised that development proposals that would cause serious adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused. It advises that all development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the following have been taken into account:
The key characteristics, assets, sensitivities and vulnerabilities

The landscape strategy

Development considerations

Particular regard will be had to protecting the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the identified Rural River Valleys and Valley Urban Fringe landscape character types.

4.48 The site is also located within the southern bypass landscape protection zone as covered by policy ENV6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and also emerging policy 4.7 of the Development Management policies.

4.49 Policy ENV6 states that “inappropriate development’ and any other development within the Norwich Southern bypass Landscape Protection zone, which will undermine the landscape quality and openness of the zone, or which would lead to the bypass (or any section of it) becoming the outer development boundary of the city, will not be permitted.”

4.50 Policy 4.7 of the emerging development management policies sets out in respect of the landscape setting of the southern bypass: “All development proposals within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, should have regard to protecting the openness of the zone and, where possible, enhancing the landscape setting of the southern bypass, including the practice of wild flower planting and management regimes.”

4.51 A key consideration is the effect of a large area of solar panels and associated infrastructure on the character and appearance of this character type and also the wider landscape. Concerns were raised by officers on the scheme originally proposed in respect of the landscape impact of the proposal, which has resulted in a revised scheme which has sought to reduce the impact on the landscape by the reduction in the area covered by solar panels in addition to further proposed landscaping.

4.52 The area of the site which is considered the most sensitive to receptors is that to the west of the site from White Horse Lane and views from Long John Hill from the city. White Horse Lane and Stoke Road are the slower receptors and therefore more sensitive.

4.53 Therefore in respect of the reduction in the area of solar panels, the southern part of the site has been omitted due to officers concerns of visual effects of close sensitive receptors of Stoke Road and White Horse Lane in addition to longer receptors of Long John Hill. In the northern part of the site, an area of 2.12Ha has been kept clear of panels to break up the expanse of panels visible from the A146 and introduce an area of openness, which would better accord with the opens set out in the Landscape Character Assessment.

4.54 In respect of proposed mitigation planting the following has been included in the amended scheme:

- A 277m mixed native hedge interspersed with trees around the scheduled ancient monument to both protect the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and also to filter views of the solar farm from residential properties on White Horse Lane. An additional 3m wide belt of shrub and tree planting will reinforce the hedgerow to the East.
- A mixed native hedge of approx. 200m would be planted along the southern boundary of the panels.
- A mixed native hedge of approx. 186m length along White Horse Lane to close an existing gap (near the overhead power cables)
- A mixed native hedge of approx. 200m length parallel to (and north of) the power lines
- A mixed native hedgerow with trees interspersed of approx. 380m in between field 1 and field 2.
- Woodland and scrub planting at a point adjacent to the A47 and north of the power cables.
4.55 The amended scheme has therefore responded to officer’s previous comments and is much improved. In particular, the retrenchment of the scheme on the western part of the site will largely remove views of the panels from the Long John Hill viewpoint, and also the nearer views from Lakenham and Bixley.

4.56 A revised landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted and concludes that based on the reduced scale of the solar farm and proposed planting that the majority of the magnitude of change to the majority of viewpoints would now be considered to have a negligible effect. These are from officer’s opinion the more sensitive areas of the site, to the west of the site. Effects from viewpoints from County Hall would remain moderate due to the elevation of the building. Effects from viewpoint of the A146 would remain moderate adverse despite the removal of a 2.12 area to help break up the solar farm and create a sense of openness. However Officers consider that as this view would be from moving traffic and at relatively high speeds this is not considered to be of any significant detriment.

4.57 The proposed planting will screen many parts of the scheme, but it is acknowledged that the full benefits of this mitigation may not be achieved until at least 5-10 years, it is therefore important to secure the planting at an early stage. The long-term landscape enhancements (improved and new hedgerows, hedgerow trees etc.) will be a positive long-term enhancement.

4.58 The Council’s Landscape Officer considers that the overall approach to the structural landscaping to be acceptable, however the detail in particular the timing of the landscaping works needs careful consideration to ensure the scheme is sufficiently mitigated. A condition in respect of the landscaping scheme and landscape management is therefore necessary to secure the necessary detail.

In terms of cumulative impacts, there are no planning permissions or applications for large scale solar farms in South Norfolk or south of Norwich which would cause any cumulative impacts with this proposal.

4.59 In terms of glint and glare, solar panels are designed to absorb as much light as possible. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any significant loss of amenity or significant effect the landscape in terms of glint and glare.

4.60 The temporary site construction compound is of a temporary nature and as such would not result in any significant detrimental harm to the landscape.

4.61 Overall whilst there would be some harm by the introduction of a solar farm within this landscape and bypass protection zone, given that the panels are relatively low level, have been removed in large areas from sensitive receptors at Stoke Road/White Horse Lane and views from Long John Hill and that significant landscaping is proposed to help screen the solar farm from other receptors, it is not considered that the proposal represents a significant intrusion in the landscape or of the setting of Norwich.

4.62 Furthermore it is not considered that the proposal would undermine the the landscape quality and openness of the zone, or would lead to the bypass (or any section of it) becoming the outer development boundary of the city.

4.63 The harm identified is less than substantial and the benefits of the proposal in respect of renewable energy generation, and subject to the imposition of condition in respect of landscaping, are considered to outweigh this harm in this instance.

Residential amenity

4.64 Impacts on residential amenity largely relate to the loss of outlook, noise and disturbance and dust during construction through the installation of the panels and also vehicular movements and loss of privacy
Noise, vibration and dust impacts are largely limited to the construction phase of the development which would result from the piling of the frames for the solar panels into the ground and the construction on site. It is acknowledged that this could result in a significant impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties, however, given that this is of a temporary nature as relates to the construction phase only, it is not considered that a refusal on these grounds could be substantiated. The Council’s Environmental Services Team confirm that subject to conditions to control hours of construction and delivery, a noise and dust management scheme etc. that there is no objection in this respect.

In terms of noise from the operational solar farm this would be limited to the substation and inverters which may generate additional background noise levels. The application details that any plant will be enclosed and as such noise will be mitigated. The nearest properties to the solar farm are numbers 1 and 2 Keepers Cottage on White Horse Lane. These would be approx. 280m from the nearest inverter. Given the distance and equipment used, the Council’s Environmental Services Team concludes that sound levels would be acceptable and result in no noise nuisance to those residential properties.

There have been of the use of loudspeakers on other solar farms in the county and therefore a condition has been imposed specifically restricting this in the interests of the residential amenities of the nearby residential properties.

In terms of impact of the coming and going of HGV vehicles along the construction traffic route, as amended the construction traffic route avoids coming through any residential area and as such it is not considered that any adverse impacts on residential amenity result in this respect.

In terms of potential overbearing impacts and loss of direct amenities in respect of loss of light, the closest residential properties are 1 and 2 Keepers Cottage on White Horse Lane which are located opposite the area of the SAM and are approx. 110m to the western edge of the solar panels. This area has been left clear of solar panels and those panels further into the site to the east will be screened from the SAM and the properties by a mixed native hedge and a 3m scrub planting belt. The site is sloped away from White Horse Lane and towards the north east corner of the site and as such views of the panels further into the site will be possible from these two properties. Views however will be broken by hedge and tree planting in various rows across the site both running east-west and north-south. As such it is considered that the solar farm would not result in any overbearing impacts, adverse loss of outlook or loss of daylight and sunlight and would not therefore have a significantly adverse effect on the amenity of these residents.

It should be noted that in planning terms there is no right to a view and it is not considered that the development would be overbearing to the properties and result in a significant harm to their amenities in planning terms.

In respect of glint and glare as the panels are designed to absorb sunlight, glint and glare is not likely to occur from the panels themselves.

CCTV cameras are proposed around the perimeter of the site, but given the distance from the nearest residential properties, it is not considered that they would result in any significant loss of residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed development would not result in the amenity of residents being significantly affected and therefore the proposal accords with local plan policies IMP9 and IMP10.

Impact on heritage assets

The heritage assets which need to be considered as part of this application are archaeological, setting of the Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings. Relevant
policies are Local Plan policy ENV9 in respect of archaeology, IMP15 and IMP18, DM policy 4.11 in respect of heritage assets. Section 12 of the NPPF sets out considerations required in respect of the historic environment.

4.75 In addition to the requirements of the Development Plan, section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also places a general duty on planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Furthermore section 66 of that same Act places a general duty, when considering proposals affecting a listed building or its setting, on planning authorities on paying special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess.

4.76 The site contains a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) which is a ring ditch. The site is also located within a landscape of known prehistoric activity. Currently the SAM is classed as being at high risk by Historic England as the site is currently ploughed.

4.77 Trowse with Newton Conservation Area is approx. 100m to the north of the application site on the other side of the A146, with Trowse Millgate conservation Area further afield.

4.78 Old Lakenham Conservation Area (in Norwich City Council boundaries) is approx. 800m north west of the sites boundary with White Horse Lane.

4.79 There are a number of Grade II and II* Listed buildings in Old Lakenham Conservation Area which are approx. 480-650m north west of the western boundary of the site.

4.80 There are a number of Grade II Listed buildings and a Grade I listed church in the Trowse with Newton Conservation Area approx. 285 – 620m north and north east of the sites northern boundary.

4.81 Within the Trowse Millgate Conservation Area there are two Grade II listed buildings which are approx. 560m north of the sites northern boundary.

4.82 To the north east of the Trowse with Newton Conservation Area lies a registered park and garden called Crown Point which is Grade II Listed in addition to Whitlingham Hall which is Grade II and Grade II* listed.

4.83 Bixley Mill is located east of the site on the northern side of the A146 and is Grade II listed and lies approx. 730m away from the site.

4.84 In respect of the SAM, Historic England whilst concluding that there would be harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, have confirmed that this harm would be less than substantial and that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal as set out in para 134 of the NPPF.

4.85 Historic England also acknowledges that the applicant has made concessions towards offsetting the harm and that these measures would reduce the overall impact on the monument and provide a degree of public benefit through improved access and interpretation.

4.86 In this case the proposal provides a renewable energy resource which would be in place for a period of 25 years only. Considering this against the less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, officers consider that the level of harm is sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of the scheme and public benefits of the enhancements to the monument. Therefore subject to the imposition of conditions to secure these enhancements, on balance the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of the designated heritage asset of the SAM.
distance and intervening features. This view is supported by English Heritage and the Councils Conservation Officer. Therefore in respect of the Development Plan and the separate duties under S66 and 72 of the Acts set out above, Officers consider for the reasons set out above that the development is acceptable resulting in no adverse harm to the character or appearance of the setting of the conservation areas or the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings.

Highway considerations

4.87 It is considered that the proposed development, although large in scale, would not pose a highway safety risk or adverse impact on the free flow of traffic during its operational life, with very few vehicle movements associated with the maintenance and repair of the panels once constructed and few vehicular movements associated with the maintenance of the grassland. It is only during the construction phase when a significant number of vehicle movements will be generated and it is the delivery of the panels and associated equipment and materials to the site that would be likely to create the most number of vehicle movements.

4.88 The proposed construction traffic route has been amended during the course of the application. The original route proposed to take construction traffic through Trowse, which was then amended to route through Stoke Holy Cross via Long Lane which raised concerns from both the Highway Authority and local residents of those areas.

4.89 The scheme as further amended and now for consideration, proposes to access the site from an existing farm access point from Stoke Road. The amended construction traffic route will be from the B1332 Bungay Road where an existing farm track on its western side is currently accessed. The construction route will follow this farm track through private agricultural land before joining Arminghall Lane. Traffic will follow a short stretch of Arminghall Lane before meeting Stoke Road where the access to the site is an existing farm access on the northern side of the carriageway.

4.90 The accesses at the B1332 Bungay Road, that onto the Arminghall Road and on Stoke Road would be upgraded to highway specifications to enable them to accommodate the proposed development. Information submitted demonstrates that two articulated vehicles can negotiate these junctions successfully.

4.91 This route would avoid coming through residential areas and officers therefore consider in respect of residential amenity, that there would no adverse impact as a result of this construction traffic route.

4.92 The Highway Authority has confirmed there are no objections in respect of the safe or free flow of traffic from the amended route subject to the imposition of conditions. They have commented that the revised route using the private track is considered as generally fine and is the best solution for the construction traffic that has so far been put forward. Avoiding the construction traffic having to go through the residential areas of either Trowse or Stoke Holy Cross. The proposals include for the improvement to the entrance onto the B1332 and Arminghall Lane.

4.93 The Highway Authority has advised that the LPA will need to consider whether the track is suitable itself for the large delivery vehicles. The applicant has detailed that the existing farm track will be upgraded however no details of this have been submitted. However it is considered that a suitable access track across the private land can be secured by condition.

4.94 Highways England have confirmed no objection to the scheme as amended which has deleted an area of panels adjacent to the A47 and instead replaced with planting, where it was considered that visibility of panels by highway users would cause a distraction.
Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that a significant number of vehicular movements will be generated by this proposed development during construction, the scheme as amended has sought to locate the route outside of sensitive residential areas and restricts the route to existing main highways and across private farmland. In consideration of this and that the highway impacts are temporary in nature (the applicant suggests likely 3 months) and that the Highway Authority and Highways England raise no objection to the proposal, it is considered that subject to conditions the proposal would have no adverse impacts on the safe and free flow of traffic and would accord with policy IMP8.

Ecology

In respect of impacts on European Designated sites (also known as Natura 2000 sites), the LPA, as a 'competent authority' is required to determine whether a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required for the proposed development. Officers have taken advice from Natural England and the Natural Environment Team at Norfolk County Council in this respect and do not consider a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required in this case as the distance to the nearest Natura 2000 site is great (>5km to the Yare Broads and Marshes SSSI which forms part of the Broads SAC and Broad SPA/Ramsar site) and there are no likely vectors for any impact on the integrity of the designated site features of the nearest Natura 2000 site.

The actual site itself has low ecological value with limited semi-natural habitat on site. The submitted ecology report contained within the Environmental Statement identifies that the site is likely to be used by commuting and feeding bats, with a building adjacent to the site and some trees having the potential for roosting bats. The report also suggests that there is a possibility that the site is used by common reptiles and great crested newts (terrestrial habitat only) in addition the likely presence of farmland birds.

The submitted report indicates that the proposed mitigation is to retain the existing semi-natural habitats on the site (woodland, hedgerows, scrub, grassland margins and scattered trees), and protecting them during construction by a Construction Environment Management Plan. Enhancement is also suggested.

The Council’s Ecologist, whilst supporting the overall approach, however notes that no site specific surveys have been carried out for these species and as such requires a condition for further surveys to be carried out to inform the habitat management plan and the Construction Environment Management Plan, and also to assess the acceptability of proposed enhancements. Other conditions required include the retention of existing semi-natural habitats on site; protection of those habitats to be set out in an updated CEMP; and production of a Habitat Management Plan. Subject to the imposition of these conditions it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in respect of ecology and biodiversity and accords with policies ENV14 and ENV15.

Drainage and Flood Risk

NPPF section 10 and JCS policy 3 requires the flood risk and drainage of all developments to be considered to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere, that satisfactory surface water drainage for the site is proposed and development on high risk flood areas is avoided where possible.

The application site is principally in Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest flood risk) with a corridor of land within Flood Zone 3 running north west to south east across the site following the route of an existing watercourse. Key issues to consider are surface water flooding issues.

The proposed panels will not prevent direct infiltration into the ground and the site remains landscaped with grassland/vegetation surrounding and beneath the arrays.
The EA and the Council’s Flood Officer conclude that the installation of the solar panels should not have a significant effect on runoff volumes as generally it will only lead to a small increase in the percentage of impermeable surface area across the site. However, if the ground cover under the panels is bare, the peak discharge of surface water could increase, and water draining from the panels could cause erosion at their base. The use of localised infiltration trenches should be considered to prevent this and slow the rate of runoff.

They also advise that in particular, where panels are sited so that they do not follow the contours of the site, then intensification of the runoff into small channels could occur. It is recommended that vegetation beneath the panels is maintained and that a buffer strip or swale be placed below the most down gradient row of panels to intercept any overland flows. During construction unnecessary soil disturbance and trafficking on soils when they are wet should be avoided to prevent compaction.

Where the proposed site lies partly or wholly within Flood Zone 2 and/or Flood Zone 3 (the medium and high risk zones), the proposal should avoid any ground raising, as this may increase flood risk elsewhere. It will also be important to consider the effects of a flood event on the proposed solar farm. Panels should be anchored down sufficiently to avoid floatation in a flood and to prevent damage to the panels themselves or to surrounding property. Sensitive electrical equipment should be located above predicted flood levels.

The Flood Report submitted advises that the positioning of the solar panel arrays will avoid the Flood Zone 2 & 3 corridor and therefore all proposed development will be within the areas located in flood zone 1.

Swales have been proposed within the site and along the boundary of white horse lane site to intercept any over land flows and attenuate them as suggested by the EA in addition to the planting of wildflower meadow to ensure the ground cover is not bare thus reducing the peak discharge of water and erosion at the base of the panels.

The Flood Defence Officer supports this approach as along as the management of the swales is by an agreed management scheme to ensure they are effective in the long term which can be secured by condition. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy 3 in the JCS and paragraph 103 in the NPPF.

Employment

The construction of the site will result in employment opportunities including some for local people, but given the contracts will be for relatively short term periods, little positive benefit can be afforded to this when making the decision.

Financial considerations

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)

Conclusion

The solar farm would have a 16.79 MW capacity which is estimated will provide power for approx. 4701 homes. This will make a positive contribution towards achieving green energy targets, tackling the challenges of climate change, lessening the dependency on fossil fuels and benefiting from energy security, which will adhere to the NPPF in terms of the paragraph 17 core principles, paragraph 93 which indicates that the delivery of renewable low carbon energy is
central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and paragraph 97 that communities have a responsibility to contribute to the provision of renewable energy. Considerable weight can be afforded to this.

5.2 It is evident that the scheme has due regard to reducing the impact on the local landscape, residential amenity, highway safety and the free flow of traffic, surface water drainage and biodiversity and impact of the development in these respect are acceptable or can be made acceptable through the imposition of planning conditions.

5.3 There will be some harm to the landscape character and landscape setting of Norwich, however it is considered that these impacts have been reduced by the amended scheme and can be made acceptable and controlled by conditions in respect of proposed landscaping. Furthermore this limited harm is considered to be outweighed by the overall benefits to the scheme.

5.4 There is harm to the designated scheduled ancient monument however this is considered to be less than substantial and the benefits of the scheme including public benefits of enhancements to the SAM are considered to outweigh this harm.

5.5 Critically the original concerns with the scheme regarding the construction traffic route have been overcome with an amended route which is considered acceptable in terms of both highway safety and free flow of traffic in addition to residential amenity.

5.6 On balance therefore it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in planning terms and is therefore recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3 **Appl. Nos**: 2015/0130  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Charles Spooner  
**Site Address**: 1A - 1B Farrier Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0WF  
**Proposal**: 2015/0130 - Variation of condition 1 of planning permission  
2014/0840 - to reduce the number of restricted items.  
**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. Restriction of sales to specified goods  
2. Restriction of opening hours  
3. Provision of parking and turning areas

4 **Appl. Nos**: 2015/0132  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Charles Spooner  
**Site Address**: 1A - 1B Farrier Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0WF  
**Proposal**: The erection of a new retail unit attached to the northern side of 1 Farrier Close (631sqm net sales area) to facilitate the relocation of Poundstretcher from 1 Farrier Close. This would be the subject of the same restrictive conditions that presently exist at 1 Farrier Close including that of condition 1 of 2014/0840.  
**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. Standard time limit  
2. Restriction of sales to specified goods  
3. Restriction of opening hours  
4. Material to be agreed  
5. Landscaping to be agreed  
6. Boundary treatments to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 5: The economy  
Policy 6: Access and transportation  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 13: Main Towns  
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centre  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (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 Autumn 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 (submission version 2013)
DM2.4 – Location of main town centre uses

1.6 Wymondham Area Action Plan (submission version 2013)
WYM18 – Sequential approach and impact assessment for retail provision in Wymondham

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0840 Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2007/0497/F to allow increased range of goods to be sold from the premises. Approved

2.2 2012/0741 Use of former Focus Store for retail use without compliance with restriction as to goods to be sold imposed by planning permission issued on 9 May 2007, ref 2007/0497/F, as modified by Modification Order made by South Norfolk District Council on 31 July 2007, - upon implementation of planning permission issued on 16 December 2011, ref 2011/1784/F Appeal against non-determination

3. Appeal History

3.1 2012/0741 Use of former Focus Store for retail use without compliance with restriction as to goods to be sold imposed by planning permission issued on 9 May 2007, ref 2007/0497/F, as modified by Modification Order made by South Norfolk District Council on 31 July 2007, - upon implementation of planning permission issued on 16 December 2011, ref 2011/1784/F Appeal Withdrawn

4. Consultations

4.1 Town Council Approve both schemes.

4.2 District Member To be reported as appropriate.

4.3 NCC Highways No objection to either scheme subject to the continued restriction on food sales floor space being retained (201sqm).
Other Representations

One objection to 2015/0132 confirming the following:

This is just an attempt to bypass the restrictions placed on the site with regards to food retailing. Should this application be passed it will be another draw away from the middle of Wymondham and another step towards turning us into a town without a town centre.

Assessment

Description of proposals

There are two applications to be considered on the site, these being for the following:

1) 2015/0130 - Variation to condition 1 of 2014/0840 to allow a broader range of goods to be sold from the existing retail unit (1 Farrier Close), the application anticipates a non-food retailer with B&M suggested, and,

2) 2015/0132 - The erection of a new retail unit attached to the northern side of 1 Farrier Close (631sqm net sales area) to facilitate the relocation of Poundstretcher from 1 Farrier Close. This would be the subject of the same restrictive conditions that presently exist at 1 Farrier Close including that of condition 1 of 2014/0840.

Given that the impacts of these two proposals are intrinsically linked to one another, it is considered appropriate to assess the impacts at the same time. The following assessment adopts this approach.

Site description

The site consists of an existing retail premises occupied by Poundstretcher. The unit is a steel framed structure with external materials consisting of brick plinth with cladding above. The structure has a curved roof and a projecting two storey entrance arrangement. The unit has a gross internal floor area of 2437sq.m. with a net sales area of 1690sq.m.

The unit has an associated car park providing 114 parking spaces for customers and staff and this is located to the south-west of the unit with vehicular access onto Farrier Close which runs along the south-eastern perimeter of the site. To the north-east of the site is the associated service yard, with the A11 (dual carriageway) located to the north beyond the existing landscaping area, this landscaping area would be reduced in size by the proposed new retail store covered by 2015/0132 highlighted above.

Key planning issues

Retail impacts including sequential test

The present unit, 1 Farrier Close, is occupied by Poundstretcher with their trading patterns restricted by condition 1 of 2014/0840. This condition reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use classes) Order 1987, or the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying those Orders, there shall be no display for retail sale or retail sale of any of the following goods beyond the specified thresholds within the retail unit:

a) Food (up to 201sqm);
b) Alcoholic drinks (nil);
c) Tobacco (nil);
d) Fashion clothing and fashion footwear (nil);
e) Chemist/pharmaceutical goods (nil);  
f) Jewellery/fancy goods and luggage (up to 16sqm);  
g) Books, newspapers and magazines (nil unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted to be sold within this development excluding food, jewellery/fancy goods/luggage, perfume and toiletries);  
h) Crockery, glassware, china, kitchenware (nil unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted to be sold within this development excluding food, jewellery/fancy goods/luggage, perfume and toiletries);  
i) Perfume or toiletries (up to 97sqm);  
j) Sports clothing and equipment (nil);  
k) Audio and visual recordings (nil unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted to be sold within this development excluding food, jewellery/fancy goods/luggage, perfume and toiletries);  
l) Mobile phones (nil);  
m) TV's, DVD's, hi-fi's, microwaves, ovens and similar non-DIY electrical equipment (nil unless sold as ancillary to the sale of other types of goods permitted to be sold within this development excluding food, jewellery/fancy goods/luggage, perfume and toiletries) and  
n) Animals or fish (nil).”

This application seeks to amend/relax this condition to read as follows:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use classes) Order 1987, or the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying those Orders, there shall be no display for retail sale or retail sale of any of the following goods beyond the specified thresholds within the retail unit:

A) Food (up to 201sqm)  
B) Alcoholic drinks (nil)  
C) Tobacco (nil)  
D) Animals or Fish(nil)”

5.6 The effect of this proposed revision would mean that any operator occupying the existing unit could sell any products with the exception of alcohol, tobacco, animals or fish and only a limited amount of food (201sq.m. which equates to approx. 12% of the stores net sales areas of 1690sq.m.). It should be noted that this restriction in respect of food sales is the same restriction that presently exists in condition 1 of planning consent 2014/0840.

5.7 The application confirms that despite the current condition being tailored to reflect Poundstretcher’s business model, it has found that the present unit is too large for their needs and as such this is the reason for the current proposed relocation to the new unit proposed under application 2015/0132. It is evident from the submission that the applicant has sought advice from a retail land agent which suggests that finding an alternative operator for this size of unit with the current trading restriction would be extremely difficult, with the specific restrictions being so specific to Poundstretcher that this would prohibit re-letting of the space, hence the proposed wording of the above condition under application 2015/0130.

5.8 The suggested revised condition would mean that it would not suitable for food operators and as such it would be suitable for the “discount sector”, e.g. a retailer such as B&M as highlighted in the land agent’s response included as Appendix 2 of Planning and Retail Statement submitted with the application.

5.9 In the context of the revised change to the wording of condition 1 of 2014/0840 it is necessary to understand what the impacts would be of this on Wymondham town centre. It should be noted that the Council has a Market Towns Initiative for Wymondham which promotes the market town.
This in itself is not a material consideration in planning terms, but the objectives of this initiative are reflected in the material planning consideration of considering the impact of any retail development on town centres. On this basis, the Council has employed retail consultants (GVA Grimley) to assess the submission and establish what impacts would occur in light of planning policy requirements.

5.10 In policy terms, the site is "out of centre" when assessed against the NPPF. It is evident that it is necessary to assess the proposals in the context of paragraphs 24 and 26 of the NPPF in terms of both the "sequential" and "impact" tests.

The requirement for an impact test is also reflected in local plan policy SHO2. The emerging policy WYM18 (now WYM17 under the Proposed Main Modifications by the Council) also seeks to ensure a sequential and impact assessment are carried out on the development proposed. It is considered significant weight can be attached to this policy in light of paragraph 216 of the NPPF, due to the emerging plan being at an advanced stage of preparation with no proposed modifications by the Inspector.

5.11 In terms of the impact test, it is necessary to establish that applications for out-of-centre development of town centre uses (including retail) would not result in a significant adverse impact would arise against existing, committed and planned investment in a centre or against town centre vitality and viability including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area.

5.12 The applicant's initial submission was assessed and it was concluded that there would be no significant adverse impact expected to arise against existing, committed and planned investment in any nearby venture. However, in the context of the impact upon town centre vitality and viability further work was necessary to establish that significant adverse effects would not occur.

5.13 The agent duly provided further information in respect of the impact upon town centre vitality and viability which has been the subject of further assessment by GVA Grimley. They have now concluded that:

"the scope for any existing centre to suffer a "significant adverse" impact is limited, should unit 1 be occupied by B&M or an equivalent discount/general merchandise retailer. There is limited provision of this nature in the Wymondham area and accordingly there would be potential positive benefits in terms of improving consumer choice and expenditure retention."

5.14 It should be noted that this position has been reached notwithstanding GVA Grimley highlighting that it would have been preferable for the applicant's to look at the implications of a different potential end occupier who could comply with the suggested terms of the condition e.g. a clothes or homewares retailer which the applicant did not wish to do. The Council has requested this additional work be completed by the applicant but in the absence of any additional work it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application based on this matter alone. Accordingly GVA Grimley had regard for these implications in reaching the above position and undertaking their assessment or greater trade diversion from the town centre.

5.15 As highlighted above, despite the current store being too large for Poundstretcher's needs, they are keen to continue trading in Wymondham and consequently have expressed a desire to occupy the proposed new unit adjacent/attached to that of 1 Farrier Close (application 2015/0132). In terms of understanding the retail impacts of this, it is evident that the applicant has suggested that if this unit was to be the subject of the same conditions as previously attached to 1 Farrier Close in respect of restricting what goods can be sold from it then no additional retail impact would occur above that already occurring. It is considered that this represents a reasonable assumption.
The unit is under the retail impact assessment threshold, but the impact of the Variation of Condition under 2015/0130 cannot be considered in isolation.

5.16 It is also worth noting that whilst the trading of a re-located Poundstretcher to the proposed new unit would be likely to be affected by the arrival of B&M or similar, this is a "competition" matter in an out-of-centre location which should not be taken into account in the determination of this application.

5.17 In summary, it is considered that the retail impacts of the scheme in the context of planning policy and guidance would not be significantly adverse whereby they would be unacceptable.

5.18 Whilst concern is noted that the impact of alternative retailers should have been demonstrated by the applicant, there is reasonable assessment to demonstrate there would not be a significant adverse impact on Wymondham Town Centre and refusal on this basis would not be justified or defendable at appeal.

5.20 Other issues

5.19 Application 2015/0132 would create a new retail unit which is to be a steel framed clad structure with curved roof and feature entrance. It is evident that the design and external materials proposed would be entirely consistent with the existing retail unit (1 Farrier Close) and as such would no compromise the character and appearance of the locality and the proposal is considered to comply with JCS Policy 2. The footprint of the proposed unit would result in the loss of some of the landscaping belt to the north of the existing store, however, it would still allow for the retention of a significant part of the planting belt and so the development would accord with local plan policy IMP2.

5.20 The application site lies a significant distance for many residential properties and as such would have no significant impact upon residential amenity.

5.21 The Highway Authority has assessed the proposal and concluded that they have no objections to the proposal, with the development being in accordance with local plan policy IMP8.

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

5.23 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011 (as amended). The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and as detailed in the above report the impacts have been given due consideration. Whilst there are no significant environmental impacts that would require an Environmental Statement to be submitted with the application the above issues in relation to sustainability remain.

5.24 Application 2015/0132 is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and will be charged appropriately. However, 2015/0130 proposes no new floorspace and so is not liable for CIL.
6 Conclusion

6.1 2015/0130 – It is considered that the relaxation of the existing condition restricting the range of products which can be sold from the premises would not lead to any significant adverse retail impacts, including upon Wymondham town centre.

6.2 2015/0132 – it is considered that as the proposed new unit would be occupied under the same trading restrictions as presently exist at 1 Farrier Close mean that no additional harm would occur in respect of retail impact than presently exist. In terms of the new build unit, the scheme is sufficiently well designed to relate well to the adjoining building and the surrounding area, would have impact upon neighbour amenity and would not compromise local highway safety.

6.3 It is also considered that the proposals would cumulatively not lead to a significant adverse effect in terms of retail impact, including Wymondham Town Centre. Whilst concern is noted that the impact of alternative retailers should have been demonstrated by the applicant, there is reasonable assessment to demonstrate there would not be a significant adverse impact on Wymondham Town Centre and refusal on this basis would not be justified or defendable at appeal. The Wymondham Market Town Initiative has been considered, and whilst not a material planning consideration in itself, the impact of the proposals on the main town centre have been given due consideration through this application.

6.4 With the above points in mind, both applications are recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail: craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2015/0436/O  
**Parish**: SCOLE  

**Applicants Name**: Mr B Tunmore  
**Site Address**: Land West Of Norwich Road Scole Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Construction 17 no. dwellings and access road, village hall and parking, open space recreation and wildlife areas  

**Recommendation**: Refusal  

1. Outside settlement boundary, harmful to the open countryside  
2. Does not represent sustainable development  
3. Insufficient justification for there being no affordable housing  
4. Harmful to setting of a listed building (St Andrews Church) whereby there are insufficient public benefits  
5. Insufficient information in respect of archaeology  
6. Insufficient information in respect of trees  
7. Highway safety concerns  

1. **Planning Policies**  

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
**NPPF 01**: Building a strong competitive economy  
**NPPF 03**: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
**NPPF 06**: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
**NPPF 07**: Requiring good design  
**NPPF 11**: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
**NPPF 12**: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
**Policy 1**: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
**Policy 2**: Promoting good design  
**Policy 3**: Energy and water  
**Policy 4**: Housing delivery  
**Policy 7**: Supporting Communities  
**Policy 8**: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
**Policy 17**: Small rural communities and the countryside  

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**  
**ENV 8**: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
**IMP 6**: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)  
**IMP 8**: Safe and free flow traffic  
**IMP 9**: Residential amenity  
**IMP 10**: Noise  
**IMP 15**: Setting of Listed Buildings  
**IMP 18**: Development in Conservation Areas.  
**LEI 2**: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities  
**LEI 7**: Open space provision in new development  

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 Autumn 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
DM3.1 Housing Quality
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.3 Meeting rural housing needs
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 No planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve subject to conditions relating to surface water drainage
3.2 District Member To be determined by Development Management Committee given the level of public interest
3.3 Conservation Officer Object.
3.4 Landscape Officer Further work required in respect of arboricultural implications
3.5 Environment Agency No objection
3.6 Natural England No objection
3.7 Historic England Object
3.8 Historic Environment Service Further work required prior to determination of the application.
3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received
3.10 Design Officer Object

3.11 Ecologist No objection

3.12 Flood Defence Officer No objection subject to conditions

3.13 Environmental Services (Protection) To be reported

3.14 NCC Highways Object

3.15 NHSCCG No comments received

3.16 NHS England No comments received

3.17 Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager Insufficient justification for there being no affordable housing

3.18 Other Representations 14 objections received. A summary of these is as follows:

- Outside settlement boundary
- Undermine site allocation process
- Compromise the development of allocated sites
- Question the economic viability of 17 dwellings being able to fund the community facility which is an integral part of the proposal
- Flooding concerns
- Existing community centre with plans for an extension
- Insufficient need for another community facility
- The cost implications of an underused facility have not been considered
- Increased traffic flow
- Detrimental to Conservation Area
- The hall would not be provided, just a contribution which would fall short of the costs needed
- Neighbour amenity (privacy, overlooking)
- Loss of habitat for wildlife

10 letters of support have been received highlighting the village hall would be an asset to a growing village and meet local need. There are limited facilities at present in the village. It would address an overgrown site which is an eyesore

1 neutral letter has been received.

A number of bodies/groups have made representations. These are as follows:

Village Hall Committee – Support the proposed facility including the car park at the front of the site as it would allow for extra security.

St Andrews Church – Support the proposal including the position of the car park.

Scole and District Gardeners Club - Support

Ramblers Association – No objection existing PROW should be retained
Diss First Responders – Support

Scole Old Boys Club - Support

Scole WI - Support

It should also be noted that prior to the submission of the application (August 2014) a consultation process was undertaken by the applicants. 487 of 563 properties in the civil parish were contacted which equates to 86.5% of all households. In response 482 said yes (95.2%) and 24 said no (4.7%).

4 Assessment

Proposal and site description

4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the following:

- construction of 17 no. dwellings,
- land for a new village hall with associated car park and recreation area and allotments

4.2 The village hall site and 15 of the proposed dwellings would be accessed via a new vehicular access onto Norwich Road which lies to the east of the site. The remaining proposed 2 dwelling units would be served via Low Road which lies to the west of the site.

4.3 The application indicates that 9 of the dwellings would be 3 bedroom units and 8 would be 4 bedroom units. The application proposes no affordable housing.

4.4 The land for the proposed village hall, associated car park, recreation area and allotments would be given to the parish Council and the applicant proposes to provide £300000 to be spent towards the cost of the village hall.

4.5 Whilst the application is outline form with all matters reserved, an indicative layout for the site has been provided.

4.6 The site is 1.6ha of grassland located on the north-western edge of the village of Scole. The site is falls from the north-east towards the southwest and is bordered by Norwich Road to the east and Low Road to the west. To the north of the site is a builders yard and to the north-east are neighbouring residential properties. To the east, are existing residential properties and the Grade II* St Andrew Church. To the south and west of the site are further residential properties. The site also lies within the Scole Conservation Area.

Key planning issues

Policy background

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

4.8 With regard to the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 215 states that where a plan is adopted pre 2004, such as is the case here, decision makers should give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF.
By way of clarification the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS) was adopted in March 2011 and amendments in 2014, and as such paragraph 215 of Annex A of the NPPF as above is not applicable to the JCS.

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

4.10 Firstly, the site lies outside of the development limit for Scole and as such is contrary to Policy ENV8 of the SNLP on the basis that none of the criterion within this policy are met by the proposal.

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

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

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

4.12 As stated above it is also necessary to have regard for the NPPF in the decision-making process. Paragraph 49 confirms that in respect of housing proposals they:

"should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."

The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three roles, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development.

4.13 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that:

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

Firstly, in respect of housing land supply, South Norfolk Council can demonstrate a 9.11 year supply within the rural area which is applicable to Scole, and as such its housing related policies are considered to be up to date (ENV8).

4.14 Secondly, in terms of establishing whether the scheme represents sustainable development it is considered appropriate to assess the scheme in the context of the three roles set out in the NPPF, and this assessment should have regard to the other components of the scheme, namely the village hall land, amenity land and allotments in reaching a balanced view of whether the scheme is sustainable or not.
Sustainable Development
Economic implications
Paragraphs 18 -22 of the NPPF highlight the government’s commitment to securing sustainable economic growth, and defines the economic role as:

"contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure."

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

The emerging DMPD contains section headings which replicate the three roles of Sustainable development as referred to in the NPPF. The section applicable to the economic role contains Policy 2.1 which supports development proposals which provide for or assist the creation of new employment opportunities, inward investment and or provide for the adaptation and expansion of existing business.

It is evident that both adopted and emerging policies as set out above are consistent with the aims of the NPPF in terms of economic implications in highlighting the importance of economic growth and that a location such as Easton will play a key role in achieving this objective. As stated above, the emerging policies are considered to carry some weight in the decision making process.

With regard to the economic implications of the scheme, in the short term, the construction of 17 dwellings would make a contribution to the local economy. This would be via the associated construction works which could employ local tradesman etc, and also through the inevitable associated spend in the locality, shops etc.

In respect of the village hall, given that the proposal only proposes to deliver the site and a contribution towards the build costs the potential benefits in economic terms are unknown as there is no certainty that the hall would be ultimately delivered. The same applies to the economic benefits that the use of the hall would bring eg revenue from events held there. In summary, it is considered that the scheme would be of some economic benefit to the local area and meets local and national policy aspirations in this respect.

Social implications
The NPPF confirms the social role as:

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

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

PPG Health and Wellbeing highlights that built and natural environments are major determinants of health and wellbeing.
4.24 PPG Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space highlights the important role open space plays in contributing to health and wellbeing.

In local planning policy terms:

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

4.26 With regard to the DMP, as previously highlighted, this contains section headings which replicate the three roles of Sustainable development as referred to in the NPPF. The relevant policies from the section associated with the social role are 3.2, meeting housing requirements and needs, 3.9 design principles applying to all development, 3.14 amenity, noise and quality of life, 3.15 pollution, health and safety, 3.16 outdoor play facilities and recreational space and 3.17 improving the level of local community facilities. These emerging policies are considered to carry some weight at this time given the advanced stage that the Local plan is at.

4.27 From a policy perspective, it is clear that both local and national policy are consistent with one another in seeking to improve the quality of life for everyone, and highlight the important role housing plays in this, as well as providing services and facilities that reflect people's needs. It is also important to be able to access these services and facilities. With regard to the proposal, the provision of 17 houses would provide the supply of housing, however this is a relatively modest amount and would be delivered when the Council can point to delivery of housing well in excess of the 5 year housing land supply target for the rural area. This does limit the level of benefit that can be attached to providing more housing in this location. The lack of any affordable housing within the scheme also has a negative impact upon the merit of the scheme.

4.28 In respect of the village hall and associated recreation land and allotments, as previously stated, the scheme would not lead to the delivery of the village hall. It would only provide the land to facilitate the hall and proposes a moderate sum of money (£300000) towards the scheme when seen in the context of what would be significant costs to produce a village hall. On this point the application does not provide any basic cost for constructing a village hall as indicated on the illustrative plan. The submission provides no evidence that there is money available to fund the project from any other source eg the Parish Council. The submission does indicates that the Parish would have access to CIL money brought about by the development, whilst this is correct the figure suggested is not correct and it would be likely to be closer to £150000 depending on the exact size of any development brought forward at reserved matters stage which in itself would not represent a significant amount in the context of the development cost of the facility.

4.29 Whilst a new village hall would make a positive social contribution within the village, the application fails to provide any certainty or likelihood that the village hall would be delivered and as such it is not considered appropriate to attach significant weight to this part of the application when seen within the context of the social role. In respect of the housing component, the benefits of 17 additional houses, none of which are affordable units, when seen within the context of the fact that the Council presently has a housing land significantly above the 5 year target are also limited.
4.30 The Council's open space standards as referred to in Policy LEI07 of the South Norfolk Local Plan could be achieved through a reserved matters application, with the indicative scheme indicating a level of open space which meets the Council's requirements. Maintenance and management arrangements for any open space could be dealt with via a S106 legal agreement.

4.31 In summary, the scheme would present limited benefits from a social perspective.

Environmental implications

The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

4.32 "contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment: and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."

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

4.34 PPG Conserving and enhancing the historic environment confirms the importance of protecting and enhancing the historic environment. PPG Natural environment highlights the need to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

4.35 In local planning policy terms:
JCS Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets requires all development to be located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise emissions and adaptable to climate change. Policy 3 energy and water minimise reliance on non-renewable energy sources.

4.36 With regard to the South Norfolk Local Plan, ENV8 prevents development within the open countryside unless specific criterion are met. IMP2 landscaping requires development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping.

4.37 It is considered that the adopted policies are consistent with the aims of national policy in respect of the environment.

4.38 With regard to the emerging DMP, this contains section headings which replicate the three roles of Sustainable development as referred to in the NPPF. It is considered that national policy and local policy, both adopted and emerging, are consistent with the aim of Central government as expressed in national policy and guidance.

4.39 Historic England (formerly English Heritage) have expressed concern at the scheme in respect of it being harmful to the significance of the Grade II* listed St Andrew's Church and the Conservation Area in terms of paragraph 132 and 134 of the NPPF. Historic England highlight the need for the Council to weigh any public benefit of the scheme in terms of para 134 and the need for "clear and convincing justification". With this in mind, it is evident that there are significant concerns about the deliverability of the village hall and the delivery of a relatively small number of dwellings, with no affordable housing provision, where the Council can demonstrate a land supply significant in excess of the 5 year target leads to the conclusion that there is no clear and convincing justification for the scheme in terms of public benefit that could be considered to outweigh the acknowledged harm to the setting of St Andrews Church and the Conservation Area.
4.40 The Council's Senior Conservation and Design Officer also concurs with the views of Historic England.

4.41 Historic Environmental Services (formerly Norfolk Landscape Archaeology) has confirmed that there is potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest will be present at the site and that their significance will be affected by the proposed development. A heritage statement has not been submitted, and a desk based archaeological assessment alone is considered to be insufficient in this instance. On this basis further work should be done prior to a decision being issued.

4.42 The Council's Landscape Officer has also confirmed that further work is required beyond that contained in the submitted arboriculture assessment.

In terms of the environmental role, it is considered that the scheme would represent a significant level of harm by virtue of the impact on the setting of the Grade II* Listed Church and the Conservation Area and the lack of sufficient information in respect of landscaping or archaeology to fully assess the impacts in respect of these areas.

4.43 In conclusion, in reaching a decision in respect of whether a scheme represents a sustainable development or not, paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are not to be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent. With this in mind, it is considered that the limited economic and social benefits of the scheme are outweighed by the significant environmental harm that would be caused by the development. On this basis the scheme cannot be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF when taken as a whole.

Other issues

4.44 Whilst reference has been made to the concerns in respect of the impact upon the St Andrews Church, the Conservation Area, archaeology, trees in reaching a decision as to whether the scheme is sustainable, it is necessary to determine whether these in their own right would justify separate reasons for refusal.

4.45 Sections 66(1) and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 require assessment of the affect upon listed buildings and its setting and the impacts of development upon Conservation Areas. As set out above it is considered that the scheme would be harmful to both the setting of St Andrews Church and the Scole Conservation Area and as such is contrary to the above provisions.

4.46 The harmful nature of the scheme in respect of St Andrews Church and the Scole Conservation Area also means that the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies IMP15 and 18 and section 12 of the NPPF.

4.47 Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of archaeology in the opinion of Historic Environment Services and as such this is considered to represent a reason for refusal.

4.48 The arboricultural report submitted as part of the application documentation is considered unsatisfactory and this is considered to represent a further reason for refusal.

4.49 In terms of highway safety, the scheme has been assessed by the Highway Authority (NCC) and they have expressed concerns in respect of the plans not providing details in respect of a form of crossing on Norwich Road in acknowledgement of the increased pedestrian movements that would be brought about by the development and also wish to see some footway widening on Norwich Road given its presently restricted width in parts. Furthermore, they have also expressed concern at the use of Low Road to access allotments and proposed dwellings. The Highway Authority's concerns are considered to represent a reason for refusal.
4.50 Policy 3 of the JCS requires major planning applications such as this to providing sources of "decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy to cover at least 10% of the schemes expected energy requirements and meeting the water efficiency requirements of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Both of these can be met through appropriately worded planning conditions.

4.51 Given the outline nature of the proposal it is not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the impacts of the layout of the scheme on neighbours in respect of light, outlook, privacy etc, however, it is apparent that a layout could be provided that does adequately safeguard neighbour amenity in respect of light, outlook and privacy and that this could be done via any subsequent reserved matters application in the event members are minded to approve the application.

4.52 With regard to ecology, the Council's ecologist has confirmed that they have no objections in respect of likely impacts ecology, including protected species.

4.53 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011 (as amended).

4.54 The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and as detailed in the above report the impacts have been given due consideration. Whilst there are no significant environmental impacts that would require an Environmental Statement to be submitted with the application the above issues in relation to sustainability remain.

4.55 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.

4.56 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is evident that the site lies outside of the defined development limit for Scole, which given the Council's position in respect of housing land supply in the rural area, means that the proposal is contrary to policy ENV8 which continues to carry significant weight in the decision-making process. In the context of the NPPF, the scheme is not considered to represent a sustainable development as set out in the assessment above including giving due weight to the acknowledged benefits of the scheme. The scheme would be harmful to both the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent listed St Andrews Church. The scheme also proposes to provide access via Low Road for both allotments and new residential properties which would be detrimental to local highway safety and a lack of details on plans in respect of highway matters are apparent.

5.2 Furthermore, the scheme also lacks sufficient details in respect of archaeology and trees.

5.3 For the above reasons, the application is recommended for refusal.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail: craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No** : 2015/0595/F  
**Parish** : BRESSINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Des Aves  
Site Address : Deal Farm Kenninghall Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2HG  
Proposal : Construction of a farm agricultural anaerobic digestion facility.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. Submitted drawings
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
5. Landscaping management plan
6. Construction Traffic Management approval
7. Construction Traffic Management provision
8. Wheel Cleaning Facilities approval
9. Wheel Cleaning Facilities provision
10. Provision of new access drive
11. Pipeline details
12. Ecology survey and mitigation

Subject to completion of S106 agreement to prevent implementation of extant consents for anaerobic digestion facilities adjacent to application site. Delegate authority to Director of Growth and Localism to refuse should no S106 be successfully entered into.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
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 historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 5 : The economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 16 : Other Villages  
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in open countryside  
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture  
EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (Part Consistent)  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 2: Landscaping
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 Autumn 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
DM2.7 Agricultural and forestry development
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide

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 2013/1887 Anaerobic digester Approved

2.2 2013/0389 County Council Ref C/7/2013/7006 Thermophillic digestion plant – determined by Norfolk County Council Approved

2.3 1996/1121 Erection of general purpose agricultural building Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Bressingham Parish Council - Refuse
Concerns about suitability of local roads to cope even with the present level of heavy traffic
Concerns over environmental and safety considerations

Shelfanger Parish Council - Refuse
Roads inadequate for amount of traffic
No benefit to local community
Concern over possibility of leakage
Maize a concern as it is to be grown for digester and not food.

After further information

Shelfanger Parish Council
There is still a feeling of disapproval and map shows some of the crops to be grown in the village.
3.2 District Members

Councillor Weeks (former Cllr) Delegate if officers minded to approve

Councillor Stone Application to be considered by the Management Control Committee

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received

3.4 Environment Agency

No objection subject to Environment permit
A standard rule permit is required
Storage in silage clamps must meet SSAFO standard
Advise construction of tanks should be CQA certified
Encourage secondary containment for the digester and storage tanks

Pollution prevention
Prior to commencement of works a comprehensive working practice procedure should be drawn up.

Waste
The Environmental Protection Regulations are applicable for any off site movements of waste. The developer therefore has a duty of care.
A registered waste carrier should be used to convey the waste material off site to a suitable permitted facility.
The applicant must apply the waste hierarchy in a priority order of prevention.

3.5 SNC Environmental Services (Protection) Expect the environmental effects to be controlled in an effective manner by means of an Environmental Permit
It is possible that whilst the approved and proposed may not give rise to an unacceptable environmental impact this may not be the case with regard to the cumulative impact.

Any approval should include a condition for

A detailed assessment of the potential impact of noise and odour from the proposed facility on the residents of the area is undertaken which:
Is to the written approval of the DPA
Considers the cumulative impact of any anaerobic digestion facility in the area that either exists or has a valid planning approval.
Identifies any measures required to prevent an unacceptable impact on residents of the area from the proposed plant either individually or cumulatively with any anaerobic digestion facility in the area that either exists or has a valid planning approval.
That any measures required to prevent an unacceptable impact on residents of the area that are identified by the report are implemented prior to the proposal being first brought into use.

3.6 NCC Highways Traffic statement submitted will need ot be revised to take in the previously approved anaerobic digestion facility.
The applicant should clearly state whether or not the previous consent is to be rescinded

96
Further detailed breakdown of construction traffic movements are requested

No details regarding gas exportation are given or the location of the proposed pipe line.

After further information received
Support subject to
Condition for construction management
Condition for wheel cleaning
Provision of new access road
Pipeline details

3.7 SNC Ecologist
Submitted Plans
No comments received
Further information
No ecological information available so difficult to make comment/support application

3.8 SNC Flood Defence Officer
Do not wish to object but have the following comments
Flood risk unlikely to propose a significant risk
Surface water drainage
Ensure adequate capacity exists within existing pond
Surface water arising from the site should as far as practicable mimic surface water flows arising from site prior to development.
Only clean water should be allowed to enter system and measures to minimise contamination

Dirty water
Should be part of a separate system to storm water drainage. Not acceptable for dirty water to discharge to soakaways or watercourse. All run off from silage clamps and wash down should be diverted to dirty water storage areas.
DAS advise that run off from silage clamps be directed to an above ground pre pit and fed back for re use
Measures should be taken to prevent run off

3.7 SNC Conservation Officer
Impact on setting of listed building is minimal and the issues primarily concern landscape impact.

3.8 SNC Landscape Officer
Original Comments
Unable to support application.

The submitted Landscape and visual Appraisal has not been undertaken in accordance with the GLVIA3 and as such is not as useful as it might be. Submitted information should be revised

Planting proposals that should include areas further away for greater screening impact

Comments on further information received
Landscaping condition
### Assessment

#### 4.1

The development comprises of two domed storage tanks (around 6m high from ground level x 31m diameter), together with a digester tank (7m high from ground level x 28.88m in diameter), a liquid storage tank (9.7 m in diameter and 3m high above ground level), a feed stock hopper 4.5 metres in height, a CHP unit, pump room, flare 10 metres from ground level, upgrading containers, a solid separator 5.5 m in height and four tapered silage clamps with 5m high walls. There is a proposed new access site to the development off Common Road to the east of the site.

#### 4.2

The site area comprises 2.6ha of a 335ha farming estate, predominantly used for pig rearing, chicken rearing and arable farming. Feedstock will be farm based product residues (e.g. manures and rotation crops) with 60% coming from the applicant’s farm and 40% being grown on nearby farm holdings all within 5 km of the plant. The process creates a biogas which will be injected into the national grid network. The site is off Kenninghall Road and will form part of the range of buildings from which existing farming activities already take place. The site is open to view off Stone Lane to the west and north and Common Road to the east.

#### 4.3

There have been two previously approved planning applications for similar development within the immediate area of the application site both on land in the same ownership as this
Should the Development Management Committee be minded to approve this application the applicant is content to enter into a legal agreement to say that the other two sites will not be developed and the recommendation reflects this position in that officers are not looking at the potential cumulative impacts of three AD plants (the proposal and the two already consented).

Principle of development

4.4 In line with the Climate Change Act 2008 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies the Core Planning Principles these include supporting the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate including encouraging the use of renewable resources as well as the need to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

4.5 Paragraphs 93-98 of the NPPF set out the government’s planning policy on renewable energy. Paragraph 93 makes it clear that it plays a key role in the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy which is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

4.6 Paragraphs 97 and 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework are supportive of renewable energy subject to the impacts being acceptable; it states “that local planning authorities should recognise all communities should contribute to energy generation from renewable energy or low carbon sources”. It does not require a need to be demonstrated for the energy they propose to generate. It also states that all applications should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise if the impacts are or can be made acceptable.

4.7 The publication of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in March 2014 gave further guidance on renewable energy. Paragraph ID: 5-003 states “The National Planning Policy Framework explains that all communities have a responsibility to help increase the use and supply of green energy, but this does not mean that the need for renewable energy automatically overrides environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities. As with other types of development, it is important that the planning concerns of local communities are properly heard in matters that directly affect them.”

4.8 The PPG also emphasises that the need for low carbon energy does not override environmental protections and consideration needs to be given to cumulative impacts of renewable energy development, there is also a need to consider local topography, protection of heritage assets, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as amenity.

4.9 Furthermore, the PPG emphasises that the need to address all planning considerations and stresses the need for renewable energy does not override environmental protection and concerns of local people need to be properly heard.

4.10 At a local level policy ULT13 in the South Norfolk Local Plan deals with renewable energy. This policy is generally consistent with the NPPF, but it does not provide a positive strategy and support for community led schemes as promoted by the NPPF. The key planning considerations relevant to the proposal include visual impact, pollution, highways, protection of heritage assets and other designations. For the purposes of considering this application the policy can be given substantial weight.

4.11 The emerging development management policy DM4.2 also takes a positive approach to renewable energy projects as long as the adverse impacts do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the benefits. This policy however, is not yet part of the Development Plan. It has been afforded little
4.12 The policy position is therefore generally supportive of renewable energy provision subject to there being no particular negative impacts in terms of site specific matters e.g. highway safety, visual impact, neighbour amenity.

4.13 The site is located in the open countryside outside of the Development Limits defined in the Development Plan. Policy ENV8 of the local plan resists development outside development boundary unless certain circumstances exist. The supporting text to this policy highlights that farm diversification projects considered under EMP8 would be capable of being considered positively outside of a development limit.

4.14 Policy EMP8 permits farm diversification schemes subject to certain criteria being met, including that they would be ancillary to the agricultural use of the farm holding, not be harmful to the surrounding landscape, ecology, public access or residential amenity and that the site is accessible (but more so in relation to uses that would attract the general public which this would not do so). Policy 17 of the JCS also permits farm diversification and small scale and medium scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified. It is considered that the AD plant would qualify as a farm diversification project in principle in accordance with these policies on the basis that will produce energy derived predominantly from matter produced no the site (chicken litter, manure, non-food crops). The remaining planning implications of policy EMP8 eg landscape impact etc will be assessed in the following paragraphs.

4.15 Having established that the principle of this renewable energy facility is acceptable in planning terms, the remaining key considerations in determining the planning application are as follows:

- loss of agricultural land (whether it is appropriate to provide this development on agricultural land including an assessment on agricultural grades),
- impact on open countryside and impact on landscape,
- impact on residential amenity including odour, noise, traffic movements,
- impact on heritage assets,
- impact on flood risk and drainage,
- impact on ecology,
- renewable energy and community benefits, and,
- cumulative impact issues

Loss of agricultural land

4.16 Para 112 of the NPPF states that ‘local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Local plan policy ENV21 seeks to protect against the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (this is defined within the NPPF as Grades 1, 2 and 3a) unless it can be demonstrated that the development cannot be located within development limits, or on previously developed land or on poorer quality farmland, and the need for the development outweighs the agricultural considerations.

4.17 The site would be located on grade 3 agricultural land. In the absence of undertaking site investigations it is not possible to determine whether the land to be used for the AD plant is 3a or 3b. On the basis, it is considered appropriate to consider whether the development could be located within development limits, or on previously developed land or on poorer quality farmland as highlighted in Policy ENV21.

4.18 It is considered that an anaerobic digester by nature of its operation would not be suitable within a development limits as it is highly likely that it would be incompatible with neighbouring land users. Likewise, it is considered that brownfield sites would more than likely lead to the same issues.
It is also evident that the applicant’s holding does not have any lower grade land within its holding (grade 4 or 5) having checked Natural England’s Agricultural land Classification Maps. Furthermore, the site area of the AD plant is relatively small and would therefore lead to only a modest loss of agricultural land in any event. With these points in mind it is considered that the requirements of Policy ENV21 have been met.

4.19 In having due regard for the guidance contained in relevant PPG, on the basis of the above assessment, officers are therefore satisfied that there has been sufficient consideration of the choice of location in relation to agricultural land loss and there is no policy provision that weighs against the proposal being considered acceptable in principle in this regard.

Development in open countryside and impact on landscape

4.20 The site is located in the open countryside outside of the Development Limits defined in the Development Plan. Government guidance in the NPPF and policy 2 in the JCS place a strong emphasis on the protection of the landscape and the countryside. In addition to the renewable energy policies, para 17 of the NPPF requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and para 109 seeks to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

4.21 The land and surrounding area is flat and open from all surrounding roads, the existing farm buildings are prominent without any screening from trees or hedges. The three elements of the proposal which will be most visible within the landscape are the domed tanks which measure approximately 7 metres in height and the flare (a stainless steel stack that will only be used in the event of maintenance or in an emergency to burn the gas produced by the plant) which is a total of 10 metres in height. The remainder of the development is lower but will remain visible given the open nature of the site. Although the domes will be visible the materials are to be agreed and are intended to be a recessive element of the landscape with the general appearance of plain, agricultural buildings. Furthermore, the proposal is sited in close proximity to existing agricultural buildings so as to minimise incursion of built form into the countryside. Correspondence is taking place with regard to further landscaping and planting and the inclusion of a landscape condition to mitigate the visual appearance of the proposed development given the open nature of the site will ensure a suitable scheme is provided. On balance although the proposal will be visible within the landscape setting it would not result in any significant visual harm to the rural landscape.

Residential amenity including odour, noise, traffic movements

4.22 A significant number of objections letters have been received to the proposal and although not the only concerns, the main three issues are that of noise, odour and traffic.

4.23 With regard to odour, the chicken and pig manure to be used in the process would be sourced from the applicants own farms and is already being produced in any event, therefore, it is considered that no more odour is being created than already occurs, the moving of these materials in themselves is not considered to be a significant concern in respect of odour.

4.24 The waste from the AD plant after the process has been undertaken is spread back onto the land as an organic bio fertiliser and soil improver will be produced from the digestion process, which will be returned to local farms as a replacement for artificial fertilisers and to improve soil quality. Firstly, the use of fertilisers on agricultural land frequently takes place as part of an agricultural process, and secondly this in itself, is not the subject of planning control and as such it is not considered this justifies any significant objection in planning terms. It should be noted that this product would be transported via a pipe line to a number of locations where it will be drawn off and then spread on the land in that locality. The use of such a pipeline will limit the impacts (smells) of transporting this product.
In terms of noise, once the plant is operational it will run 24 hours a day every day of the week, in acknowledgement of this and the proximity of the neighbouring properties to the site, the Environmental Services team has been consulted. They have confirmed that they have no objections or detailed comments to make with regard to the above referenced planning application, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework section 122, primarily due to the development needing to be the subject of effective control via the Environment Agency via environmental permit, should permission be granted.

With regard to traffic movements, concern has been raised by local residents and the Parish Council. The feedstock for the plant will be generated from the animal waste and energy crop produced and grown on the applicants farm and feed crops from other farms within 5 km of the site. Much of the traffic movement already associated with the animal waste and feed crops would occur regardless of this process being undertaken, with waste from the farm and any crops grown would need to be transported from the site if they were not being used by an AD plant and likewise for any neighbouring farms. On this basis it is considered that the traffic movements associated with the feedstock element of the process would not significantly compromise local highway safety.

In terms of the waste from the process, the information provided with regard to traffic movements states that providing the pipeline to take away the digest will reduce the number of vehicle movements associated with the site.

The application has been assessed by the Highway Authority (Norfolk County Council) and they have confirmed that they have no objection. In reaching this view, they have had due regard to the revocation of the two extant permissions for AD Plants in the vicinity.

I have for completeness and clarity copied below the highway officers comments:

“The current application involves the provision of a new access road from Common Road which will reduce the effect of traffic levels on Kenninghall Road to some extent.

Whilst there is no guarantee over future activities, It is recognised that the farm already generates a number of vehicle movements on this part of the network through crop /manure transportation. As an agricultural site, the movement of crops and residual waste can currently take place to and from the premises without restriction (other than appropriate licences etc) and outside of the planning system. And the vehicles associated, are already on the local road network.

Whether the sugar beet within the holding for instance is lifted and either taken straight to the factory or brought to the farm for storage or potentially used in the Digester, is not something that we have any control over.

The crop / manure transportation is likely to be fluid (both in terms of material and direction of travel) and therefore unlikely to prove any different to normal farming activity that could take place. This being the case, there is not a great deal that we could do to legally sustain a highway objection.

According to the submitted vehicle generation figures, the current proposal differs in terms of the number of vehicles to be generated, from the 2013 permission, notably in terms of the number of vehicles required to remove the digestate from the site. The current proposal requiring four times as many movements for this aspect than previously. This aspect alone resulting in around 50 percent of the total traffic movements. However the latest information shows that a number of pipelines are to be provided to pump the liquid digestate to the surrounding fields. The information states that by providing the pipelines this will result in cutting the number of vehicles required to remove the digestate by 85%.
This aspect is therefore a key issue in reducing the overall traffic generation and the likely impact on the public highway.

The drawing submitted for the pipelines is to a large scale. As such I consider that additional details will be required for this aspect and the proposed draw off points. The routes for the pipelines will need to be within private land as the pipelines cannot be laid within the highway other than for any transverse crossings. I am happy for these details to be provided under a condition, providing that the principle of the pipelines is feasible and the method of draining the digestate is acceptable.

The construction phase of the development is however a new and fairly definitive aspect. During the construction phase, the transport statement advises that this will continue for approximately 30 weeks and over this time the number of vehicle movements generated by construction traffic is 200 HGV in addition to staff vehicles. This number is very similar to that proposed for the 2013 consent and there are therefore no highway objections to that aspect.

However, taking into account the rural routes serving the farm and the total number of construction vehicle movements, we would wish to agree the route to be used by traffic associated with the construction of the facility. In addition to ensure that this aspect of the development does not result in additional highway maintenance at the taxpayers expense.

The conditions as required by the Highway Authority are included above, subject to these conditions there are no highway grounds of objection to the proposal which accords with IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

In acknowledgement of the above, including the fact that the site would be the subject of an environmental permit, the proposal is considered to accord with the principles of IMP9 and IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Heritage assets

4.30 The farmhouse connected to the site is a listed building but due to the position of the proposed plant and the original farm buildings the impact on the setting of the listed building will be minimal. The distance between the site and other listed buildings within the area is significant enough that the proposal will have no adverse impact on the setting of these buildings.

4.31 In light of the above it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 and will not have an adverse impact on the setting of any listed building.

Flood Risk and Drainage

4.32 The application included a Flood Risk Assessment. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and based upon the information provided and the comments of the Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Defence Officer there are no objections on flood risk or drainage grounds.

Ecology

4.33 Given the proposal would be on open agricultural land, it is not considered necessary to require a detailed ecology study before a decision can be made. However, it is considered appropriate to attach a condition to any subsequent approval which requires further surveys to be undertaken prior to commencement of development in order to inform any mitigation measures, if necessary, required during the construction phase of the development. It is considered that subject to the imposition of this condition it is considered that the scheme is
Renewable energy and community benefits

4.34 The overall impacts of the development have been considered on the loss of agricultural land, landscape impact, impact on local residents, the highway network, heritage assets and ecology on site. Each matter is considered to be adequately addressed subject to the imposition of relevant conditions. The overall harm of the proposed development for the low-carbon energy when balanced against the benefits this would bring is not considered sufficient enough to refuse this application.

Cumulative impact issues

4.35 As previously highlighted in this report, there are two extant permissions for AD plants in the vicinity which are on land in the same ownership as this application and should the Development Management Committee be minded to approve this application the applicant is content to enter into a legal agreement to say that the other two sites will not be developed and the recommendation reflects this position in that officers are not looking at the potential cumulative impacts of three AD plants (the proposal and the two already consented).

Other matters: Energy Crop

4.36 Concerns have been raised by the local residents regarding the loss of agricultural land for the sole use of growing energy crops for the benefit of the Anaerobic Digester and the financial benefits for the applicant. However, this plant is small scale in terms of energy production and consequently I do not consider that there is sufficient loss of agricultural land to have an adverse impact on food production.

Local financial considerations

4.37 This application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for any buildings which people would enter into, but due to the nature of the proposals there is no chargeable floorspace in this development.

4.38 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011 (as amended). The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and as detailed in the above report the impacts have been given due consideration. Whilst there are no significant environmental impacts that would require an Environmental Statement to be submitted with the application the above issues in relation to sustainability remain.

4.39 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.

Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 6 and 16 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV8, ENV9, IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, IMP10 and UTL13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The benefits of exploiting a renewable resource in the national interest are not outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality. The proposal will not cause a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway. Subject to the conditions the proposal will not
have an adverse impact on the character, appearance or amenity of the area and is therefore recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 and Chris Raine 01508 533841
larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
craines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No** : 2015/0707/F  
**Parish** : ALPINGTON  

**Applicants Name** : Alpington Development Land Ltd  
**Site Address** : Land South Of Wheel Road Alpington Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Erection of 10 residential units (Class C3) and school car parking area (Class Sui Generis) with associated landscaping and highway works.

**Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted details  
3. Visibility splays  
4. Provision of on-site parking, access  
5. Construction worker parking  
6. Off-site highway works  
7. Ecological mitigation  
8. Western boundary hedgerow  
9. Retention of trees and hedgerows  
10. Planting scheme to be agreed  
11. Hedge heights  
12. Tree and hedgerow protection  
13. External lighting details  
14. Contaminated land  
15. Remediation scheme  
16. Unexpected contamination  
17. Air Source Heat Pump Specifications  
18. Archaeological works  
19. Discharge rates of surface water  
20. Water efficiency  
21. Renewable/ low carbon energy  
22. Materials to be agreed  
23. PD removal for southern boundary  
24. Surface Water Drainage

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 15: Service Villages  
Policy 20: Implementation
Development Management Committee

22 July 2015

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
   ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
   TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
   Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to
   the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage.
   Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Autumn 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
evelopment in South Norfolk
   DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM3.1 Housing Quality
   DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
   DM3.9 Design Principles
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
   DM4.1 Building Fabric Energy Efficiency, Carbon Compliance and Allowable Solutions
   DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
   DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
   DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
   DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
   Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide

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

S66 (1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission
for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the
case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the
building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it
possesses."

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other
land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special
attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance
of that area."

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent planning history
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

(Summarised comments)

09.07.15 – PC position has not changed. Councillors could neither approve nor refuse the application but raised concerns regarding the ratio of small dwellings to large on the main site and the small amount of affordable housing. Suggest that if permission is granted the amount of smaller lower cost dwellings is increased to meet local needs.

Councillors are requesting sight of a construction plan for the development to include security arrangements during construction, traffic movements and environmental plans.

Councillors could neither approve not refuse the application but raised concerns about the ratio of small dwellings to large on the main site and the small amount of affordable housing. Suggest that if permission is granted the amount of smaller lower cost dwellings. Planners should reconsider the ratio of large dwellings to small dwellings. The amount of affordable housing and low cost smaller dwellings should be increased to meet the needs of downsizers, singles, young people and young families of the village.

3.2 District Member

If minded to approve agree to a delegated decision. Happy with this application.

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd

(Summarised comments)

There are assets owned by AW within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site therefore request an advisory note should permission be granted. Sisland Water Recycling Centre will have available capacity for the foul drainage flows. The sewerage capacity has available capacity for these flows. Surface water details are not relevant to Anglian Water.

3.4 Ecologist

(Summarised comments)

No additional comments to make.

The ecological assessment is fit for purpose and indicates the site is of low ecological value. Should you be minded to approve the application you may wish to consider ecological enhancements in line with the NPPF. With reference to the ecological report I would suggest 5 swift boxes and 3 sparrow terraces.

3.5 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)

(Summarised comments)

Having reviewed the proposal we would recommend that the following conditions and informatives be attached to any permission granted:
- site investigation and risk assessment (contaminated land) plus site remediation;
- reporting unexpected contamination;
- air source heat pump specifications; and
- lighting condition.

3.6 NCC Highways

(Summarised comments)

As a preferred site for development (ALP1) the principle of development on this site has been accepted. The proposal for a new car park will be of significant benefit to reduce on street parking outside the school.
The provision of a frontage footway for pedestrians is as requested as part of the pre-application discussions. The proposed site layout is acceptable however the layout does not show any vision splays at each of the new entrance points onto Wheel Road. The site layout should be amended to show these. It is not clear whether the existing front hedge is to be removed in total or retained in part. Conditions and informative note requested if planning permission is granted.

3.7 SNC Affordable Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager (Summarised)
The affordable housing is an acceptable mix and the designs and floorspaces are also acceptable. No objection to the application.

3.8 SNC Environmental Waste Strategy
No comments received

3.9 SNC Flood Defence Officer (Summarised comments)
Request clarification as to whether there are two discharge points to the off-site ditch and if so these should be reduced or combined to provide a single point of discharge or no greater than greenfield run-off rate from the site.

We are satisfied that the future management of the surface water drainage systems has been identified, as well as the ownership and responsibility details for the footpath and ditch to the west. Details of greenfield run-off rates remain outstanding with the proposed discharge rates post-development.

No objection but recommend conditions and informatives. EA surface water flood risk map indicated medium to low risk of flooding within the highway adjacent to the site. The applicant should ensure that any removal of verges to provide access does not provide a pathway for floodwater and risk to the development. Details of ditches in centre and to the south of the site are required to be shown, including future management and maintenance of these features. Clarification is also sought for land to the west of the site, including the PROW.

3.10 NHS England
No comments received

3.11 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
No comments received

3.12 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.13 SNC Landscape Officer (Summarised comments)
In terms of the wider visual impact I have no particular concerns. Provided the boundaries are as per the submitted layout the overall view from the south will be similar to what is already there.

(following submission of additional comments re. the hedgerow) - if the hedge is replanted on a new alignment it may prove to equally as beneficial and visually significant in the long-term but the historical line (it’s ‘importance’) will be lost.
The emerging policy presumes in favour of retention unless the need or benefits of a development clearly outweigh their loss.

The submitted AIA includes an assessment of the existing hedgerow which concludes it [H1] is classified as 'important'. Its removal is therefore contrary to emerging policy DM4.9. If its removal could be avoided I would be able to support the scheme.

3.14 Environment Agency

The site is in flood zone 1 and is less than 1 hectare in area therefore we have no flood risk comments to make. No record of contamination on site.

3.15 Public Rights Of Way

(Summarised comments)

Alpington footpath no. 9 runs to the west of the application site. The site layout plan indicates retention of the footpath in its current position with a minimum width of 4m. Plots 1 & 4 will have a hedge which will form the boundary of the footpath and have the effect of enclosing the footpath, removing the open aspect of the path. The 4 metre width should be considered as a minimum and should not be encroached upon by the new hedgerow.

3.16 Historic Environment Service

(Summarised comments)

Report has now been received. It is likely that some of the findings are structural remains of a medieval roadside settlement. Consequently significant heritage assets with archaeological interest will be affected by the proposed development. If planning permission is granted we request that this is subject to a programme of archaeological work in accordance with the NPPF. An archaeological trial trench was carried out prior to submission of the application but we do not yet have the final report although the evaluation confirmed the presence of archaeological features. We will respond accordingly on receipt of the report from the archaeological contractor.

3.17 SNC Design Officer

(Summarised comments)

The site does not sit within a very historic context; the most important factor here will be how the development will be viewed from the open countryside to the south and from the street. Existing neighbouring properties are predominantly modern bungalows and smaller historic dwellings although there are larger Victorian properties to the east. Provision of the new car park for the school would be beneficial to break up the parking, with some planting so the car does not dominate. I do not have significant concerns about the layout or grain of development. There is plenty of space around the dwellings and sufficient amenity space. Of more concern is how the development is viewed from the outside and the access to the rear buildings could appear more organic. The affordable houses are small in scale but this is not an unusual form although it might be preferable to re-orientate plot 6. This would improve the internal layout and the group would read better with the larger detached houses. The larger properties have similar forms which results in a uniform appearance when looking from the countryside and the buildings appear larger in scale without relief in the elevations. Modifications to the form do not have to be substantial to achieve some variation - the south elevations could be more broken up or the width of the principle sections could be shortened.
Changing the massing would break up the form although it does not need to be done to all four units. The end unit at the front west of the site could also be change and changes in materials can relate to changes in sections. Materials and style references are acceptable in principle and the indication is they are likely to be of good quality. It is important to get the indicative design detailing right at this stage.

3.18 Representations

9 responses including 2x letters of comment, 4x letters of objection and 3x letters of support:

Comments
- this is a main route through the village which often gets clogged with parent’s car. It is sensible to assume 10 dwellings means 20 new cars and the real problem is the additional traffic around an increasingly busy crossroads. Combined with the absence of local facilities it seems a curious choice of location to build new houses.
- I have met with the applicant on several occasions and appreciate the consultation process which has been informative and constructive. I also acknowledge some of my comments have been reflected in the application. However, request feedback on a number of areas including distances, lighting, planting and parking.
- I do not wish for any housing to be built on the site however I am aware of the need for new housing in general.
- as there appears to be no reasonable grounds to object and I cannot offer my support either I would like to register no comment.
- any restrictions that can be imposed on lighting will continue to be appreciated.

Objections
- object to this development on the grounds it is a new development and we were told there would be no new development in Alpington until the road access into the village was improved. This improvement has not taken place.
- absolutely crazy another application is taking place; our highways cannot take any more traffic.
- I have photographic evidence of the road during school time and it is extremely dangerous.
- if this goes ahead, why houses and not bungalows like the rest of the village.
- the field is huge so why not put the housing down the other end where it will cause less problems.
- we are losing our countryside with no consideration for the environment, highways or the residents.
- a meeting for the residents should take place before anything happens as the village cannot take any more building.
- the development is unwarranted and excessive and the top down housing requirement was mandated and is not welcomed by the majority of residents.
- main concerns are the increase in traffic on the access rural lands, specifically Slade Lane, Church Road, Wheel Road, Burgate Lane and Berhapton Road.
- additional traffic movements of around 100 per day will be generated by 10 houses and I would like traffic calming measures and pinch points to be installed on the above roads where they are dangerous and overloaded at peak times.
- please note that many of these are one track with no pavements.
Walkers, cyclists and horse riders are already jousting with fast moving traffic.
- it is the duty of planning to make roads safe for all users.
- it is important to minimise light pollution and maintain the night sky.
- street lighting should not be mandated - it is not welcomed or needed.
- I do not endorse the lighting of the new parking area and path as it will impact upon people on Wheel Road.
- why are we wasting money asking for comments_
- our objections regarding sewage, traffic and the extension of the village boundary have all fallen on deaf ears and we will have to suffer the consequences not only after the development but with further extensions to the boundary in the future.

Support
- the village has had a housing quota imposed on it by central government and I do not believe the highway network can support any more vehicles however this application is the best option for the village in light of the above.
- design of the new housing has obviously been well thought out, reducing the impact of the solid line of housing.
- scheme provides school car parking and 3x affordable homes, all of which are needed in the village.
- I am impressed by the provision of small closes and do not believe that it will impact on views from existing houses as has been suggested.
- housing floor plans are modern and suitable for families, a much needed increase in a village which needs younger residents.
- consultation with residents prior to submission is refreshing in this day and age.
- if highways approve I would like them to impose some form of limited parking in Wheel Road, such as timed zones as I still believe we will end up with parking on the road outside the school.
- I would ask that the 3x affordable houses are designated for local people only.
- our field and premises join the proposed site and we have been in consultation with the developer regarding the school car parking area.
- our only concern is the need for the path and car park to be lit during early evenings in the winter months if it is to be practical for staff parking.
- a car park will improve on road parking around the school.
- A well designed scheme reducing impacts on residents that will be attractive to all.

4 Assessment

Introduction and site context

4.1 The application proposes 10 new residential properties on a greenfield site within the settlement of Alpington.
The site lies outside the current defined Development Boundaries for Alpington although it has been identified as a preferred option for 10 dwellings within the emerging Site Allocations Plan (ALP01). The proposal includes 3 affordable dwellings as well as a small area of car parking for the adjacent primary school, Alpington & Bergh Aton Church of England VA Primary School.
Existing residential properties, predominantly single storey, are located to the north of the application site whilst to the south the site opens into agricultural land which extends towards Nichols Road and Church Meadow Lane. Alpington & Bergh Apton primary school is adjacent to the east of the site and the Wheel of Fortune public house is to the west, separated from the site by an existing Public Right of Way (PROW).

There are some ground level changes across the site, with the land gently sloping down towards the primary school to the east. An historic hedgerow with some trees forms the northern boundary of the site and Wheel Road immediately abuts this boundary.

Planning law requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan comprises the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted March 2011) and the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) (originally adopted December 2003). The Council are in the process of preparing a new Local Plan and site allocations and these are currently under examination by the Inspector and as such do not carry full weight. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Framework.

The key matters for consideration when assessing this proposal are: the principle of development in this location, the design and layout of the site, highways matters, site drainage, residential amenity (existing and proposed) and ecology and landscape issues. Each of these matters will be considered in turn below.

Principle of development

National and local planning policies promote sustainable development and in particular seek to encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites in order to avoid development of greenfield land. Development should be well-located and appropriate in form, design and scale for its context. In particular Policy JCS15 identifies the settlement of Yelverton (including part of the parish of Alpington) as being a Service Village and therefore able to accommodate small-scale housing growth with the development plan period. JCS15 indicates that development at a scale of 10-20 dwellings per Service Village should be achievable, subject to detailed site constraints. Appropriate exception sites may also come forward for development within this timeframe.

South Norfolk Council is currently progressing the Site Specific Allocations and Policies document which has identified this site as suitable for a development of 10 dwellings (ALP01). In addition, this policy also sets out that proposals for the site should be frontage development, incorporate a public footpath along Wheel Road and include appropriate boundary treatments along the southern boundary of the site. Despite objections to this allocation it carries significant weight on the basis that there are no proposed modifications suggested by the Inspector to make changes to this allocation policy.

As noted in the introduction to this assessment, the applicant proposes a total of 10 dwellings and a new public footpath on this site in accordance with the requirements of Policy ALP1. It is considered that the application proposes a suitable quantum of development within a sustainable location and on a preferred site, as allocated within the emerging planning policy framework. The development is therefore considered to accord with the principles of the national planning policy framework, as well as Joint Core Strategy Policy 15, and to also generally accord with the emerging requirements of ALP1.

Design and layout

A high standard of design is promoted throughout the planning policy framework. In particular, paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that good design is a key part of sustainable development and paragraph 64 extends this theme and directs that permission should be refused for development of poor design.
Paragraph 66 notes that applicants are expected to work with those who will be affected by development and local planning authorities should consider scheme where this is in evidence more favourably. At a local level JCS Policy 2 also promotes good design and emerging Development Management policy DM3.9 sets out the aspirations for the District.

The application proposes a combination of 7 large detached dwellings set within spacious plots and 3 smaller affordable housing units. Earlier design concepts for the site are illustrated within the application and demonstrate the evolving design approach for the site and reflect, in part, responses obtained following engagement with the local community, as well as comments of the planning department prior to submission. Further alterations have also been made following the submission of the application and receipt of consultee comments, in particular those of the Design Officer.

It is noted that the large properties proposed do not reflect the development to the north of Wheel Road however larger properties are in evidence to the east of the site and elsewhere within the village of Alpington, as demonstrated by the 'Village Scale Map' in the Design and Access Statement. Concerns about the scale of the development along the village boundary have largely been addressed by the minor alterations that have been made to the properties, effectively reducing the perceived bulk of the properties, particularly when viewed from the rural setting to the south of the site. Minor changes to the palette of materials proposed, as well as modifications to the details of some of the elevations have alleviated the uniform appearance of the larger detached properties, thus creating interest and having the effect of reducing the overall mass of the development. The changes that have been made by the applicant in this respect are considered to result in an acceptable form of development.

The affordable housing units are located in the north east corner of the site, closest to Wheel Road and the area noted as parking provision for the neighbouring school. Following concerns about the unbalanced relationship between these properties and the larger dwelling the applicant has repositioned the dwelling proposed on plot 8. This results in a stronger group of dwellings that has a more successful relationship with the rest of the site, and in particular with plot 7 immediately to the rear of these properties. (Plot 7 has also been moderately reduced in height to address this concern). These changes have also improved the internal layout of this property.

To the east of the application site the application proposes a strip of car parking for use by staff and visitors of the adjacent primary school. The parking layout is constrained is simple in form however the addition of a small section of landscaping in the centre of the site will reduce the dominance of the parked car within the wider setting.

On balance, whilst the scale of the proposed dwellings is generally greater than those within the immediate context of the application site it is considered that the amended scheme is an appropriate addition to village and can be accommodated on this generous site. The development has an attractive layout which allows for some long views through the site to the open countryside beyond. The applicant has conceived a development of good quality design and character that accord with the principles of those policies set out above.

Highways matters

Development proposals should not endanger the safe and free flow of traffic on the highways network as set out in Policy IMP08 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the wider planning policy framework. New development should also incorporate sufficient on-site parking for occupiers. For the reasons set out below it is considered that the proposals meet the requirements of these policy objectives.
4.16 A number of concerns have been raised relating to the increase in vehicular movements to and from the site following the occupation of this development with particular reference to the capacity on the existing highway network and the current on-road parking associated with the school.

4.17 The Highways Officer has assessed the proposal and following the submission of an amended site layout incorporating the visibility splays for the access points to both the residential development and the school car park has confirmed no objection to the scheme.

4.18 A number of planning conditions have been requested to secure the details submitted by the applicant at this time and these will be included on the permission accordingly. The Highways Officer has not raised concerns about the capacity of the local highway network, noting that the principle of development of this quantum in this location has been accepted, but has commented that the provision of a school car park as part of this scheme will be of benefit in reducing the current on-street parking. Whilst it is noted that suggestions have been received from local residents regarding the installation of traffic calming measures around the site it is not considered that this development would result in additional traffic movements to such a degree that would justify this requirement.

4.19 The parking provision within the site is generous and includes a mix of marked parking bays for the affordable housing units and detached garages for the larger dwellings. The proposals meet the requirements of the Norfolk County Council parking standards and it is noted that due to the spacious nature of the plots additional parking and/or visitor parking could accommodated on the site without significant impact on the site frontage.

Landscape and ecology matters

4.20 Landscape and ecological proposals form an important aspect of design, as set out in Local Plan Policy IMP2 and JCS Policies 1 and 2. This recognition of the critical role landscaping and ecology mitigation can have to the success of a scheme is re-iterated in section 11 of the NPPF.

4.21 The development proposes the removal of the hedgerow that currently extends along the site frontage, abutting Wheel Road in order to allow for the addition of a footpath in this location, as set out in ALP1. It is noted by the Landscape Officer that this hedgerow is an 'important' hedgerow as defined by emerging Development Management policy DM4.9 and as such its removal should be considered contrary to this policy. The applicant proposes the replacement of this hedgerow which, as the Landscape Officer recognises, will in time be of similar or greater ecological value to the site however concern has been raised that its historic importance is irreplaceable. This consideration must be assessed in conjunction with the policy requirement for the applicant to provide a footpath along the site frontage to connect the existing footpaths either side of the site. The Highways Officer has verbally advised that retaining the hedgerow and positioning the footpath within the site would not be acceptable and, in terms of the safety of users as well as the amenities of residents of the site, I do not consider this to be a suitable solution. Whilst recognising the emerging status of the conflicting policies, I consider that in this instance greater weight should be afforded to the requirements of ALP1 as the provision of the footpath is a site specific requirement for development in this location.

4.22 Site plan drawing IW-SA-20-00-01 Revision C02 outlines the proposed planting for the site in general terms whilst the Arboricultural Impact Assessment sets out in greater detail the existing landscaping of the site and the impact of the development on these site features. This assessment concludes that whilst there will be some impact on the trees and hedgerows to be retained on the site the overall impact of the development would be 'neutral'.
Whilst objecting to the loss of the northern hedgerow the Landscape Officer has not raised a concern about the remainder of the landscaping proposals and as such I conclude that there is no objection to these proposals. I therefore consider that, subject to suitably worded conditions requiring the submission of a landscape planting scheme and the protection of those features to be retained on and adjacent to the site, this proposal accords with the principles of those policies outlined above.

4.23 Whilst the proposed development does not encroach upon the Public Right of Way (PROW) to the west of the site, the PROW Officer has commented that the proposed hedgerows along the west boundary of the site will have the effect of enclosing this previously open aspect footpath. This will inevitably alter its character however it will be for a relatively short section only and the PROW Officer has not raised an objection to this aspect of the proposal. They have determined, however, that the 4m width of the footpath should not be encroached upon by the new hedgerows and as such a condition will secure this in perpetuity in recognition of the importance of protecting PROW's as set out in paragraph 75 of the NPPF.

4.24 In terms of the visual impact of the development proposal within the wider landscape, the Landscape Officer has advised that the scheme will not have a significant impact. On reflection I concur with this assessment and consider that this is due to the comparatively small size of the site within the wider landscape and its close proximity to the existing development boundary and built form along Wheel Road. Furthermore, specimen tree planting within the site as well the enclosure of the site predominantly by hedgerow will assist with reducing the visual encroachment of the development into the surrounding landscape. Precise details of the boundary treatments are to be secured by condition and permitted development rights for the erection of fences and other means of enclosure are removed along the southern boundary in recognition of the importance of this boundary, as referred to in ALP1.

4.25 Turning to the site ecology, I have noted that the ecologist has recorded that the submitted ecological assessment is fit for purpose. This assessment concludes that the site is of low ecological value. This reflects its current arable usage. The ecologist has suggested that ecological enhancements in line with the NPPF should be considered for this site, as well as more the more detailed requirement for bird boxes and terraces on site. Further discussions with the ecologist have indicated that these enhancements should include swift boxes and sparrow terraces and accordingly appropriate conditions to secure these details have been applied to the permission (see page 22 of the ecological assessment).

4.26 The landscaping and ecological enhancements proposed for the site are therefore considered to accord with the principles of those policies set out above.

Site drainage

4.27 In accordance with JCS Policy 1 new development should be located to minimise flood risk (including taking into account climate change and more extreme weather events) and must include appropriate mitigation, through both design and the implementation of sustainable drainage options. The national planning policy framework also promotes this approach to drainage.

4.28 The application site is noted as being within flood zone 1 and therefore has the lowest probability of flooding however the Flood Defence Officer has commented that the highway adjacent to the site has a medium to low risk of flooding and care therefore needs to be taken to ensure that works to the verges adjacent to the site does not increase this risk.

4.29 The applicant has incorporated drainage ditches within and adjacent to the boundaries of the site. These will connect to existing off-site drainage ditches which will accept the discharge from the site.
The Flood Defence Officer is satisfied with this solution and has also confirmed that the proposed maintenance and management arrangements for the surface water drainage systems are acceptable. However the applicant's attention is drawn to the requirement for adequate details to be included within transfer documents to ensure future occupiers are aware of their responsibilities regarding regular inspection and maintenance of the drainage system.

4.30 The development proposal is considered to accord with the principles of the planning policy framework, being located on land with a low risk probability of flooding and incorporating suitable drainage options within the boundaries of the site. The applicant has also confirmed the required capacity for wastewater connection with Anglian Water, as required by ALP1.

Affordable housing

4.31 In accordance with current local planning policy requirements the applicant is required to provide 30% affordable housing as part of this proposal for 10 dwellings (JCS Policy 4: Housing Delivery). As noted above three dwellings on the site are to be affordable housing units. The Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that this provision complies with the above policy and also that the dwellings are of an acceptable mix and design. It has verbally been confirmed that the alterations to Plot 8 are acceptable. These dwellings will be secured by an appropriate legal agreement.

Residential amenity

4.32 As set out in Policy IMP09 of the South Norfolk Local Plan development should not result in significant adverse effects on residents in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or damaging the setting, privacy or amenities of nearby dwellings. It is also reasonable to assess the impact of the development on the future occupiers of the site (in addition to the existing residents within close proximity to the site) as appropriate design solutions form a fundamental planning consideration throughout the planning framework (paragraph 56, NPPF).

4.33 Due to the separation distance of the between the proposed properties and those opposite the development is not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities of the existing residents closest to the site in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy. The relationship between the proposed dwellings is also considered to be acceptable due to the generous spacing between the properties and the orientation of the dwellings.

4.34 I have noted the concerns that have been expressed by some local residents regarding lighting of both the residential properties and the car park, including a request for restrictions on external lighting as part of any permission. Whilst I am sympathetic to these concerns on balance I do not consider it to be reasonable to restrict external lighting within a residential development. The site plan indicates lighting within the proposed school car park will be provided by low level lighting bollards which are considered to have minimal impact but provide sufficient lighting to meet the needs of the users of the car park, particularly during the darker winter months. Precise details of these bollards have not been received at this time and as specifications are variable it is necessary to secure these details by condition. A further planning condition will also require the agreement of the local planning authority prior to any further lighting installations within the car park in the future in order to provide continued protection for the local residents from unacceptable light pollution. As a final matter, concern has been raised about the addition of street lighting along Wheel Road as a direct consequence of the addition of the footpath. I understand that this is unlikely and requests are usually only considered by Norfolk County Council if the proposal is within an adoptable highway and is requested by the Parish Council. This is not a matter than can be pursued within the planning system.
For the reasons set out above the scheme is considered to accord with those policies that require good design and in particular seek to protect the amenities of the nearby residents.

Other matters

Contamination

A number of conditions have been requested by the Contamination Officer as it is noted in the submitted documents that further sampling work is required on site to ensure that the site is suitable for the sensitive receptors proposed (i.e. residential development). The request for these conditions is reasonable to protect future occupiers of the site and these conditions have been attached to the permission accordingly.

Archaeology

The applicant has undertaken trial trenching on site as part of the preparation of this planning application. This work has concluded that there are archaeological features on the site which the Historic Environment Service have advised are of significant historical interest. As a consequence of this, and to protect these heritage assets, a programme of archaeological works has been requested. Section 12 of the NPPF has regard to the historic environment - including features of archaeological interest - and it is considered that the proposal can be considered to be in compliance with this, subject to the application of these planning conditions.

Energy and water efficiency

Policy 3 of the JCS requires new residential development of a minimum of 10 dwellings to include sources of ‘decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy’ to meet at least 10% of the scheme’s expected energy requirement, and to meet Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes for water efficiency. The applicant has indicated that air source heat pumps will be installed as part of the development however full specification details for these units have not been supplied at this time therefore a condition securing these details has been requested by the Environmental Protection Team. This is a reasonable request to protect the amenities of residents in accordance with Local Plan Policies IMP9 and IMP10. A further condition will be applied to ensure the water efficiency standards are met.

Provision of the school car park

The creation of a small car park to the east of the site forms part of this application and it is noted that it is the applicant’s intention to ‘gift’ this parcel of land to the adjoining school, Alpington and Bergh Apton primary school. Whilst the acceptability of the car park has been considered as part of the above assessment, the provision of this car park is not a requirement of or conditional upon the acceptability of these proposals and as such has not been a consideration in the determination of the merits of this application. With the exception of ensuring suitable materials, lighting and highway treatments are secured, it is not considered appropriate to secure the provision or gifting of the car park to the school either by condition or an associated section 106 legal agreement.

CIL

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

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

5.1 Following amendments to the original submission to improve the relationships between the proposed dwellings, as well as its appearance within the wider landscape, it is considered that this proposal meets the objectives of both the national and local planning policy framework. In particular the scheme is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and Local Plan Policies ENV9, IMP2, IMP6, IMP8, IMP9 and TRA1. Due consideration has also been given to Policy ALP1 of the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher 01508 533960 and Tracey Lincoln 01508 533814 kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

8. **Appl. No**: 2013/1630/F  
   **Parish**: HEMPNALL

Applicants Name: Mr John Hollis  
Site Address: Springwood Spring Lane Hempnall Norfolk NR15 2NT  
Proposal: Retrospective application for change of use of land to retain existing forestry accommodation (2 no caravans)

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. In accordance with submitted plans
2. Personal permission linked to charcoal burning
3. No additional lighting without details being 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 5: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   HOU 8: Agricultural and forestry dwellings
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
   ENV 14: Habitat protection
   ENV 15: Species protection
   HOU 22: Mobile homes
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
   UTL 15: Contaminated land

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
   DM2.11 Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside
   DM2.1 Employment and business development
   DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
   DM2.7 Agricultural and forestry development
   DM3.1 Housing Quality
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
   DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning/Appeal History

2.1 2009/1336 Retention of two temporary residential caravans for a temporary period of 3 years for a forestry worker and family Approved

2.2 2009/0004 Retention of two temporary residential units for on-site forestry worker and family Refused

2.3 2005/1493 Retention of 2no caravans for a temporary period of 3 years for a forestry worker and family Approved

2.4 2004/0334 Retention of 2no. residential caravans Refused
Appeal dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Hempnall Parish Council Refusal
- As site lies outside the Development Area.
- Impact on protected species particularly important bat populations
- Impact on County Wildlife Site (CWS)

3.2 Topcroft Parish Council Refusal
- Planning Policy for Traveller sites states that LPA should restrict new traveller site development in the open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan
- As site lies outside the Development Area
- Site is also outside SNC traveller’s site locations.
- Concerns in respect of impact of the activity will have on CWS and on protected species

3.3 District Member Objection
- Due to location outside the development area
- Requests that the application is referred to Planning Committee for consideration if minded to approve

3.4 Flood Defence Officer No objections subject to conditions

3.5 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
- Confirms that site is within County Wildlife Site (CWS)
- Contacted the applicant in the past and the wood appears to have been relatively well managed with respect to wildlife, with some restoration of the ancient woodland taking place
- Following a site visit, NWT concluded that further ecological assessments as previously requested, were no longer required as the proposed development is unlikely to impact on the ecology of the wood.
Equally the wood appears to have been managed in accordance with submitted management plan and no reason to believe this will not continue.

- Similar levels of activity happen in many other CWS woodlands, without detrimental ecological impact.
- The areas within the red line are either on or immediately adjacent to existing hard-standing and loss of vegetation will be minimal in relation to CWS as a whole.
- If approval given conditions in relation to protected species and enhancement in agreement with NCC Ecologist.

3.6 Woodland Trust

No comments received.

3.7 NCC Ecologist

To the original scheme:
- No objections subject to conditions in respect of protected species.

To the amended scheme:
- As no additional works will now be undertaken the conditions previously suggested are not necessary, an advise note in respect of bats on site and suggested enhancements is requested.

3.8 NCC Highways

- No objection to retention of two caravans for use by forestry workers.
- However, an objection is raised to the additional traveller pitches on the grounds of the site being in an unsustainable location.

3.9 Environmental Services (Protection)

No comments received.

3.10 Tony Cooke

No comments received.

3.11 Gypsy Liaison Officer

No comments received.

3.12 Representations

24 letters of objection have been received from local residents on the following grounds:
- Impact on surrounding businesses, particularly in respect of security.
- Outside development area and SNC traveller site locations.
- Undesirable precedent for further development/caravans on the site.
- Unsustainable location for a traveller’s site and remoteness from local services.
- Applicant has failed to demonstrate that business is financially viable and that there is a functional need for accommodation on the site.
- Planning history for site and conflict with previous refusals for the caravans.
- Detrimental impact on a County Wildlife Site (CWS), Ancient Woodland, biodiversity, trees and protected species particularly Bats and Great Crested newts.
- Safety concerns due to close proximity to airstrip.
- Detrimental impact on residential amenities of nearby properties.
- Impact on the character of the area.
- Due to the implications regarding the proposal in terms of criminal law and planning policy, we believe that Council has no alternative than to refuse the application.
Furthermore due to the unlawful nature of the application site and being inhabited by the applicant without necessary planning permission consents, enforcement action issued and the applicant removed from the land.

Three letters of support have also been received from local residents on the following grounds:
- Benefits of supporting a local family/business which has operated from the site for many years.
- Business provides a local sustainable source of charcoal whilst managing the woodland.
- Scheme would have a minimal impact in the surrounding landscape.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the change of use of land to retain existing forestry accommodation in the form of two residential caravans on land at Springwood on Spring Lane in Hempnall. The site comprises of 16 hectares (40 acres) of woodland owned and managed by the applicant. The site is in a remote position located outside the development boundaries of any of the surrounding villages. The applicant and his family have been living at the site since 2003.

4.2 Whilst the original application also included the creation of four affordable travellers pitches to enable the stationing of a maximum of 8 no. caravans and the erection of an amenity building on the land, this element has been withdrawn from the application, and therefore the only matter being considered is the retention of the two residential caravans for occupation by a forestry worker.

4.3 The application is accompanied by a management plan and supporting statement, with additional information provided in respect of the financial situation of the business and how the business has operated over recent years.

The main issues in this case are; the principle of development in this location, design, scale and visual impact, highway safety, residential amenity and biodiversity/trees.

4.4 Principle of development
The site lies outside of the development boundaries of any surrounding villages, in an area designated as countryside where new residential dwellings would be contrary to Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). Policy HOU22 of the SNLP classifies mobile homes including residential caravans as permanent housing in planning policy terms. Notwithstanding this, Policy HOU8 of the SNLP supports forestry worker accommodation in the countryside where it has been demonstrated that no other accommodation is available locally, there is a clear functional need for a forestry worker to be available on the site on a full time basis and there is clear evidence that the enterprise is financially viable and sustainable in the long term.

4.5 The site has a lengthy history, beginning in 2003 for the retention of the mobile homes for occupation by the applicant’s family which was refused and subsequently dismissed on appeal due to there not being clear evidence at the time of the applicant’s ability to develop the enterprise in order to justify the need to live at the site. In 2005 temporary planning permission was granted for the retention of the two residential caravans for forestry worker occupation for a temporary period of three years, which was subsequently renewed for a further three years in 2009. These permissions were based on the functional need for the accommodation being based on the ‘charcoal burning operations’ undertaken on the site meeting the functional need, and the business plan and financial information from 2006 to 2009 demonstrating that the business was operating on a sound financial basis.
4.6 The application was deferred from the 29 April 2015 committee meeting following concerns being raised that insufficient financial evidence had been provided in support of the application and serious allegations that the applicant had not carried out charcoal burning on the site for some considerable time.

4.7 In respect of the charcoal burning, the enforcement officer and I visited the site unannounced to take photographs for the 29 April committee and ‘burning’ was taking place on the site. The applicant has advised that the following burns have taken place: 2009 20 burns; 2010 36 burns; 2011 48 burns; 2012 37 burns; and in 2013 49 burns. The bulk of production takes place from April to early October. The evidence provided by the objectors that no smoke has been seen over the last ten years and that the applicants burning furnaces are disused and rusty and therefore there has been no burns, unfortunately does not prove the case. The applicant has advised that the furnaces referred to are spare and I can confirm that this is the case having visited the site in April. Equally when I left the site I was unable to see any smoke being emitted from the wood, even with the knowledge that a burn was taking place at the time.

4.8 The applicant has now provided financial accounts up until end of 2013 (year end of 2014 still with being with his accountant) in support of the current application which demonstrates that the charcoal burning element is still being undertaken on site to meet the functional need under Policy HOU8, with a continued increase from 2010 onwards in the revenue generated through charcoal sales, as well as other income generated through the sale of fire wood and wood products.

4.9 It is acknowledged that the applicant’s income is also supported through the undertaking of contract work in connection with forestry and tree surgery in the local area, the Council when giving its previous temporary consents, was fully aware that the income generated from the charcoal business would not on its own support the applicant and his family financially, however it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that he meets the functional and financial tests in respect of Policy HOU8 of the SNLP to justify the need for him to live on the site for the purposes of charcoal burning. Conditions are however suggested in respect of restricting the occupation of the caravans to the applicant and his dependants in connection with the forestry use of the site. It is also considered that as required by Policy HOU8, the applicant has demonstrated that the enterprise is sustainable in the long term, and therefore a permanent, as opposed to temporary permission should be granted in this instance.

Design, scale and visual impact

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

4.11 The residential caravans to be retained are considered acceptable in terms of their design, scale, siting and would not be significantly visible or cause detriment to the character of the surrounding landscape. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy 2 of the JCS, Section 7 of the NPPF and Policy DM3.9 of the emerging SNLP.

4.12 Highway safety
Access to the site would remain as at present off Spring Lane. The application has been assessed by the Highway Authority who have raised no objection to the retention of the forestry worker accommodation on the grounds it would not adversely affect highway safety. As such, it is considered that the amended scheme would accord with Policies IMP8 and TRA19 of the SNLP and emerging Policy DM3.12.
Residential amenity

4.12 Whilst there are a number of neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the site, it is considered that the nature of the development, combined with the significant separation between the proposed caravans and existing dwellings is such that the scheme would not result in any significant loss of privacy or amenities of other properties in the area.

4.13 As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and emerging Policy DM3.14.

Biodiversity/trees

4.14 Concerns have been raised by local residents and by the Norfolk Bat Group that the scheme would cause detriment to local wildlife including protected species. During the determination of this application there has been a strong element of disagreement over the impact of the development on protected species, in particular bats.

4.15 The application has been assessed by the NCC Ecologist and Norfolk Wildlife Trust who have both visited the site. The preliminary ecological survey has concluded there is a low risk for great crested newts. A Natural England EPS licence is not needed, as neither a breeding site nor resting place will be affected. It was suggested that mitigation is handled through a methods statement for great crested newts as some low risk remained (no longer required, see below).

4.16 Following the site visit it was apparent (for planning purposes), that no surveys for bats were necessary for two reasons. The first was that within the development footprint, no potential roosts will be removed or disturbed. The trees within 20m of the development footprint were immature pine, with low bat roost potential. The second factor was that prominent features that are capable of accommodating bat roosts, the disused concrete bunkers, would be unaffected by the development proposed. No licence will needed to be applied for in this case. Those who carry out woodland practices, including charcoal burning should be aware of the law. The applicant is aware of the bats using one bunker and seeks to enhance the second bunker making it suitable for hibernating bats. This enhancement coupled with the biodiversity benefits of the woodland management plan are in line with local policy, under policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy, as Spring Wood is a County Wildlife Site.

4.17 Since the above comments were made the applicant has withdrawn the traveller pitches and the NCC Ecologist view has been sought again, who confirms that as the application is now only for the retention of the existing forestry accommodation which has been on the site for over 10 years, the previous conditions requested are no longer necessary as no additional works/development will be undertaken. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy 1 of the JCS, Section 11 of the NPPF and polices ENV14 and ENV15 of SNLP.

4.18 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.

4.19 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5 Conclusion

5.1 The applicant has demonstrated that he meets the functional and financial tests in respect of Policy HOU8 of the SNLP to justify the retention of the two caravans in this location. The proposal does not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby residential properties; highway safety or protected species. The proposal is considered to accord with the aims of the Joint Core Strategy, NPPF and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2015/0084/F  
Parish: WORTWELL

Applicants Name: Mr Tony Sprake  
Site Address: Land To Rear Of 133 High Road Wortwell Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of single storey dwelling with attached garage and provision of vehicle access to no. 133 High Road.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted plans  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Provision of parking/manoeuvring space  
5. Visibility splays  
6. Slab levels to be agreed  
7. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
8. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
9. Existing trees on site

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 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
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 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 Autumn 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  
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 1990/1821 Erection of 14 holiday chalets Refused

2.2 1993/0173 Certificate of lawfulness of existing use as haulage yard Deemed Refusal

2.3 1993/1821 Change of use of farm buildings/vehicle workshop for making of cane furniture Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommend approval. Following submission of amended plans – consider this a further improvement on original.

3.2 District Member Determine as delegated.

3.3 Flood Defence Officer No objection subject to advisory note regarding surface water drainage.

3.4 NCC Highways Recommend conditions regarding provision of car parking and visibility splays.

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) No objection subject to condition regarding unexpected contamination.

3.6 Other Representations 1 letter of no objection to one dwelling but would object to more if proposed.

3 letters of objection from two addresses covering:

- Precedent for ribbon development behind existing properties along High Road.
- Increase in surface water run off
- Potential for light pollution from new dwelling
- Provision of adequate visibility splays
- Form and character of development not in keeping with village.

4 Assessment

Site Description

4.1 The application site comprises of a detached dwelling within a large plot set back from and on the west side of High Road. The eastern part of the site is within the existing development boundary for Wortwell. There are a group of timber outbuildings immediately to the rear of the dwelling which have been used the past as farm buildings, vehicle workshop and for the assembly of cane furniture. These buildings are now used for domestic storage and are in poor condition. The open part of the site comprises informal residential amenity area with areas of hard standing and rough ground.
There is a vehicle access to the site from High Road on the southern side of the dwelling and the ground level rises considerably east to west from High Road to the site boundary with the A143. The application site is bounded to the north and south by detached dwellings. 135 High Road, to the north east of the application site, is a grade II listed building.

Proposal

4.2 This application seeks full planning permission for one detached bungalow to the west of the existing dwelling. The site would be sub-divided to create a private amenity area for no. 133 with the amenity area for the proposed dwelling to be provided at the western end of the site. The proposed dwelling would have a footprint of 13 metres x 10.5 metres and is designed with a pitched and hipped roof with an overall ridge height of 5.5 metres (2.7 metres to eaves). The proposed dwelling would be accessed by the existing vehicle crossing on High Road and proposes a turning head within the site. The application also proposes a separate vehicle access to the north of the existing to serve no. 133.

Principle of Development

4.3 Wortwell 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 Part of the site lies outside of the development boundary within the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan. However, the whole site is within the development boundary with 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 of the development boundary, the proposed change to the boundary is a material consideration, and it is considered that 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 This part of High Road is generally characterised by detached dwellings within plots of varying sizes which front the highway. To the north of the application site is an existing detached dwelling set the listed building. This proposal would reflect this pattern of development and so it is considered to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. This application proposes a bungalow which would be elevated above road level. However, it would be set well back into the site and with a limited overall height, would not appear unduly prominent or be otherwise harmful to the character of the area and when assessed against s(66)(1) of the Listed Building Act would preserve its setting.

Setting of listed building

4.6 The proposed dwelling would be sited 40 metres form 135 High Road which is a grade II listed building. Given the degree of separation and the low overall height of the proposed development, it is not considered that it would harm the setting of this listed building.

Impact on neighbouring properties

4.7 The proposed dwelling would be well separated from neighbouring properties and, as it is single storey in design, would not result in any loss of privacy likely to be harmful to their residential amenities.
A condition to agree boundary treatments is recommended to ensure that adequate screening with neighbouring properties is maintained.

4.8 The existing access and drive currently serves no. 133 only and is now proposed to serve the new bungalow. However, the applicant also proposes to create a new vehicular access on the northern end of the site which would serve no. 133 only. Therefore there would be no increase in the level of use of the existing drive that may otherwise have the potential to increase disturbance the occupiers of no. 129.

4.9 There is currently no formal private amenity area to the rear of the existing dwelling at no. 133. This application proposes to create a separate amenity area of 20 metres in depth to the rear of this dwelling which is considered adequate.

4.10 A small number of objections have been submitted regarding the impact of this proposal on the character of the area, surface water drainage provision and visibility splays. These concerns are addressed in the course of this report.

Impact on highways

4.11 The proposed dwelling incorporates a single garage with parking in front and there would be space for further parking at the front. A turning head is also proposed which would allow vehicles to leave the site in forward gear. On this basis, NCC Highways have raised no objection subject to conditions requiring the provision and retention of parking and manoeuvring areas and adequate visibility splays. Similarly, no objection has been raised to the proposed vehicle access to serve no. 133.

Impact on trees

4.12 There are no trees within the area of the site to be developed with some forming the boundaries or immediately adjacent to the application site. Therefore, a condition is recommended in conjunction with the landscaping condition, requiring agreement to the retention of trees along the boundary where appropriate.

Drainage considerations

4.13 Foul drainage would be disposed of via the main sewer. Concern has been expressed that the development of the site would worsen the existing surface water provision. No objections have been raised by the Flood Defence Officer or Environmental Services who have recommended a condition regarding unexpected contamination and an advisory note regarding surface water drainage provision.

4.14 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.

4.15 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 This 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. The proposed dwelling is set well back into the site and designed to limit its visual impact in wider views. It reflects the existing pattern of development and would not harm the setting of the nearby listed building. Accordingly, this application is recommended for approval.
10. **Appl. No** : 2015/0321/F  
**Parish** : BROCKDISH

Applicants Name : Mr Baskerville  
Site Address : Land South West Of Red Barn Farm Brockdish Needham Bypass  
Brockdish Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of a Country House and associated Landscaping work

Recommendation : Refusal

1 Does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 and therefore contrary to policy

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 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
TRA 13: Corridors of movement  
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

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

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.12 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  
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
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 2000/1037 Conversion of barn to dwelling Approved

2.2 2000/1036 Conversion of former cart-shed into two letting properties Approved

2.3 1996/0721 General purpose agricultural building Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommends refusal on the following grounds:
- Loss of agricultural land
- Design of house
- Impact of additional access on/off the bypass (A143) and impact on highway safety

To the amended access:
- Concern that residents will use the A143 access

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee
- To fully assess the implication of the design and compliance with Para 55

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection) No objections subject to conditions

3.4 NCC Highways Originally object on highway safety grounds, however no objection subject to conditions to the revised access route

3.5 Landscape Officer No objections subject to conditions

3.6 Senior Conservation and Design Officer No comments received

3.7 Design Officer Refuse (see assessment)

3.8 The Ramblers Clarification sought on matters including details of existing and proposed hedging and future maintenance.

3.9 Flood Defence Officer No objections subject to conditions
3.10 Representations

2 letters of support
1 letter of objection:

- Decision to alter the access to Whitepost Lane should be resisted vigorously.
- Originally a ‘drove’, the old byways, droves and unadopted roads etc are an ever diminishing resource and need to be protected and preserved
- Dismayed that Whitepost Lane would be potentially upgraded, do not need any more tarmac roads in the countryside
- Note that recent correspondence suggests only a small section of the lane would be upgraded, whilst still not happy it would be less damaging

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a substantial six bedroomed detached house and associated landscaping works on land to the south-west of Red Barn Farm with access off the A143 bypass at Brockdish. The site lies on an existing field within the Waveney Tributary Farmland area to the north of the Waveney valley. It is positioned directly to the south and adjacent to a wooded area within which sits existing farm buildings. An existing lane leads down the east flank of the field to the farm buildings. The existing area to the front (south) of the proposed house is very open in views, particularly to the west. The site is located in an area of relatively open countryside with agricultural fields and woodlands. There are several listed farmhouses and other typical vernacular buildings of varying sizes fairly sparsely located around the area along with a number of other more modern agricultural buildings. To the south of the site is Brockdish Hall, a grade 2 listed 17th century brick and timber frame house set in the remains of former parkland. Typical materials around the site include red brick, coloured render, weather boarding and pantiles.

The main issues in this case are; the principle of development in this location and design, highway safety, setting of listed buildings, residential amenity and contamination/drainage.

Principle of development and design

4.2 In terms of policy the site is outside any development boundary or village limit and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under this policy and therefore the erection of a new dwelling in this location is contrary to policy.

4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. Brockdish is situated within the Rural Policy Area which has a confirmed 5 year land supply of site 9.11. Therefore the 5 year land supply is not an issue for consideration within the determination of this planning application.

4.4 An exception to the above is Paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should avoid allowing new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the exceptional quality or because of the innovative nature of the design. Such a design 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
The proposed development has been assessed in relation to each of the 4 elements of para 55, all of which must be satisfied in order for the proposed development to be supported.

a) Be truly outstanding or innovative and reflect the highest standards in architecture

The site is located between the Waveney Valley and Tributary Farmland within Landscape Character area A5 and B4 where key design principles for the Waveney Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland identified in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The character of this part of Brockdish is distinctly rural with a relatively large-scale open valley landscape with some long views within the valley. The existing landscape is one of varied undulating arable farmland with native hedgerows, woodlands and areas of parkland. Existing buildings in the immediate context are a mix of agricultural farm buildings, farm houses, barn conversions and cottages associated with the existing land uses and the existing farm settlements of Red Barn Farm and Brockdish Hall Farm.

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement and Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal. Whilst these include a description of the site and its immediate context, there is little in the way of analysis or evidence submitted setting out the defining character of the area in terms of historic development, land use, grain and pattern of development, scale and form, architectural style and detail, use of materials etc explaining how the design has evolved in response to local character.

In this instance, the proposal is for a six bedroomed house in a ‘classical’ style, constructed of Hamstone, Welsh slate and flat roofed leaded dormers. In terms of referencing classical styles, the applicant refers to the building as being a ‘grand country house’, however in ‘country house terms’ the building is fairly modest in size, and should be considered a ‘small country house’. The basic form of the building would be a large two-and-a-half storey building with a pitched roof and two single-storey symmetrical wings set either side of the principle elevation in a classical style. Notwithstanding the quality of materials proposed and articulation of the elevations, it is considered that this simple form, on such a large scale, would not go beyond the high quality normally expected with any proposal for a new dwelling and would not be considered exceptional, truly outstanding or innovative. The architectural detailing proposed also struggles to relate to the design principles in Section 3.8.2 ‘Architectural Quality’ of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD.

With regard to design quality in terms of construction, function and energy performance, it is noted that the number of energy saving measures proposed is limited, with no particular combination of measures that will be unique and would be integrated into a high quality architectural design. Whilst the proposal is intended to satisfy the requirements of Level 4 or 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, this is not considered to be ‘innovative’.

b) In respect of whether the scheme significantly enhances its immediate setting.

The accompanying Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal and photographs provide an assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed development on the existing landscape setting with the assessment concluding that ‘the development will contribute to the quality of the landscape in both visual and landscape terms, enhancing the ecological value of the area by the addition of a large number of landscape receptors to both the site and the surrounding country-side. However, in the absence of any analysis or definition of the character of the area, it is not possible to validate this view. Recent appeal decisions have clearly emphasised the importance of a para 55 dwelling ‘significantly’ enhancing its setting and therefore whilst the site has the potential to make a contribution to the locality by providing a parkland setting in keeping with the former character type of the area and the landscape typical to this part of the Waveney Valley, the erection of a dwelling on this site would not significantly enhance its immediate setting and therefore is not acceptable.
c) Sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area

4.11 With regards to whether the scheme is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area, the site is open agricultural land, which characterises this area together with narrow lanes, farm buildings and houses. The proposed design together with its siting and size of the dwelling would be out of keeping with the open nature of the agricultural land and would be harmful to the characteristics of the immediate area.

4.12 In view of the above it is therefore concluded that the scheme has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development would satisfy the stringent requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Setting of listed buildings

4.13 The impact of development on listed buildings requires consideration under the development management policies and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, which requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Brockdish Hall sits within a wooded area, and is very secluded, there are no important long distance planned landscaped views of the house that would be affected by this proposal, and the Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the scheme on the grounds that it would not have any harmful impact on the Listed Building. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with section 12 of the NPPF and equally in consideration of the Council’s duties under the Act it is considered that for the reasons set out above that the proposal would not adversely affect the Listed Building.

Highway safety

4.14 The proposal originally proposed to serve the dwelling via a shared access off the A143, classified as a Corridor of Movement. The Highway Authority raised an objection to the scheme on the grounds that the proposed development would intensify the use of an existing access on a stretch of classified highway which carries significant traffic movements, usually at speed. The application has been amended to re-locate the access to Red Barn via a track to White Post Lane. The Highway Officer has withdrawn his objections subject to the imposition of conditions. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Residential amenity

4.15 Whilst there are a number of neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the site, it is considered that the design, combined with the distances of separation between the proposed and existing dwelling is such that the scheme would not result in any significant loss of privacy or amenities of other properties in the area, or any future occupants of the proposed dwelling. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and emerging Policy DM3.14.

Drainage/contamination

4.16 No objections have been raised by the Environmental Protection Officer in respect of contamination or drainage/flooding issues subject to the imposition of conditions.
Other matters

4.17 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.

4.18 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to conflict with the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policies 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and paragraph 55 of the NPPF, and is recommended for refusal.

6 Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposed development is outside any Development Limit or Village Boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan. In the absence of any special need identified the proposal conflicts with policy ENV8. The South Norfolk Rural Policy Area has 9.11 years residential land supply, so the overriding presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to design, innovation, significantly enhancing its immediate setting and being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. In view of the above the proposal is contrary to the Joint Core Strategy Policy 2 and South Norfolk Local Plan policy ENV8. Because the proposal development conflicts with the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations that override it, including the criteria set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the proposal is refused in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF.
11. **Appl. No**: 2015/0582/F  
   **Parish**: CHEDGRAVE

Applicants Name: Mr Matthew Hubbard  
Site Address: Church Of All Saints Hardley Road Chedgrave Norfolk NR14 6NQ  
Proposal: To erect a lych-gate on the boundary of All Saint's church Chedgrave.

Recommendation: Authorise DGL to approve/refuse in default

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
   ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (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 autumn 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  
   DM3.9 Design Principles  
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
   DM4.11 Heritage Assets

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

   S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

   S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”
2. Planning History

2.1 1989/2012 Extension to provide hall kitchen and wc Approve

2.2 1991/0665 Extension to provide hall kitchen, wc, vestry and store Approve

2.3 2014/0225 Pine tree in churchyard felled/dismantled Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Chedgrave Parish Council are the applicants

3.2 District Member Councillor Collin Gould the Local Member for Loddon has provided comments on the application and requested the application go to Development Management Committee to discuss the merits of the proposed design.

3.3 Historic England First consultation - could not support submitted design. Amendments required to narrow the structure and to give the roof a much steeper pitch. Second consultation - could not support the amended scheme as the roof pitch needs to be steeper. The timber sole plate should sit directly on top of the masonry walls and it is recommended that if flint is to be used it should form the bulk of masonry walls rather than just a decorative panel in order to provide a more traditional construction.

3.4 Historic Environment Service No objection but recommended a programme of archaeological works be conditioned.

3.5 Other Representations The neighbour at 3 Church Close has objected to the proposal. The proposed location is outside of the church boundary fence and the size of the structure is too large. The proposed seats will attract people to the structure causing problems with noise in the evenings. The proposed height does not look sufficient for a vehicle. The lych-gate would be better constructed at the pedestrian access, which is more suitable for a war memorial and where it would be more attractive.

The neighbour at 2 Church Close supports the proposed scheme.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks planning permission to erect a lych-gate at the northwest corner of the churchyard boundary of All Saints Church, Chedgrave, which is a grade I listed building originally dating from the 12th century but much restored during the early 19th century. The church is constructed in flint with limestone dressings and also has a large amount of red brick with roof finishes comprising thatch, slate and plain tile. The site is situated within the Loddon and Chedgrave Conservation Area and the location for the new lych-gate set some distance back from the road.

The principle of the proposal

4.2 The principle of erecting a lych-gate on the church boundary is acceptable as this type of structure within the buildings curtilage is a characteristic form of development that is very much in
keeping with the special architectural and historic interest of the church building and its traditional churchyard setting. However, any such proposal needs to satisfy policy requirements in Sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF regarding design and protection of heritage assets as well as the satisfying the requirements of Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which refer specifically to preserving the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Design/materials

4.3 The proposed new lych-gate is to be a traditional timber structure with brick/flint walls and has a double pitched slate roof with front and rear gable ends. The material finishes are all in keeping with the historic character of the church and its setting.

4.4 With the original application submission concerns were raised about the width of the proposed structure and its shallow roof pitch, both of which provided the building with less traditional proportions not characteristic of a lych-gate of the style proposed. Following negotiations an amended scheme to provide a narrower building with a much steeper roof pitch was submitted, these changes providing the structure with much better proportions much more in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing church and its setting. However, before the latest amended scheme was submitted a further amendment was made to the depth of the building to reduce the ‘tunnel’ effect resulting in the side elevations being much narrower than the front and rear elevations. Where lych-gates have gable end roofs running front to back they are generally deeper than they are wide or more or less square on plan and at the scale proposed it is considered that the much narrower side elevations will provide a structure less characteristic in the context of the existing site. Historic England has provided comments supporting this view and has requested further amendments.

4.5 It is considered that if the depth of the structure can be increased then this would help to provide the building with more typical proportions thus allowing it to sit more comfortably at the proposed location. With these amendments the scheme would not cause any harm to the special historic/architectural interest of the church and its setting and therefore would satisfy the requirements of sections 7 and 10 of the NPPF regarding design and heritage assets. It would also satisfy the requirements of Sections 66 and 72 of the Act regarding the preservation of the listed buildings and their settings and the preservation of conservation areas. The requirements of local plan policies IMP15 and IMP19 would also be satisfied together with policy 2 of the JCS.

Archaeology

4.6 The Historic Environment Service have not raised any issues with the proposal but have recommend a programme of archaeological works which have been specified under condition in order that the proposal can comply with policy ENV9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Neighbour amenity

4.7 Two responses to the original application proposal have been received from neighbouring properties along Church Close immediately to the west side of the site. No.2 has objected to the proposal for the following reasons: the proposed location is outside of the church boundary fence and the size of the structure is too large; the proposed seats in the new structure will attract people causing problems with noise in the evenings; the proposed height does not look sufficient for a vehicle. The lych-gate would be better constructed at the pedestrian access, which is more suitable for a war memorial and where it would be more attractive.

4.8 In response to the above it is considered that the new structure is appropriately sited at a suitable location in relation to the church, its churchyard and any existing fencing. The overall proportions of the original proposal have been amended which has helped to reduce the overall bulk of the building although the height has been increased. It is not uncharacteristic to see a lych-gate at a similar scale to that proposed although many are smaller.
It is not considered that the new seating proposed in the original scheme would have any significant impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of noise/disturbance to make the proposal contrary to the requirements of policy IMP9 of the Local Plan. However, the seats have been omitted in the latest amended scheme which will help to address issues raised. With regard to vehicle access the amended scheme is of sufficient height for a vehicle to pass through.

4.9 As a final amended scheme has not yet been agreed there has been no further formal consultation with the neighbour who has objected to the original scheme. The neighbour at no.2 Church Close supports the application.

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

4.11 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
Reason: no increase in internal floor space

5 Conclusion

5.1 With the amendments recommended above it is considered that the proposal would be a sympathetic scheme causing no harm to the special architectural/historic interest of the church and its setting, with no adverse impact on any views of the conservation area. Any issues regarding neighbouring amenity have been addressed by amendments to the original scheme and the protection of important archaeology is ensured by condition. It is therefore recommended that Development Management Committee give authorisation for the Director of Growth and Localism to approve the application, subject to further amended details being submitted and agreed.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Philip Whitehead 01508 533948
and E-mail: pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2015/0712/F  
**Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

**Applicants Name**: Mr John Renaut & Others  
**Site Address**: Hill Farm Redenhall Road Harleston Norfolk IP20 9QN  
**Proposal**: New single storey building (with a 150 square-metre footprint) to serve as a farm shop and cafe.

**Recommendation**: Refusal  
1. Outside development limit and not sufficiently justified as farm diversification

---

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- 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 5: The Economy

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan 2003**
- EMP 2: Distribution, nature and scale of employment development
- SHO 2: Retail development - impact test (Part Consistent)
- SHO 2: A3 uses outside the defined central business area
- IMP 2: Landscaping
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- EMP 8: Farm diversification schemes (Part Consistent)

1.4 **Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan**

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

1.5 **Development Management Policies**
- DM2.1 Employment and business development
- DM2.4 Location of main town centre uses
- DM2.6 Food, drink and hot food takeaways
- DM2.9 Rural tourist and recreational destinations
- DM3.9 Design Principles
- DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
- DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
- DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0779
The installation consists of 2 11kW Gaia Approved Wind Turbines. Each turbine is mounted on a free standing 18m galvanised steel lattice mast on a 25sq.m concrete base. Each turbine has two blades and are manufactured as a single composite Unit, 13m in diameter.

2.2 2005/0819
Proposed extension to existing free range Approved egg production unit 1no.

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council
Amended Proposal
- Still concerned over the access due to the fast moving and frequent traffic
- Access should be at right angles to improve visibility

3.2 District Member
Cllr J Savage
Amended proposal
- Can be delegated
- Concerns over access have been addressed

Cllr B Riches
To be reported if appropriate

Original proposal

Cllr J Savage
To be determined by committee
- Support the proposal but have some reservation regarding the access

Cllr B Riches
No response

3.3 NCC Highways
Amended proposal
Support with conditions

3.4 Ecologist
No Objection
- No ecology report but site appears to be arable field so limited ecological implications for the site

3.5 Flood Defence Officer
Advisory comments on surface water and foul drainage

3.6 Landscape Officer
Amended proposal
- Insufficient information to approve the proposal
- The proposed bunds do not complement the existing landform; ideally they should not be discernible.
- Concerned about unclear destination of the remaining excavated material
- The planting needs to be shown on a plan in order for us to understand the overall effect.

Original proposal
- Further information of bunding and planting required
Development Management Committee

3.7 Other Representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>Petition of support with approximately 187 signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One letter of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interesting and innovative especially link with local school which will provide a better understanding of where food comes from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beautiful setting, minimal impact on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural extension to the business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide local employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amended proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>One letter of objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Would not be prepared to have visibility mirror on my land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>One letter of objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has been at least one accident on the access with increased use concern that there would be further accidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is located within the open countryside to the north east of Harleston and consequently is outside of the development limit.

4.2 The application is for a new single storey building for a new café / farm shop within the agricultural field to the north of Hill Farm. Redenhall Road is located to the north and it is proposed to access the development from this road. Nos. 1 and 2 Hill Farm Cottages are located to the north east of the site and there is a cluster of dwellings on the opposite side of Redenhall Road. Eggs from the farm are currently sold from a shed located close to where the proposed building is planned. A caravan club site for up to 5 caravans is located to south east of the site.

4.3 In policy terms, the NPPF would give preference to a café retail development being located within the development limit; this approach is supported by policy SHO 10 which permits café (A3) uses within development limits as does emerging policy DM2.6, which can now be given reasonable amount of weight. It is evident that this proposal does not comply with this requirement.

4.4 Given that the site is an agricultural enterprise with the farm currently having egg laying hens, poultry, cows and a small number of sheep it is necessary to assess the scheme in the context of farm diversification.

4.5 Policy EMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan along with the paragraph 28 in the NPPF promotes agricultural diversification projects.

4.6 The supporting text of policy EMP8 confirms that to be considered as a farm diversification scheme it is necessary to be ancillary to, and facilitate, the existing operations of the farm.

4.7 In the context of “ancillary”, it is considered that the policy is seeking for there to be strong link between the proposal and the existing enterprise eg a farm shop selling the produce from the farm or holiday accommodation through the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings.

4.8 With this in mind, whilst it is accepted that a small amount of produce from the farm would be sold in a small part of the proposed building (the proposal would also necessitate the removal of a small structure associated with egg sales), a significant element of the proposal would have no linkage/reliance upon the existing farm enterprise.

4.9 It should be noted that the proposed development is a new building, and not the conversion of an existing building and it is located away from existing farm buildings complex and is positioned so that it could operate completely independently from the farm.
On the basis of the above, it is not considered that the scheme complies with the requirements of Policy EMP8 in representing an acceptable farm diversification scheme.

It is evident that the facilities could present a useful facility for users of the nearby caravan site and it has also been indicated that an educational link would be provided to a nearby school. Furthermore, it has been suggested that further ideas may come forward in the future such as a tractor play area/ petting area and farm trail.

Whilst these are accepted they do not override the policy concerns set out above.

Highways

The Highway Officer initially raised concerns about the use of the existing access and the limited level of visibility. It is now proposed to modify the existing access moving it to the East and creating a “Y” shaped access which will improve visibility. The Highway Officer now supports the development subject to conditions.

Landscape

The development is located away from existing building and the land slopes up from the Redenhall Road, so the buildings and associated car parking has the potential to be visually prominent. Small bunds are currently proposed around part of the site. The Landscape Officer does not consider that the proposed bunds would complement the existing landform; ideally they should not be a discernible feature. Ideally any change in levels and landscaping should be shown on a plan, demonstrating how the new building and associated parking can be accommodated without having a harmful impact on the local landscape in accordance with policy 2 of the JCS. It is however considered that if necessary the details could be conditioned.

Residential amenity

The roadway to the farm and proposed development is located to the rear of the Hill Farm Cottages. The roadway is used for existing farm traffic and people buying eggs, however this will increase with the proposed development and as such there is potential for noise and disturbance to increase as a result of the development. In this instance however it is considered that on the basis of limited day time opening hours and metalled finish to the track no significant adverse impact would occur so as to represent a reason for refusal.

Other issues

The proposed development is too small to require a retail impact assessment and paragraph 25 in the NPPF states that the sequential approach should not be applied to small scale rural development. Having said that locating town centre uses outside the development limit does not help to support the market towns such as Harleston which the Council is making great effort to support through the Market Town initiative.

Other issues such surface water drainage can be dealt with via condition.

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

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

5.1 In conclusion, the proposed new café/farmshop located outside of the development limit, and is not considered to represent a farm diversification project as it is not considered ancillary to the agricultural operations of the existing farm, and whilst small scale being located outside the development it would not help to support the market town of Harleston.

5.2 On this basis the application is recommended for refusal.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No** : 2015/0901/F  
**Parish** : LODDON

**Applicants Name** : Mr Richard & Mrs Britt Kittle  
**Site Address** : Land North East Of Bush Farm Stubbs Green Loddon Norfolk  
**Proposal** : Erection of a new 4-bedroomed house with garaging.

**Recommendation** : Refusal  
1. Harm to landscape setting, contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF and JCS policy 2.  
2. Does not meet the criteria for an agricultural workers dwelling, contrary to policies HOU 8 and ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

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

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Autumn 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  
DM2.11 Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside  
DM2.7 Agricultural and forestry development  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2005/1063 Removal of agricultural occupancy condition Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommend approval - outstanding design.

3.2 District Member This application should be considered by the Development Management Committee. There are concerns raised by Highways over its location on sustainability grounds and it is outside the Loddon Development boundary. The applicant is relying on Section 55 of the LDDF which is concerned with design which is subjective and for this reason I wish the application to be considered by the committee.

3.3 NCC Highways Object - the site is poorly located in terms of transport sustainability. The site is remote from local service centre provision and approval of the application would render the development reliant on the use of motorised vehicles, conflicting with the aims of sustainable development.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) No comments

3.5 Conservation Officer No comments received

3.6 Historic England We do not feel that the proposals will result in harm to the setting of nationally important heritage assets (the nearest being Hales Hall and Barn). The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, however the Council should be aware that it is near the grade II Bush Farm.

3.7 Design Officer

- The building could be considered an outstanding design in the local context, although the use of Modcell is not ‘innovative’.
- The design of the building will help to raise the standard of design in the area…particularly with the use of the Modcell panels.
- The building will be very visible within the valley to the south/east - by being sited to the south/east of the track, the contemporary style of dwelling will be very visible within the open countryside and an imposing feature in an otherwise agricultural setting. I do not consider that a new building in this position will therefore significantly enhance the immediate
The construction of a new building to the east side of the track is inconsistent with positioning of previous farm buildings and landscaping to the north/west side of the track and open fields to the east. I do not therefore consider that this particular design in the proposed location is sensitive to the existing character of the area, especially when the building is viewed from the wider landscape to the east.

The decision should be made not only on whether the design of the building can be considered to be exceptional and outstanding, but on whether the design and location of the building is appropriate within it immediate setting and sensitive to the local character the area. If it is not considered to meet the last two criteria, then it should not be considered as an exception to policy ENV8.

3.8 Flood Defence Officer
No objection, subject to conditions.

3.9 Representations
2 letter of support received – the design of the house is very exciting and refreshing to see in this location. The sunken design and green walls lets the building sit delicately in the landscape and the large amount of glass helps to create a very minimal visual impact.

4 Assessment
Proposal

4.1 The application proposes the erection of a new 4 bedroom detached dwelling on land north east of Bush Farm, Stubbs Green, near Loddon. The house comprises of two main elements, one larger than the other, each of which have pitched roofs made of corrugated metal cladding. The living space would be contained within the larger of the two elements over three storeys, the lowest of which would be partly below ground level. There would be a full length window on the east elevation, and a green wall on the north elevation and the design aims to maximise natural light throughout the building. There would be a high degree of energy efficiency, through the use of a ‘ModCell’ straw bale cassette construction, and the maximising of solar gain.

4.2 The applicant and his wife are conservation farmers and wish to reside closer to the farm. It is understood the applicant’s father, a partner in the business, resides at Bush Farm, close to the application site.

Principle of development

4.3 The site lies within open countryside as designated by the South Norfolk Local Plan. It is also within the rural area of the district, where the Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. The application seeks to demonstrate that the proposal meets such special circumstances, and it is stated that the proposal would allow for the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work. It is also stated that the exceptional quality of the design warrants approval of the application.
Agricultural need

4.4 The applicants practice conservation farming, which is a form of farming which focusses on areas such as zero tillage, wider rotational changes, cover cropping, and the integration of grazing animals with arable farming. It is stated that this type of farming requires a great deal of monitoring and development which would be aided if they lived by the land.

The applicant’s father resides on the farm, however it is stated he has now retired. The applicants reside approximately 3 miles away, at Hales Green Farm. It is stated that because they do not reside at the farm, it has made it difficult to keep cattle, and assist in the prevention of farm related crime.

4.5 Policy HOU 8 of the Local Plan sets out the criteria for the consideration of agricultural worker dwellings.

This states that:

Agricultural and forestry dwellings will only be permitted in the open countryside if:

i) Required in connection with an agricultural or forestry enterprise; and

ii) There is an existing functional need for a full time worker to live on the site;

It is considered that insufficient justification has been made to demonstrate that there is an existing need for a full time worker to reside at the site. The growing of crops does not require round-the-clock supervision. If cattle were to be kept on the land, the applicant is within 10 minutes away by car, which is considered adequate to attend in the event of an emergency. The existing dwelling at Bush Farm provides a deterrent for crime, and also allows for a degree of supervision of the site.

And

iii) No other dwelling is suitable or available for occupation by the worker concerned.

It is considered that the applicant’s current residence is within close enough proximity to fulfil the requirements of managing the farm.

In addition:

iv) The size of dwelling permitted will be determined by the requirements of the enterprise rather than the owner or occupier and, in order that control may be exercised over future enlargement, permitted development rights may be withdrawn by planning condition.

No financial information has been provided regarding the size of the farming enterprise. However there is a concern that the size and type of dwelling proposed may be unaffordable for future occupiers who would be employed in agriculture.

It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to meet the key tests of policy HOU 8.

Consideration of the exceptional quality / innovative nature of the design

4.6 The applicant has stated that the outstanding design and layout of the proposal should be considered a material consideration. The tests for such proposals under paragraph 55 of the NPPF are stringent and require the design to:
be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
reflect the highest standards in architecture
significantly enhance its immediate setting
be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area.

The design has been examined under each of these criteria by the Council’s Senior Design and Conservation Officer.

Taking each test in turn:

**Outstanding or innovative, helping to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas**

4.7 The architect accepts that the Modcell system is not ‘innovative’ in nature, but would like it to be considered as part of an ‘outstanding’ design. The system is a sustainable form of construction, and would help to raise the standard of design more generally in the rural area. To be considered outstanding, the design would need to be regarded as being exceptionally good. Within the local context and compared to the general national level of architectural design for housing, the application could be considered to meet this test.

**Reflect the highest standards of architecture**

4.8 It is worth noting that the inspector in a previous appeal decision for a building designed by the same architect for this scheme (APP/L2630/A/14/2225546, Land at Cricket Field, Alburgh Road, Shelton) compared the design with ‘most of today’s normal, mundane, mass housing or single dwelling schemes.’ In that context, the design of the house is certainly well above average and this criterion can therefore be considered as being met.

**Significantly enhance its immediate setting:**

4.9 It is important to note that even if a building is considered to enhance the existing setting of the immediate area, that enhancement still needs to be significant. This is more easily achieved if the existing land is considered to have negative qualities within its surrounding setting – which is not the case in this location.

4.10 The architect states that ‘the design through its quality would significantly enhance an insignificant piece of land with limited aesthetic quality which would otherwise not be given a second glance to.’ The land forms part of an arable field which is part of a particularly open landscape, and the fact the site is currently undeveloped is considered to contribute towards the wider open landscape setting. The siting of a new dwelling in this location would significantly alter the existing character of the immediate area, and would introduce a very visible new feature in the form of a contemporary large dwelling to existing open countryside and an agricultural landscape. Although the design is of a high quality, it’s siting is considered inappropriate, as it would not be well related to the cluster of buildings at Bush Farm and its scale and appearance would cause significant harm to the open character of the countryside in this location.

**Sensitive to the characteristics of the area:**

4.11 Although in terms of the roof forms and gable elements the design draws from the character of the nearby agricultural buildings, the contemporary design of the dwelling means that it would be very prominent and also quite different in character to the existing buildings in the area. In addition the siting, on the other side of the track to all the other buildings, and the very prominent position at a higher point in the valley, means that it would stand out and be an imposing building, particularly when viewed from the east.
Therefore although the design contains elements which are sensitive to the characteristics of the nearby farm buildings, the siting, scale and appearance of the proposal is not considered to be sensitive to the existing character of the area.

It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to comply with two key tests of paragraph 55. Recent appeal decisions within the district (including APP/L2630/A/14/2225546, Land at Cricket Field, Alburgh Road, Shelton and APP/L2630/W/14/3000987, Land east of Hope Cottage, Station Road, Alburgh) have confirmed that decisions on these types of applications should be made not only on whether the design of the building can be considered to be exceptional and outstanding, but also on whether the design and location of the building is appropriate within it immediate setting and sensitive to the local character of the area. This proposal does not meet these requirements, and the harm that would be caused is contrary to policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.

Impact on the setting of listed buildings

The closest listed building is the former Bush Farmhouse, to the west of the site. This building is surrounded by a number of more modern farm buildings, and given the separation between the listed building and proposed dwelling, it is not considered that the setting would be materially affected. In addition it has been agreed by all parties that Hales Hall, a grade I listed house and barn complex to the east would not be materially affected, given the distance and the screening that exists around the Hall.

Impact on residential amenity

The nearest dwelling is at Bush Farm, on the opposite side of the farm driveway. There would be sufficient distance between the proposed and existing dwelling to ensure no harmful amenity impacts would be caused. The proposal complies with policy IMP 9 in terms of impact on neighbouring occupiers.

Impact on highways

The site is well outside development boundaries and is remote from the local services and transport connections that are available. Given the site's rural location and lack of alternative access methods it is likely that approval of the application would render the occupiers reliant on the use of the motorised vehicles. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development would therefore conflict with the aims of sustainable development as required by the NPPF and also local Policy 5 of Connecting Norfolk - the 3rd Local Transport Plan for Norfolk (LTP3) 2011 – 2026. However, permission has been sought under the provisions of paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which contain no such criteria, and it is inevitable that such a dwelling would be somewhat isolated. As a result this is not considered to be grounds on which to refuse the application.

Other matters

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.

If approved, the application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The applicant has stated the proposal meets the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF, and the design is considered to contain elements which are outstanding and it can also be said to represent the highest standards of design. However, the proposal fails on two key tests of paragraph 55, in that it would cause harm to the landscape character of its immediate setting, and would not be sensitive to the very open character of the countryside in this location nor the layout and character of the nearby cluster of farm buildings.

5.2 It is also stated that the dwelling is required in connection with the farm business. However insufficient justification has been made to demonstrate that there is a functional requirement for an agricultural worker to be located any closer to the farm than is already the case. For these reasons the proposal conflicts with policies ENV 8 and HOU 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, and guidance within paragraph 55 of the NPPF. It is therefore recommended for refusal.

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

5.4 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 The proposal, by virtue of its scale, siting and appearance would cause harm to the open landscape character of its immediate setting, and would not be sensitive to the very open character of the countryside in this location nor the layout and character of the nearby cluster of farm buildings. The South Norfolk Rural Policy Area has a housing land supply in excess of 5 years, so the overriding presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. The proposal therefore conflicts with criteria within paragraph 55 of the NPPF and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011, amendments adopted 2014).

6.2 Insufficient justification has been made to demonstrate that there is a clear functional requirement for an agricultural worker to be located any closer to the farm than is already the case. For these reasons the proposal conflicts with saved policies ENV 8 and HOU 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Robert Webb 01508 533681 and E-mail: rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14. **Appl. No**: 2015/0961/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Mr Stephen Lee  
Site Address : Unit 1 - 3 78, 80 And 82 Dr Torrens Way Costessey Norfolk NR5 0GB  
Proposal : Change of use from 3 Nr healthcare units to 4 Nr wheelchair accessible ground floor flats.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions  
1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. Boundary screening to implemented prior to first occupation  
4. Parking to be implemented prior to first occupation  
5. Water efficiency

Subject to securing the S106 for the affordable provision

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 5 : The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
TRA 19: Parking standards  
HOU 04: Residential development within defined development limit

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 Autumn 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM2.2 Protection of employment sites  
DM3.1 Housing Quality  
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
Development Management Committee
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document

2. Planning History

2.1 2008/1476 New Medical Centre with ancillary Pharmacy (A1), Healthcare units for ancillary medical services (D1) with 8no. flats above, 41 no. houses and flats. New road junction to access the site from Longwater Lane, new bus laybys and extension to Ceme

2.2 2012/2208 Change of use from 3 No healthcare units to 4 No disabled accessible ground floor flats

2.3 2013/0166 Change of use from 3 No healthcare units to 4 No disabled accessible ground floor flats

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Original comments:
Recommend approval subject to comments being addressed by condition:

- Noted that developers have been in contact with Saffron who are willing to take these on
- Offer from developer to put posts and bollards in on Dr Torrens Way to prevent unlawful incursions to land to the west and sum of money to enable Norfolk CC to paint double yellows in the area following this request from the PC was appreciated.
- Concerns expressed over compliance with the Equality Act 2010 and note Building Control have requested a door from bedroom as an escape route
- These doors would however open onto a narrow access route which would be dangerous
- Concern with the narrow width of the access drive serving the car parking for these flats. Acknowledge that the GP has fenced off the other access to these parking spaces.
- Three units may be better than 4
- Query regarding parking layout within the space available
- Suggestion that cycle store could be removed to provide more vehicular parking

Comments on amended plans:
Noted that emergency escape doors had been added with restraining posts, emerging into the narrow brickweave access passage. Query raised that there would not be an accessible slope out of the emergency exit or that the posts would impeded passing vehicles. Councillors reiterate their previous concerns and request that they be addressed. It was noted that the developers had been in contact with Saffron who would be willing to take these on.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
3.3 NCC Highways

Whilst no highway objections are raised, it is clear that the proposed access arrangements from the estate road to the parking area at the western end of the building are somewhat constrained. The block paved area over which vehicular access is proposed, would have originally been formed as a pedestrian way only.

There is an existing drop kerb entrance into the small parking area that is accessed from the western end of the Surgery car park. It is clear that the proposed parking area was meant to be served from this route. Which is a far better solution than the arrangement proposed in this and the previous applications.

3.4 SNC Design Officer
No objections

3.5 Roundwell Medical Centre
No comments received

3.6 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.7 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
No comments received

3.8 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
Please note that I am commenting only on housing principles – I am not commenting on site-specific matters.
I am pleased to note the proposal that these 4 flats are designed for people with mobility problems. There is a shortage of such properties in South Norfolk.

It has been agreed that one of these flats is to be an affordable dwelling in accordance with Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy, and that it will be made available for rent through a housing association. This availability will also meet an established need. The revised designs are appropriate.
On this basis I have no objection to the application.

3.9 Other Representations
None received

4 Assessment

The site and proposal

4.1 The application proposes the use of ground floor units originally permitted as healthcare units for ancillary medical services, to wheelchair standard residential flats. The units currently occupy the ground floor of a three-storey block of flats located adjacent the car park serving the Medical Centre. Car parking for the healthcare units is located to the west of the block and access through the Medical Centre car park area, however this has been fenced off.

4.2 The proposal seeks to covert the three existing units to four 1-bed wheelchair standard flats, with the existing shop fronts filled in and replaced by windows and doors serving a bedroom and bathroom. Each unit will be provided with one parking space.
4.3 The units were approved by planning permission 2008/1476 which restricts their use to only ancillary medical uses within the D1 use class.

4.4 The application is submitted with marketing information demonstrating marketing of the units since 2010.

4.5 The application has been amended to add emergency access doors to the southern elevations of the buildings and the installation of bollards to prevent a conflict with these doors and vehicles passing along the access drive.

4.6 Key issues for consideration are the loss of the medical units and as such the loss of the potential employment use; principle of residential use; Highway issues; residential amenity; design; water conservation; and affordable housing.

Loss of D1 medical use units and loss of potential employment

4.7 Policy 5 of the JCS and emerging DM policy DM2.2 seek to protect employment sites and buildings allocated or permitted for business class and other employment uses.

4.8 Policy DM 2.2 advises that proposals leading to the loss of such sites and buildings will be permitted where: the possibility of re-using or re-developing the site/premises for a range of alternative business purposes has been fully explored and it can be demonstrated that the site or premises is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for an employment use; Or there would be an overriding economic, environmental or community benefit from redevelopment or change to another use which outweighs the benefit of the current lawful use continuing.

4.9 Whilst this site is not a designated employment site, the loss of the D1 ancillary medical units would represent a loss of potential employment. And as such consideration is had to the loss of these units and whether this is justified.

4.10 The NPPF is clear that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. The DM policy recognises with the overriding criterion that in some cases it may be more beneficial to the local community if a former employment site or building is re-developed for an alternative use.

4.11 The policy clearly sets out that an alternative business use is firstly preferred before a change of use away from employment use should be considered. The policy tests require consideration as to whether the business is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for an employment use (following consideration of alternative types of employment) and also if there are any overriding benefits from the proposal that would outweigh the benefit of the lawful use continuing.

4.12 In this case the application has been submitted with a report of the marketing that took place between 2010 and present. This sets out any interest in the units and why no offers were made. Both freehold and leasehold options were considered.

The report states that both the particular D1 ancillary medical use restriction deterred offers and a number of physical constraints which include:

• the presence of the security fencing around the medical centre therefore closing these units off inhibiting their presence and access;
• rear servicing being restricted to a pedestrian alley with no goods access;
• staff parking only accessible through medical centre car parking which is controlled by security fencing whose hours are controlled by the Medical centre;
• internal design of the unit with an internal column preventing appropriate fitting out;
• the units are shell finished with limited service connections and the capital commitment needed from potential occupiers to complete their fit has been off-putting.
4.13 The report sets out that a strategy to consider non D1 use classes was considered, but as there are other physical constraints as set out above which affect the reasonable commercial use and enjoyment of the premises as standalone units, it was not considered that a change of use to alternative commercial units would be appropriate.

4.14 The Council’s Property services team have considered the marketing information submitted including the terms and prices and advise that the marketing terms are reasonable and that the considerable constraints outlined seem to be the reason the properties have not let or sold rather than the rent/price.

4.15 There are community benefits to the proposal by the virtue of the design of the flats for wheelchair users and the delivery of 1 of the 4 as affordable. Whilst these may not be considered as overriding benefits individually, when taken together with the demonstrated case that the units have been marketed and are not practical to be utilised for their intended purpose, it is considered that there is a sufficient case to allow the loss of these units from potential employment and that the case outweighs this potential loss of employment use in this instance.

Principle of residential

4.16 The site is located within the development boundary where the principle of new residential development (or in this case conversion) is acceptable subject to compliance with other development plan policies.

Residential amenity/car parking

4.17 The conversion of the unfitted and unoccupied medical units to residential use will have no adverse impacts on the existing residents of the rest of the apartment nor other properties in the immediate area.

4.18 There are however a number of compromises to be had in regards to the acceptability of the conversion of these units to flats. A similar scheme (2013/0166) was refused on March 2013 on the grounds of poor design and amenity and access arrangements.

4.19 The compromises in the design, amenity and parking/access arrangements of the scheme can be summarised as follows:

- There is very limited outdoor amenity space for the proposed flats
- Vehicular access is very narrow and limited (although no objection raised from highways)
- Poor outlook across the medical centre and close proximity of the security fencing around the perimeter of the car park

4.20 The benefits of the scheme can be summarised as follows:

- Four wheelchair design flats would be delivered which are needed across the district and in this location
- The site is highly sustainable and well located for access to the medical centre and public transport for intended users of the flats
- The proposal would bring a viable use to the units, which have remained empty since their construction in 2010.
- One of the four units is proposed as affordable with the likelihood that the other three will be secured by a housing association.
- A reasonable solution of woven wicker fencing and green screen (instant planted screening) has been proposed along the southern side of the access to help improve the outlook across the medical centre car park.
- Users of the flats would have access to public open space which is immediately adjacent and north of the building.
As set out above, therefore whilst there are a number of compromises in the design and level of amenity and parking access for the proposed flats, these are considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. Critically since the refusal in 2013, a further 27 months has elapsed with no viable prospect of the units being occupied for their approved healthcare use. As such and on balance the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of design and amenity.

Affordable Housing

The application proposes 1 of the 4 dwellings to be affordable. The applicants have also advised that they are in discussions with a Housing Association to take on all four flats, since they already own the rest of the apartment building. As such in practice there is the possibility that all four flats could be ‘affordable’. However, since the recent Ministerial Statement on affordable housing in November 2014 the Council can no longer insist on the provision of affordable dwellings for schemes of less than 11 dwellings or 1000sq.m. floorspace. In this instance, if the developer wishes to enter into a S106 agreement to secure a unit it is welcomed. But in light of the above statement it is not reasonable to insist on this and so no weight can be given to its provision in the balance of the acceptability of this development.

Water conservation

JCS policy 3 requires all housing developments to be water efficient and comply with code level 4 of the Code for sustainable homes for water efficiency. This will be secured by condition.

Financial considerations

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

With an absence of a 5 year supply of housing land, paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF are invoked which require a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

There are community benefits to the proposal by the virtue of the design of the flats for wheelchair users. Whilst these may not be considered as overriding benefits individually, when taken together with the demonstrated case that the units have been marketed and are not practical to be utilised for their intended purpose, it is considered that there is a sufficient case to allow the loss of these units from potential employment and that the case outweighs this potential loss of employment use in this instance.

Whilst there are a number of compromises in the design and level of amenity and parking access for the proposed flats, these are considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. Critically since the refusal in 2013, a further 27 months has elapsed with no viable prospect of the units being occupied for their approved healthcare use. As such and on balance the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of design and amenity.

On balance therefore and notwithstanding the compromises of the scheme, it is considered for the reasons set out above and in view of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, that there are no significant and demonstrable adverse impacts which outweigh the identified benefits. The scheme is therefore considered acceptable and approval is recommended.
**Major Applications submitted by SNC**

15. **Appl. No**: 2015/0385/D  
   **Parish**: LONG STRATTON  

Applicants Name: Mrs Renata Garfoot  
Site Address: Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2UY  
Proposal: Reserved Matters Application of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 50 dwellings (Class C3), 800 sq.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

Recommendation: Delegate authority to the Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions, subject to negotiating final details in respect of discharge of conditions.  
1. In accordance with amended plans  
2. Change of use of land to north within blue line to residential garden  
3. Safeguarding and construction details of pedestrian link to north  
4. Management and maintenance of roads  
5. Construction traffic parking

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 5: Streetscape  
IMP 6: Visual impact of parked cars (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
TR A 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TR A 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TR A 19: Parking standards
EN V 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

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

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 Housing Quality
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.1 Building Fabric Energy Efficiency, Carbon Compliance and Allowable Solutions
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

1.6 Long Stratton Area Action Plan, submission version 2015

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Relevant 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 2015/1089 Proposed advertising hoarding boards. Approved

2.4 2012/0562 Screening opinion for residential development Environmental Impact Assessment not required
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**  No comments received

3.2 **District Member (Cllr Andrew Pond)**  Requests the application be considered by Development Committee. A zebra crossing should be provided on Swan Lane due to the increase of traffic predicted from this and other nearby housing developments.

3.3 **Anglian Water Services Ltd**  No comments received

3.4 **SNC Design Officer**  The site is located immediately to the west of Long Stratton village centre and is defined by a variety of attractive assets, for example mature trees, high quality landscaping and varied topography. The proposals successfully capitalise these key assets by creating a well-structured building layout that builds on the quality of the surroundings and the remaining site features.

An analysis of the form, layout and character of Long Stratton has been carried out that helps to create a set of robust design principles that give the proposals a defined identity based on the design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The analysis has also looked beyond the core of Long Stratton to consider how the proposals can be informed by the surrounding land uses and landscape setting. This includes information about how the site responds to South Norfolk House and its relationship with existing residential areas surrounding the development and the edge of countryside.

Careful consideration has been given to ensure that the proposed development is not imposing and is sympathetic to the urban grain and density of the adjacent developments. Buildings have been positioned to give a continuity of frontage to the access road and a presence to Swan Lane, similar to that of the existing properties to the east.

The positioning of the commercial unit considers the constraints of the layout whilst turning the corner at the site access. This gives a strong street presence on approach from Swan Lane and a frontage which follows the alignment of the access road.

Many of the buildings along the ‘spine’ have been positioned to define ‘home zone’ areas whilst creating all important enclosure. Furthermore, some of the buildings are deliberately positioned at an angle and not parallel to the edge of the road so that glimpses of frontages are formed through key vistas (i.e. the buildings define the spaces, not the roads). Where appropriate, dwellings have also been positioned to act as closed stop ends to provide vista terminus.

Parking remains in curtilage throughout. Where parking courts feature, they have been positioned to achieve optimum surveillance in accordance with Secured by Design guidelines. Parking is broken up with landscaping and street trees to provide attractive streetscapes.
The appearance of the development combines traditional building forms with contemporary detailing and materials. The success of this is capitalised by the bespoke design of house types which is achieved through the use of large windows, composite contemporary doors and cantilevered entrance canopies. The house types are also designed to specifically accommodate the street layout and to turn corners that address the street.

Pedestrian and vehicle movement across the site is proposed through a network of footpaths and streets that allow connections to Swan Lane and the existing residential areas of Long Stratton to the east.

Overall, it is felt that this application demonstrate how it will achieve a high quality scheme. The information submitted successfully shows how the proposals will combine the existing site assets into one coherent development that joins up with the proposed and existing land uses. The applicant should continue to work with the local planning authority to further develop the selection of materials for house types beyond this reserved matters stage to ensure that it comes up with a set of detailed proposals that successfully build on the existing character of Long Stratton and compliment the bespoke design of house types.

3.5 Ecologist

Comment on amended plans:
Further details are have been submitted in respect of the ecological management plan, number and location of bird and bat boxes/tiles and a lighting plan. Condition 14 can be discharged but further details in respect of lighting is required.

3.6 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)

With reference to the proposal for additional investigation and detailed quantitative risk assessment, Maple Park, Swan Lane, Long Stratton by Delta Simons (June 2015).

The pre- commencement condition - condition 8 of consent 2014/2278 has been satisfied for the ‘North Zone’ subject to the following requirements:

In the event that contamination that was not previously identified is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. All development shall cease and shall not recommence until:

1) a report shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority which includes results of an investigation and risk assessment together with proposed remediation scheme to deal with the risk identified and
2) the agreed remediation scheme has been carried out and a validation report demonstrating its effectiveness has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

For the ‘South Zone’ further site investigation is needed prior to remedial works and as such condition 8 has not been satisfied. Following the further site investigation, a remediation method statement should be produced and agreed in writing with the local planning authority and following remedial works a validation report would also be required.
As detailed in condition 8 any work should be carried out in accordance with current best practice and in line with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s - ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination – CLR 11’

Comments on amended plans:
- The proposed footway along the north-western side of the commercial building should be widened to 1.8m in order to provide suitable pedestrian links between the car park and the entrance to the building.
- The Highway Authority would not want multiple colour blocks in the gateway feature outside the multiple open space. The crossing point should be delineated by a pedestrian dropped kerb only.
- A note has been added stating the wall adjacent the northern access to the commercial car park will be lowered to improve visibility, however it is not stated how low this wall will become and what level of visibility will be provided.
- Fence adjacent to plot 50 needs deleting in respect of visibility
- Consideration to be had to better relate parking spaces for plot 29.

Should your Authority support the application then it is recommended the above be addressed and the following conditions and informative notes be appended to the consent notice: management and maintenance of roads; on-site parking for construction workers; note advising of process for street lighting; note advising S38 agreement required to discharge highway conditions

Finally, this application also seeks the discharge of conditions 3, 6 & 7 of the outline consent. At the moment insufficient evidence has been submitted to recommend these be discharged at this time.

Condition 31 of the Outline consent (2013/0265) specifies 10% affordable housing, comprising:
- 20% 1 bedroom wheelchair bungalow
- 40% 2 bedroom 3 person bungalows
- 40% 1 bedroom 2 person flats

At least 3 (including the wheelchair bungalow) are to be for rent.

The plans submitted with this reserved matters application show that this condition can be met. I am satisfied with the internal layout and space standards shown.

I understand that the final tenure mix of the 5 affordable homes is not yet agreed with the housing association that is to acquire them. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the Council is able to ensure compliance with the Outline consent.

Comments on original plans:
No objection with the following comments:
Reports submitted indicated the use of infiltration drainage would not provide a satisfactory means of surface water drainage for the site. In addition seasonal variations in groundwater levels reduced the viability of an infiltration basin in the southern part of the site as originally proposed.
The FRA advises that the main part of the site discharging surface water to a positive piped surface water drainage system with two on-line cellular attenuation tanks located within the open space areas providing a cascade system of attenuation prior to a controlled discharge maximum of 19.8 l/sec into the Anglian Water surface water sewer in Swan Lane via an existing surface water drain in the access road to South Norfolk House. The lower south-eastern part of the site has a separate positive piped surface water drainage system with an on-line box-culvert attenuation tank and controlled discharge maximum of 12.7 l/sec to the Anglian Water surface water sewer in Swan Lane. Attenuation will provide storage for all storm flows up to and including the 1 in 100 year event including 30% for climate change. The FRA Appendix G drawing refers.

The FRA Appendix E refers to a letter from Anglian Water dated 11 September 2012 stating that they will accept flows connecting to the surface water sewer on a continued like for like basis at no greater than 32.61 l/sec.

Drawing No 141301 CL-11 P1, S104 layout shows that the surface water drainage system for the site including the shared pipe run, the box culvert attenuation tank and two hydro-break flow control systems will be offered to Anglian Water for adoption. However, the two attenuation tanks serving the northern and western parts of the site have not been shown as being offered for S104 adoption. We would request clarification as to future management of the two attenuation tanks including a management schedule if these features are to be managed by a management company. If these features are to form part of the open space adoption we would recommend submission of an appropriate management schedule and would recommend early consultation with our Amenities Manager Gary Howard to ensure that agreement can be reached to enable these features to be adopted by the Local Authority.

Comments on amended plans:
Still requires a management schedules regarding the proposed attenuation tanks which have been indicated that will be owned and managed by a management company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NHS England</th>
<th>No comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>NHS Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Long Stratton Medical Partnership</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.12 | SNC Landscape Officer | Comments on original plans:
- Insufficient space has been allowed for existing trees to grow within the layout and location of dwellings.
- Further details of the function and management of the triangular areas of trees on site required.
- Northern boundary should be a hedge not a close boarded fence – to provide a setting to the development and to maximise biodiversity |
- Further clarification and justification for further tree removal is required.
- Question if the tree planting indicated within the development will be achievable given limited space
- Need clarification on the purpose of the woodland walk, why an access drive to it is needed and why trees need to be removed in this area
- Need further detail and clarification on the landscaping of the Swan Lane frontage
- There are no detailed planting proposals for the site, so the submitted Landscape Management Plan (LMP) cannot be checked against these.

Comments on amended plans: (summarised)

- The access drive on the north of the ‘woodland’ is now deleted and the whole area is grass with trees; there is to be a circular mown path. This is acceptable.
- T22 is now confirmed as being proposed to be removed, concern but no objection.
- Full consideration needs to be given to the long-term sustainability and contribution to ‘Maple Park’ of the retained trees.
- Concern still raised regarding anticipated tree growth and the layout of dwellings.
- The boundary treatments along the north and northwest are still disappointing. A new hedgerow is now proposed on the north, but on the inner side of the close-board fence. In order to have the most visual benefit and maximise biodiversity, such planting should be on the outside. No planting is proposed along the boundary with SNC’s car park and the treed triangle; if this were to be planted with a hedge, this would create connectivity between the habitats. Further consideration requested.
- Trees are situated on what will be the ‘woodland walk’ area. Two of the trees are proposed to be removed because it has been identified that their future growth is incompatible with the proposed dwelling’s siting. I cannot support these trees’ proposed removal on the basis of the reason given.
- Details on tree pits are still required.
- Consideration needs to be given for planting along the site frontage.
- The Landscape Management Plan has been expanded in light of my previous remarks, and the submission of planting proposals gives this a context. There are a couple of outstanding pieces of key information that need to be added but subject to these amendments the LMP should be acceptable.
- Other than the comments above, the planting proposals are generally acceptable. I am pleased to note the addition of hedging around the play area, which to my mind will create a far more welcoming space. Species needs to be re-considered for this.
- To remove temptation to use the area of open space/play area for site storage and therefore protect it from any accidental damage, I suggest that the Tree Protection Plan be amended so that the whole of the play area be designated as a construction exclusion zone.
The revised details have addressed some of my concerns previously raised, but there are some issues outstanding.

I remain concerned that the proposed layout still makes insufficient allowance for the future growth of the few remaining trees around the site and therefore is not in line with BS5837.

It has been accepted that T5 will cause shading and its growth will be problematical for plot, but the response has been to propose removal of the tree not adjust the proposed layout.

Despite the assertions of the agent, I can see long-term issues with T3, which is arguably the best tree on the site. This oak is possibly only half to one third of its potential height and whilst I accept that the proposed dwelling may not compromise the tree’s spread at this time, its form and character are such that it would be highly unlikely for the tree to be able to grow naturally should this proposed layout be agreed. BS5837 cautions against the siting of dwellings in close proximity to large trees.

It is now proposed to retain all three trees of G19 but the briefing note accompanying the latest revisions states “The trees will be maintained regularly (crown pruning) to ensure branches do not affect Plot 37”. That such management will be required indicates that the proposed layout is still far from ideal.

As it stands the proposed scheme is contrary to the requirements of condition 19 of the outline planning permission 2013/0265.

With regards to new planting, I have received confirmation about the easements, and the implications for planting along Swan Lane. As you will recall, I had asked for additional planting for the housing frontage on Swan Lane, however this is not possible, apparently, due to Anglian Water’s easement restrictions. I can accept this, but what does not appear to make sense is the fact that new planting is proposed either side of this area (at the POS and near the parking bays) where the easement appears to apply also. We need to be sure that the planting proposals presented as part of this application are all achievable as presented. If they are not, then we need revised drawings.

The Written Scheme of Investigation for the archaeological work at the site has been approved and part A of the condition can therefore be discharged. Parts B & C of the condition remain in place until all of the archaeological work has taken place and the final reports have been submitted and approved.

No comments to make – the planning obligations were secured at the outline stage.

Currently in discussions with the applicant with regard to the design and requirements for the play areas to accord with the S106 which was secured as part of the outline consent.
3.17 Environment Agency
Surface water drainage:
No objection to the reserved matters. Further management and maintenance information required before the condition should be discharged.

Original comments re contamination: object to the discharge of the contamination condition at this time. Investigations and submitted report identified significant hydrocarbon contamination in the area of the above ground storage tank. Contamination is significantly in excess of generic assessment criteria and further site investigation and risk assessment should be undertaken to identify pollutant linkages and determine appropriate remediation techniques.

Comments on the updated Contamination report:
Based on the revised strategy, we are satisfied that condition 8 be discharged for the North Zone of the proposed development, however we wish to maintain our objection to the discharge of condition 8 for the South Zone.

3.18 Norfolk Fire Services
The proposed fire hydrant location is acceptable.

3.19 Other Representations

7 letters of objection and 1 letter of support with the following comments:

- Concern with how infrastructure- schools, doctors etc will cope with all of the new houses planned for Long Stratton
- Support plots 23 and 24 being bungalows.
- Concern with plots 25 and 26 being two storey as these would result in overlooking of properties and gardens
- Object to any pedestrian footpath through to St Andrews Close
- The amended ecology report should be adhered to
- The proposed pedestrian link to the north (to facilitate pedestrian linkages to the planned 600 dwellings as part of the LSAAP to the north) is totally inadequate. There would be no natural surveillance or openness and would be a ‘muggers alley’.
- The proposed flats will result in overlooking
- There will be adverse noise from the parking areas near St James Way
- Will affect value of surrounding properties
- Plots 35 and 36 are houses and they should be bungalows to prevent overlooking and loss of light to existing properties
- Pleased that the nature area has been included on the site
- Why does planting at the rear of plot 46 stop at the eastern boundary?

- The boundary of plot 46 is not clear on the plans
- Will a fence be erected along the entire eastern boundary of the site?
- Question the floorspace of the office accommodation this is set at 800m2 when it should read 800sqm – this needs to be corrected on the description.
- Hedgehogs using the site need to be considered during and post construction
4 Assessment

The site

4.1 The site is land at Cygnet House, Swan Lane within the development boundary for Long Stratton. It measures approximately 2.46 Hectares and is owned by South Norfolk Council.

4.2 The site is situated between Swan Lane to the south, South Norfolk House to the west, an area of open land used for agricultural purposes to the north, and residential development situated off St Andrews, St James' and St David’s Way, to the east. The site is roughly triangular in shape. There are two buildings located within the site – Cygnet House a former Care Home, which has recently been demolished and The Lodge, which is occupied by South Norfolk Council. The majority of the site, which is located to the north of Cygnet House, comprises open overgrown scrub land, together with a number of trees of various ages, the majority of which have recently been cleared from the site. An area of managed open space, which incorporates a tree circle, is situated toward the south of the site and to the west of Cygnet House.

4.3 Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is gained via a link road connecting South Norfolk House with Swan Lane. A T-junction from the link road provides access to the site and Cygnet House.

4.4 It is important to note that the topography of the site varies significantly between its southern and northern boundaries. In particular, there is a steep increase in levels to the north of Cygnet House.

The proposal

4.5 Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the site to demolish the existing building and provide up to 50 residential dwellings together with up to 800sqm of B1 Office floor space was granted in April 2014 (ref 2013/0265/O). Only the principle, number and access were for consideration at that time with all other matters reserved.

4.6 This application seeks approval of those matters previously reserved which are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the 50 dwellings and the B1 office building.

4.7 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, plus one small apartment building containing two flats. There is a mix of two and single storey properties.

4.8 In-line with the outline consent there are 5 dwellings proposed to be affordable and these are located in two main areas on the site. Recreation and play space is proposed to the front and further within the site and the quantum is in excess of the policy requirement of 1000sqm.

4.9 The application, in-line with the outline approval, proposes a singular vehicular access point to the west of the site on to the existing access road to the Council Offices.

4.10 A S106 was secured with the outline consent for the site and this secured a number of obligations, including contributions for education, libraries, securing the quantum of play area on the site and the future management and maintenance of that space and a financial contribution towards recreational space off site. A condition imposed on the outline also requires a further S106 to be entered into prior to the commencement of development to secure the approved 10% affordable housing on site.
4.11 Amended plans have been submitted through the course of the application which include revisions to the highway specifications, changes to the groupings and layout of some of the dwellings and parking areas, reduction in scale of some of the buildings along the eastern boundary, additional information in respect of proposed landscaping, AIA, renewable energy, proposed pedestrian links, contamination, drainage strategy and management and maintenance, and cycle parking for the commercial building.

4.12 A number of conditions are also requested to be discharged as part of the application and these include conditions relating to highways construction specifications; details of parking for the commercial building; cycle parking; contamination; foul and surface water schemes; sustainable construction, renewable energy and water efficiency; ecological mitigation; archaeology; details to ensure development is designed in relation to noise impacts from commercial to residential; finished ground and floor levels; boundary treatments; tree implications; landscape management plans; fire hydrant provision; construction details of retaining walls; pedestrian link to St Andrews Close; detailed masterplan.

4.13 The main issues for consideration are the principle; highways and access issues; landscaping; layout; appearance and scale; open space; ecology; residential amenity; drainage; affordable housing and sustainable construction/renewable energy; and condition discharge including contamination.

Principle

4.14 The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2012/1385. This had regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of up to 50 dwellings and 800sqm of office floorspace. It is only the details reserved at that outline which are therefore now for consideration which are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Highways and parking

4.15 The Highway Authority has confirmed no objection to the reserved matters subject to a number of conditions.

4.16 Comments are awaited from the Highway Authority regarding the additional information submitted in relation to details required by condition. These largely relate to technical highway design specifications and can be resolved following a committee resolution by way of the usual discharge of condition process.

4.17 Critically in respect of the overall quality of the development, officers consider that a high quality surface material of brick paviors needs to be used in key areas of the development to break up the road and parking areas given that it will be a highly visible development and there is limited opportunity for green verges to the front of properties. The main road through the site and parking areas for the commercial building would be asphalt with two gateway areas along the route which would be block paviors to break this up. Furthermore the roadway to the south of the site and all parking areas are to be block paviors. This should ensure that the development remains a high quality on its streetscape.

4.18 In respect of parking, policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site. Amended plans submitted have addressed some of officer’s previous concerns regarding the position of car parking in respect of functionality and impact on the streetscene. Parking spaces are now better related to the dwellings they serve and there is an appropriate balance of on plot parking and small parking courts which help minimise the impact of cars on the streetscene whilst also providing well overlooked and small parking courts. Nine of the 50 plots would have tandem parking and this is considered an appropriate balance again to ensure a balance between meeting adequate parking levels and ensuring the street scene is not dominated by parking.
Overall on balance and as amended, the proposed layout in respect of the parking arrangement is considered acceptable.

Pedestrian linkages

4.19 The outline consent indicated a pedestrian access between the site and St Andrews Close (in the north-east corner of the site), and this was required to ensure pedestrian permeability from the site to the surrounding area.

4.20 A condition was imposed on the outline consent which required details of this pedestrian access to be submitted as part of the reserved matters. Due to changes in site levels and discussion with the police community architectural liaison officer, it is considered that this pedestrian foot-link would not be practical to deliver.

4.21 As an alternative, and as required in the wording of the proposed and emerging Long Stratton Area Action Plan (LSAAP) (due for examination shortly), an area of land between the site and the northern boundary is reserved for a pedestrian link to the planned development to the north.

4.22 Representations have been made by the promoter of the land to the north as to the suitability of the proposed reserved strip for a pedestrian link, as a safe and suitable design to connect the envisaged 600 dwellings and employment land (as promoted in the LSAAP) to the town centre. They indicate that the lack of a considered layout in this respect (garages and fencing along the length of the route, and limited overlooking) would result in a ‘muggers alley’ and would not provide adequate pedestrian links from the large scale development proposed to the town centre as envisaged by the LSAAP.

4.23 The Norfolk Police Architectural Liaison Officer have commented on the proposed pedestrian link (the space of which is reserved is 5m wide and 20m long) who consider that the route would offer quite a straight and wide foot/cycle path without any bends or blind-spots and if well used would police itself. Subject to a 1.5m fence with a trellis on top along the two boundaries along its length, low level planting on the footpath site (to avoid excessive vegetation growth and height) and a suitable lighting scheme the Architectural Liaison Officer has advised that there is no objection in principle in respect of safety for this proposed foot link.

4.24 The foot-link would not be delivered at this time, given that the land to the north is currently only being proposed through the emerging LSAAP and could be some time before this comes forward.

The land will be reserved for that future link and will be fenced off with only access for maintenance until such time as the foot-link is required. A condition will need to be imposed to ensure that land is safeguarded for a potential pedestrian link and for details of its design, surfacing and lighting prior to its implementation.

4.25 Overall therefore it is considered that the deletion of the pedestrian link to the east is acceptable, given that a route is safeguarded to the north with the planned growth coming forward in the LSAAP. In respect of the design of the safeguarded pedestrian route, whilst the promoter of the land to the north has serious concerns as to its design and suitability as a sustainable link to the town, for the reasons set out above, officers consider that the proposed safeguarded access would provide a safe and appropriate pedestrian access.

Landscaping/open space

4.26 In respect of landscaping, a landscape masterplan has been submitted with the application along with an updated Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) and the application is also seeking discharge of two landscaping conditions imposed on the outline consent.
4.27 A number of young trees within the site have been removed and this was established through the outline consent. Crucially, existing trees to the front of the site, in the triangular woodland areas to the north-west of the site and the cluster in the south-east of the site would be retained as part of the development.

4.28 Proposed planting includes a native species hedge along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site (in combination with fencing behind) which provides a fair balance between providing secure boundaries and also maximising landscaping for biodiversity and a setting to the development.

4.29 The Council’s Landscape Officer had raised a number of concerns regarding the proximity of some of the proposed dwellings in the north-east corner of the site to retained trees in regards to future growth. An updated AIA has been submitted to demonstrate that an accurate reflection of the anticipated growth of the trees has been taken into account. Final comments from the Council’s Landscape Officer will be presented to committee.

4.30 A number of trees are proposed within the development to soften the streetscape and also within gardens. Amended drawings and information has been submitted in respect of proposed species to ensure that there is adequate space for these trees to grow. At the time of writing the report the comments of the Council’s Landscape Officer on the acceptability of the proposed planting are awaited, however subject to these outstanding comments in respect of species, which is a matter for the condition discharge, it is considered that the amount of planting within the development is appropriate in design and landscape terms.

4.31 The existing bunding along the site frontage with Swan Lane is to be removed and this will be left grassed and will form part of the natural play area to the front of the site around the ring of trees. Further tree and hedge planting is proposed in this location to help define the play area. Whilst precise details of the design of this play area in respect of landscaping is still to be agreed with the Council’s Play and Amenities Officer and Landscape Officer, such an approach is supported in principle and precise details of this design can be concluded as part of the discharge of conditions and S106 agreement.

4.32 Two further open space/play areas are proposed within the development. An area to the north-east of the office building is proposed to house the formal play area which would be equipped. Precise details of the design are to be agreed with the Council’s Play and Amenities Officer and this is already set out in the S106 secured at outline stage.

4.33 A woodland walk area is proposed to the south-east of the formal play area and this will utilise the retained trees in this part of the site.

It would be planted as a wildflower meadow with a mown path. It is well located centrally within the site and crucially ensures existing trees would be retained and the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement within the site. Again precise details of its design and planting is still to be agreed by the Council’s Landscape Officer, however this can be concluded as part of the discharge of conditions.

4.34 Both play areas are well located within the site and designed so as to ensure good natural surveillance. As such the principle of the location of the play/open areas is acceptable and the precise detailed design can be left to the approval of the condition and S106 previously imposed.

Scale, layout and design

4.35 Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF requires all development to achieve good design.
The site is located immediately to the west of Long Stratton village centre and is defined by a variety of attractive assets, for example mature trees, high quality landscaping and varied topography. These assets also constrain how the site can be developed and overall it is considered that the proposals successfully respond to these site features by creating a well-structured building layout that builds on the quality of the surroundings.

An analysis of the form, layout and character of Long Stratton has been carried out that helps to create a set of robust design principles that give the proposals a defined identity based on the design principles set out in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The analysis has also looked beyond the core of Long Stratton to consider how the proposals can be informed by the surrounding land uses and landscape setting. This includes information about how the site responds to South Norfolk House and its relationship with existing residential areas surrounding the development and the edge of countryside.

Careful consideration has been given to ensure that the proposed development is not imposing and is sympathetic to the urban grain and density of the adjacent developments. Buildings have been positioned to give a continuity of frontage to the access road and a presence to Swan Lane, similar to that of the existing properties to the east.

The positioning of the commercial unit considers the constraints of the layout whilst turning the corner at the site access. This gives a strong street presence on approach from Swan Lane and a frontage which follows the alignment of the access road. It is acknowledged that this area is very tight but the position, design and layout of the building and parking is considered to have responded to the constraints.

Many of the buildings along the ‘spine’ have been positioned to define ‘home zone’ areas whilst creating all important enclosure. Furthermore, some of the buildings are deliberately positioned at an angle and not parallel to the edge of the road so that glimpses of frontages are formed through key vistas (i.e. the buildings define the spaces, not the roads). Where appropriate, dwellings have also been positioned to act as closed stop ends to provide vista terminus.

Parking remains in curtilage throughout. Where parking courts feature, they have been positioned to achieve optimum surveillance in accordance with Secured by Design guidelines. Parking is broken up with landscaping and street trees to provide attractive streetscapes.

The appearance of the development combines traditional building forms with contemporary detailing and materials. The success of this is capitalised by the bespoke design of house types which is achieved through the use of large windows, composite contemporary doors and cantilevered entrance canopies. The house types are also designed to specifically accommodate the street layout and to turn corners that address the street.

Overall, it is considered that this application demonstrates how it will achieve a high quality scheme. The information submitted successfully shows how the proposals will combine the existing site assets into one coherent development that joins up with the proposed and existing land uses. Whilst one of the conditions applied to be discharged is the materials, this is still in negotiation to ensure that the materials successfully build on the existing character of Long Stratton and compliment the bespoke design of house types.

Ecology

An Ecology report was submitted with the outline consent which included measures for mitigation and enhancement. This was considered satisfactory at that time subject to a condition in respect of requiring full details of mitigation including the of the timing of the works for breeding birds, the need for further species survey prior to reserved matters and enhancements such as bat and bird boxes. The overall principles were acceptable, it was therefore only the details of mitigation that was to be further secured.
4.45 The application as submitted includes information to discharge this condition (condition 14). Based on amended details the County Ecologist has confirmed condition 14 can be discharged however further details of any lighting proposed will need to be agreed.

4.46 The presence of hedgehogs has been identified on site by a local resident. Whilst hedgehogs are not protected species the concerns have been passed onto the applicant who is considering this further.

Residential amenity

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

4.48 Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties largely relate to those properties to the east of the site.

4.49 Where proposed properties are located close to the eastern boundary and relate to bungalows in the top north-east corner of the site, bungalows are also proposed on the application site. This coupled with appropriate boundary screening of hedge and fencing ensures that the proposed dwellings would not result in any significantly detrimental impacts on those existing dwellings in terms of overbearing, privacy or overshadowing impacts.

4.50 A two storey apartment building is proposed along the southern boundary (plots 31-32), however given that the distance between this building and the rear of those existing dwellings is approx. 26m and that there is a boundary fence and hedge as an intervening boundary feature, it is not considered that the proposed flats would result in any significantly detrimental loss of privacy to that existing dwelling.

4.51 Plots 35, 36, 37 and 46-49 which are adjacent to the eastern boundary are all two storey properties. There is sufficient distance and boundary treatment proposed between these dwellings and those existing properties to the east to ensure that the amenities of those existing dwellings in terms of loss of privacy, overbearing and loss of light impacts would not be adversely affected.

4.52 In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on residential amenity. Furthermore gardens of sufficient size and shape for their intended purpose (including a shared garden space for the two flats) are proposed and there is adequate space for on-site parking.

4.53 The impacts of the commercial building on surrounding (existing and proposed) dwellings is to be considered as part of the design and layout. Furthermore condition 10 on the outline consent requires a scheme for protecting the noise-sensitive development (existing and proposed dwellings) from noise from the proposed commercial building to be submitted. Details have been submitted to indicate that the most sensitive dwellings from the commercial building would be those within 45-55metres of the commercial building. The design and layout of the commercial building and how it functions has been designed so as to mitigate any impacts on residential amenity. Plant and delivery vehicle parking areas are strategically located to maximise the use of existing and proposed buildings, level changes and planting in order to reduce any potential impacts from the plant and noise and disturbance of coming and going of delivery vehicles. This has ensured that there would be no significantly detrimental impacts on the amenities of nearby residential from the properties from the commercial building and in officer opinion therefore satisfactorily discharges condition 10 of the outline.
4.54 Drainage

In respect of surface water drainage the Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Officer have advised they have no objection to the reserved matters but have asked for further information in support of any discharge of condition relating to surface water.

4.55 The surface water drainage strategy has altered since the scheme was approved at outline stage. The original FRA recommended the use of an infiltration basin with an overflow connection to the public surface sewer with a limited flow rate. However following infiltration testing the use of an infiltration basin is no longer viable and instead a new strategy is proposed which includes a piped network and underground attenuation storage tanks, with controlled flows into the existing public sewer. This solution is acceptable in this instance given the poor infiltration of the ground, possible residual contamination and high groundwater in the southern part of the site.

4.56 The outstanding matter for the discharge of this condition is the management and maintenance of that surface water system. A management schedule has been submitted and comments are awaited from the Council’s Flood Officer in this respect.

4.57 In respect of foul water, Anglian Water confirmed at the outline stage that there was sufficient capacity at the Long Stratton sewage treatment work.

4.58 Affordable housing

Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. Based on development viability, 10% of the proposed dwellings were secured as ‘affordable’ as part of the outline consent. This equates to 5 affordable homes.

4.59 The reserved matters application proposes 5 affordable dwellings comprising of two standard bungalows, 1 wheelchair bungalow and two no. 1-bed flats which accords with the number and mix agreed at outline.

4.60 The location of the affordable housing is in two areas. 4 of the properties are in a small cluster in the centre of the site, and the 5th (the wheelchair bungalow) is located at the entrance to the site. It is considered that the location and distribution of the affordable housing is acceptable.

4.61 Tenure mix of the affordable dwellings is not yet agreed with the Housing Association, however a further S106 is required to be entered into prior to the commencement of development to secure the approved 10% affordable housing on site and their mix and tenure. This is secured by condition through the Outline consent.

4.62 On the above basis the Council’s Affordable Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer confirms he has no objection to the proposal.

4.63 Sustainable construction/ renewable energy

Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of the building, the compliance with code level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. These requirements are also covered by conditions 13 and 26 of the re-issued consent 2014/2278.

4.64 Information as amended has been submitted by the applicant which indicates that the renewable energy requirement will be met with the use of air source heat pumps for the dwellings and the commercial building in addition to solar photovoltaic panels to the front of the commercial building.
This is considered acceptable and to accord with the requirements of the policies and the condition.

4.65 Confirmation that the buildings have been constructed to comply with the water efficiency requirement will need to be submitted prior to their first occupation in order to comply with this condition.

Procedural matters to address discrepancies between the red and blue lines of the application site

4.66 A Grampian condition is proposed which requires no occupation of plots 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 until planning permission has been secured for the change of use of that land (as shown on drawing 110/H) to ancillary residential curtilage. This is to ensure that those properties indicated have adequate private amenity space in addition to avoid strips of land between this development and the future development to the north which would be unmanaged and unmaintained.

EIA

4.67 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening has been undertaken as part of this application. This concluded that there would not be significant impacts to require a full Environmental Statement to accompany the application. All other matters raised are addressed in this report.

Condition discharge

4.68 A number of conditions are intended to be discharged as part of the submitted application in addition to the consideration of the reserved matters. The conditions relate to the varied outline consent 2014/2278.

4.69 An assessment of the current situation for each of those conditions is set out below. A significant number are still under negotiation between the LPA and the applicant, however officers consider that agreement can be reached on these matters and authority from Members is requested to delegate further consideration of this to officers following any committee resolution.

4.70 Condition 2 – submission of reserved matters – acceptable.

4.71 Condition 3 – detailed plans of roads, footways and cycle ways and drainage of the highway – detailed technical information is still in negotiation and so authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is requested

4.72 Condition 6 – space for 26 cars and a light good vehicle to park for the commercial unit needs to be provided and this shall be surfaced etc in accordance with submitted details. A sufficient number of parking spaces have been proposed. Detailed technical highway specifications are still being negotiated between the LPA, the Highway Authority and the applicant. Authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested.

4.73 Condition 7 – a scheme for cycle parking to be approved – Sufficient number and design of cycle parking spaces has been submitted and this is acceptable subject to final agreement with the Highway Authority. Authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested.

4.74 Condition 8 – Assessment of contamination required – investigation and risk assessment reports for contamination have been submitted with the application and further information submitted through the course of the application.
Negotiation is still ongoing between the LPA, the Environment Agency the Councils Environmental Services department and the applicant to reach agreement in respect of this matter. Authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested.

4.75 **Condition 10** - requires a scheme for protecting the noise-sensitive development (existing and proposed dwellings) from noise from the proposed commercial building. – As set out in the main report above, details have been submitted to address this and this is considered acceptable subject to further information on the opening times of the proposed office building.

4.76 **Condition 11** – precise details of foul water and sewage to be submitted – This is still under consideration by Anglian Water and authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested.

4.77 **Condition 12** – Surface water drainage scheme – As set out in the main report the proposed surface water drainage strategy is acceptable, as amended, subject to confirmation from the Flood Officer that the management and maintenance schedule submitted is acceptable. Authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested in this respect.

4.78 **Condition 13** – Build to Code level 4 for water consumption – information has been submitted to suggest that the development has been designed to comply with this requirement. Confirmation that the buildings have been constructed to comply with the water efficiency requirement will however need to be submitted prior to their first occupation in order to comply with this condition.

4.79 **Condition 14** – Ecology mitigation report – The Ecologist has confirmed the information submitted is satisfactory to discharge this condition.

4.80 **Condition 15** – Archaeological assessment to be submitted – Historic Environment Service has confirmed that they have approved the Written Scheme of Investigation for the archaeological work at the site and part A of the condition can be discharged. Parts B & C of the condition remain in place until all of the archaeological work has taken place and the final reports have been submitted and approved.

4.81 **Condition 16** – Details of finished floor levels and ground levels to be submitted – Adequate information has been submitted and this condition can be discharged.

4.82 **Condition 17** - Details of boundary treatments to be submitted – amended information in this respect has been submitted and is acceptable. This condition can therefore be discharged.

4.83 **Condition 19** – Requires details to be submitted with the reserved matters for a layout that anticipates adequate tree growth of existing trees – Information in the AIA has been submitted to demonstrate this. Final points of query are outstanding with the landscape officer.

4.84 **Condition 20** – Requires a landscape management plan to be submitted – The scheme as amended is acceptable.

4.85 **Condition 22** – provision of a fire hydrant in an agreed location – Norfolk Fire and Rescue service have advised that the revised details submitted are acceptable and the condition can be discharged.

4.86 **Condition 23** – materials – Details of proposed materials have been submitted and negotiations are ongoing between the LPA and the applicant to reach agreement. Authority to delegate the outstanding negotiations to officers is therefore requested.
4.87 Condition 25 – Details of pedestrian link to St Andrew Close – this is set out in the main body of the report. Whilst this pedestrian link is no longer being proposed, an alternative link is being safeguarded to the north to link into planned growth from the LSAAP immediately adjacent to the site to the north. This condition is therefore considered to have been complied with by an alternative arrangement.

4.88 Condition 26 – Renewable energy on site – This is set out in the main body of the report. Information as amended has been submitted by the applicant which indicates that the renewable energy requirement will be met with the use of air source heat pumps for the dwellings and the commercial building in addition to solar photovoltaic panels to the front of the commercial building. This is considered acceptable and to accord with the requirements of the policies and the condition.

4.89 Condition 30- submission of a masterplan detailing of phasing, dwelling mix, structural landscaping and open space. An indicative phasing plan has been submitted and dwelling mix, landscaping and open space matters are covered in other areas of the submission. The proposed phasing is considered acceptable.

4.90 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.

4.91 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as is pursuant to an outline which was approved prior to the introduction of CIL.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The site is constrained by topography and trees and the design and layout has responded to this. It is evident there are some concessions to be had in respect of proximity to retained trees however this on balance considered to be acceptable.

5.2 The scale and layout of the development as amended is considered to have no adverse impact on residential amenity.

5.3 Overall and on balance the reserved matters are considered acceptable and to accord with the development plan.

5.4 A number of details are still under negotiation in respect of condition discharge, however agreement can be reached following resolution of the reserved matters by committee.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement Ref : 2015/8005
Parish : CROWNTHORPE
Site : The Drift, Crowntorpe Road, Crowntorpe Wymondham
Development : Standing and Occupation of Residential Mobile Home
Developers Name : Mr & Mrs D Wilkinson

1. Background

1.1 The site is a detached bungalow set back from the highway in Crowntorpe just outside Wymondham and is one of a small group of 5 residences. At the rear of the site the current owners have stood a large mobile home measuring 13.7m by 6m and measuring 4.2m high which is 1.55m away from the boundary with the neighbours. It is of the type that is delivered in two halves and assembled on site.

1.2 The mobile home has been stood at the rear of the property to provide residential accommodation for the owner’s elderly mother, father and their mothers full time live-in carer. The mobile is entirely self-contained and the elderly occupants rarely leave the mobile home.

1.3 The Council has received two complaints about the standing of the mobile home.

1.4 The owners have been written to and advised of the need to apply for planning permission but have failed to submit an application

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph 207 Enforcement

South Norfolk Local Plan -
IMP 2 Landscaping
IMP 9 Residential Amenity
ENV 8 Development in the Open Countryside

2.2 The site and its mobile home is located outside the development boundary for Wymondham and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP).

3. Consultation

3.1 Neighbours Object:
- Total loss of privacy
- Overlooking into all aspects of our garden
- Unable to sell their home

4. Assessment

4.1 The standing of a mobile home as an independent dwelling in this location conflicts with SNLP policy ENV8 as the site is well outside any Development Limit.

4.2 In this case the mobile is occupied by the elderly parents of the occupiers of the main house, together with a live-in carer whose presence is required because of a serious medical condition of one of the occupiers.

The owner advises that the mobile is dependent on the main house for electricity, water, sewerage and access. It is also stated that the occupiers of the mobile take some meals in the main house. However, the mobile provides a kitchen, 2 bathrooms, 3 bedrooms, dining room, lounge and utility room and is clearly designed for independent use. In these circumstances the mobile is not considered to be incidental to the residential use of the main dwelling, but requires planning permission as an annexe.
4.3 In view of the temporary nature of the mobile; the close relationship of the mobile home occupiers to the residents of the main dwelling; and the personal circumstances which make that annexe accommodation necessary; I consider that the principle of an annexe is acceptable while the particular need for it exists.

4.4 An objection from a neighbouring property has been received with particular reference to loss of privacy in their garden. A fence along the boundary between the properties provides screening, although it is possible for a taller adult standing to see over the fence from the entrance ramp to the mobile. In view of the separation of over 20m between the mobile and the adjacent dwelling however I consider, on balance, that this relationship is acceptable as a temporary arrangement.

4.5 The scale of the mobile home and its position detached from the main dwelling are not ideal for an annexe in planning policy terms, but in view of the particular circumstances outlined above, I consider that the mobile should be allowed to remain to meet the particular need for the occupiers in this instance.

5. Recommendation

5.1 Authorise Officers to serve a positive enforcement notice (subject to legal advice if required) requiring the removal of the mobile home once the mobile home is no longer occupied by the parents of the main dwelling residents currently in occupation.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Martin Burrows 01508 533843
Development Management Committee

22 July 2015

Appl. No : 2011/1804/O
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners
Site Address : Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road
Including Extension To Thickthorn Park & Ride Hethersett
Proposal : Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and
associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to
1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses)
comprising shops, small business units, community
facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space,
equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension
to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from
A11.

Recommendation : Deed of Variation to Section 106 Agreement to be secured.

1. Planning Policies (relevant to Deed of Variation)

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 02: Ensuring the viability of town centres
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 5 : The Economy
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy
Area
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres
Policy 19 : The hierarchy of centres
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
SHO9: Shop sites in major residential development

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 Autumn 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
DM1.2 – Requirements for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM2.4 – Location of main town centre uses

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
Het 1 – Land north of Hethersett
2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0860  Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Alterations to condition 32 and 33. To delete condition 32 and substitute with 32a in regard to commencement of Phase 2 and 32b commencement of Phase 5, deletion of condition 33 and substitute 33a and 33b, 33a in regard to first occupation of Phase 2 and 33b first occupation of Phase 5  Approved

2.2 2014/0863  Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Deletion of condition 32b footway/cycleway  Approved

2.3 2015/1058  Discharge of condition 4 following planning permission 2011/1804/O - design code for each phase of development.  Under consideration

2.4 2015/1059  Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout  Under consideration

2.5 2011/1804  Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.  Approved

2.6 2011/1489  Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride  Approved

3 Assessment

3.1 A deed of variation is to be sought from developers for this approved development. Permission 2011/1804 permitted 1196 dwellings, primary school site, open space and sports pitches along with 1850sq.m. of local services. This level of floorspace for local services was identified in the committee report for this application (Appendix 1) and condition 19 of the decision notice (Appendix 2).

3.2 The Section 106 agreement however identifies that a Neighbourhood Centre Site of two hectares (20,000sq.m.) should be provided for the erection of local facilities such as shops, post office, newsagent and doctors. Part 8 of the Schedule to the Section 106 agreement identifies the neighbourhood centre site is identified to provide local facilities such as shops, post office, newsagent and doctors or similar facilities, and confirms this should not include the site for the new primary school.
3.3 The amount of floorspace permitted in the decision and detailed in the committee report of 1,850sq.m. clearly is closer to 0.2 hectares (2,000sq.m.) and so a deed of variation will be sought to correct this error.

3.4 Further consideration of the implications of providing 2 hectares has also indicated the following. The emerging site allocation, HET 1, seeks to ensure services are provided to support housing, but does not seek to allocate this quantum of main town centre uses floorspace. 20,000sq.m. would provide significantly more than services to support the proposed housing.

3.5 It must also be considered that only 1,850sq.m. of main town centre uses were considered when determining the application. The provision of up to 20,000sq.m. of main town centre uses would lead to a need for a sequential test and retail impact assessment for this level of floorspace. The associated impacts on highways and on the retail hierarchy within the Norwich Policy Area would need further consideration. This would be a high level of floorspace to provide in association with 1196 dwellings, and would be more akin to a district centre which is not envisaged in the emerging site allocation policy HET 1.

3.6 Concern has been raised through ongoing discussions over the capacity of the GP surgery that serves Hethersett. The opportunity to provide a doctor’s surgery on the 2 hectares has been raised. Whilst the provision of community facilities is part of the planning consent, the Section 106 agreement cannot secure a doctor’s surgery due to the fact that a GP surgery is a private company. Part 8 of the Section 106 agreement only seeks to suggest potential uses such as a doctor’s surgery, but does not firmly secure this use. Therefore the reduction in area from 2 hectares to 0.2 hectares would not prevent a GP surgery from being provided as the Section 106 agreement could not secure one in the first instance.

4 Conclusion

4.1 In this instance it is considered clear that the Section 106 should have secured 0.2 hectares rather than 2 hectares for the neighbourhood centre site. The impact of permitting this level of main town centre floorspace has not been planned for in the emerging site allocation policy HET 1, has not been assessed as such in the original committee report (Appendix 1) and has not been secured as such in condition 19 of the planning decision (Appendix 2). A deed of variation will be sought to rectify this typographical error.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jo Hobbs 01508 533674 and E-mail: jhobbs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **App. No**: 2011/1804/O  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

**Applicants Name**: Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road (including Extension To Thickthorn Park & Ride) Hethersett

**Proposal**: Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 square metres (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM (RM's to include, siting, design, layout, landscaping, and phasing)  
3. In accordance with submitted drawings  
4. Design Code to be submitted and approved prior to submission of reserved matters  
5. Detailed phasing plan for open space provision to be submitted and agreed  
6. External materials to be agreed  
7. Surface water drainage  
8. Foul water strategy  
9. Archaeological work to be agreed  
10. Off-site highway works (Thickthorn)  
11. Ecological management strategy TBA  
12. Details of estate roads  
13. Estate road details for each phase TBA  
14. Construction Traffic parking TBA  
15. Construction Traffic Route TBA  
16. Details of wheel cleaning facilities TBA  
17. Travel Plan  
18. Development limited to 1196 dwellings  
19. Landscaping scheme TBA  
20. Retention of trees and hedges  
21. Tree protection  
22. Contamination - detailed scheme TBA  
23. Details of flood lighting to be agreed  
24. Fire hydrants  
25. Individual reserved matters – levels  
26. No residential development to the east of Burnthouse Lane until strategic gap agreed  
27. Amended Masterplan detailing additional buffer planting to Colney Lane (to accommodate additional mitigation for newts) to submitted and agreed

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards education, libraries, travel plan, off-site highway works, and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type tenure and mix of affordable housing, including its affordability in perpetuity, local centre (including retail and small business units and community facilities), and safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes.
1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPFP 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPFP 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPFP 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPFP 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPFP 07: Requiring good design
NPFP 08: Promoting healthy communities
NPFP 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPFP 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
HOU 3: Strategic Land Reserve (Part Consistent)
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1489 Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride

Approve with no conditions

3. Consultations

3.1 Great Melton Parish Council
Refuse
- No assurances of adequate drainage facilities.
- Not apparent how sewage will be dealt with
- Road systems not adequate
• No guarantees that the infrastructure in the area will be able to cope
• Light ad noise pollution
• Loss of green belt land
• Increased security risk to Great Melton residents
• Large scale development should not be considered until LDF consultations have been completed
• The numbers of dwellings proposed is too much for a village

Little Melton Parish Council

Original plans

The emphasis on green space, cycling and walking is to be commended and if done properly the development could be an exemplar of sustainable transport.

However, have raised the following concerns:
• Traffic studies have ignored the roads to Little Melton
• Phase 1 and 2 should be reversed and the cycleways and roads put in place first
• Impact on infrastructure
• Back Lane can not take construction vehicles
• Off-ride cycle route need to join up with the UEA cycle route
• Would want to see provision for a public house.

Amended plans
• Who will provide the missing section of Cycle Route between Braymeadow Lane and the bridge over the A47? The cycle path should be completed within the first phase of development. A safe cycle route should be seen as a selling point for the new houses.
• Money should be provided for traffic calming measures in Little Melton, that slow down the traffic and make through journeys unattractive.
• Consideration should be given to providing traffic lights at the junction of New Road and the B1172 as it will be very difficult for traffic to turn right at peak hours without them and this will lead to rat running.
• Why is there no sheltered housing being proposed within the development?
There should be an additional doctors surgery within the development.

Hethersett Parish Council

Original Plans – Refuse

• Application is premature
• Shortage in five year land supply should not be considered a material consideration when assessing this planning application (following legal rulings)
• Contrary to JCS ‘Strategic Gap’ policy
• Outside the development boundary
• Should not Hethersett have had an Area Action Plan, as is the case for Wymondham?

Detailed comments

• Should the development be approved, Henstead Road needs significant improvement
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- The rear access to the High School from Back Lane should be investigated in order to alleviate increased traffic in Queen's Road.
- There should be no road access/exit to new Road at the Great Melton/New Road junction.
- Significant improvements required to Colney Lane to support an increase in traffic.
- All proposed community facilities should be provided in full and on time.
- Is there sufficient capacity in the current water infrastructure to meet the demands of the proposed development?
- Will appropriate health facilities be provided in accordance with the JCS?
- Will education provision be developed adequately to accommodate the large increase in pupil numbers arising from the development?

Amended plans – Refuse

- The use of Henstead Road as a primary access/exit to the site is unacceptable, unworkable, unsafe and will cause major congestion in the area.
- How can access to Henstead Road be ‘limited’ as the applicant’s suggest?
- The developer should be made to construct an access road for construction vehicles to Colney Lane, and not us Churchfields as suggested.
- Traffic controls, traffic lights/roundabout need to be put in place at the New Road/B1172 junction to cope with additional traffic from the development.
- The access road at the west end of the development site should link directly with the New Road/Great Melton Road junction with associated traffic control.

Can assurances be given that provision for surface water drainage has been adequately addressed?

Colney Parish Meeting

Object

- Traffic
- Erosion of gaps between villages
- Loss of productive farmland and reduction of biodiversity
- Development alternatives have not been considered

Plans are lacking in detail regarding sewage, drainage and landscape issues.

3.2 District Members

Cllr L G P Dale

Application should be determined by members of committee to allow for the examination of the impact on the existing community, to assess the proposed planning gains, and to ensure those are secured in perpetuity. To check that the housing accords with the LDP and the GNDP requirements for the provision of affordable housing.

Has also raised many concerns and queries in respect of the environmental impact of the development, particularly regarding the traffic impact of the proposals and its effect on the local road network. The applicant has responded to these queries, and the majority of them have been answered satisfactorily through further explanation.
3.8 SNC: Planning Policy

Strategic Gap
The applicant’s Design and Access Statement (DAS) suggests that Saved Local Plan Policy ENV2 is ‘out of date’. We have recently received updated advice from landscape consultants which confirms the importance of the strategic gap between Cringleford and Hethersett. This reinforces Saved Local Plan Policy ENV2 which protects the physical separation between settlements, and will inform emerging policy. Technically, parts of this site intrude into the strategic gap. The relocation of the sports pitches to the east of the site lessens the visual impact of the proposed development when approaching from Coiney Lane, and this move is appreciated. However, the latest version of the Illustrative Masterplan shows housing and apartments to the east of Burnthouse Lane, i.e. within the strategic gap.

Northern Site Boundary
The preferred site for development, as recently featured in South Norfolk’s Site Specific Allocations consultation, stops south of the applicant’s proposed site boundary, in order to avoid the overhead cables. While it is recognised that the application is in outline form and the illustrative Masterplan indicates a non-residential buffer to the north of the site, the northern extent of the site and potential proximity of housing to the overhead cables is a concern. Additionally, the proximity of the site to Little Melton prompted a draft policy requirement for strategic landscaping to the north of the site, which appears to be addressed in the Illustrative Masterplan.

Proposed Number of Dwellings
JCS policies 10 and 14 identify ‘at least 1,000 dwellings’ at Hethersett, along with open space, community facilities and housing with care. The draft Site Specific Allocations document proposes around 1,200 dwellings for the village, but this includes land outside the application site. The application therefore represents a higher
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number of dwellings than the equivalent preferred site. However, Hethersett is in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and there is an acknowledged shortage of housing supply in the NPA.

Green Infrastructure/Pedestrian and Cycle Access
JCS policy 10 calls for green infrastructure to provide enhanced public access from Hethersett into the countryside. The Illustrative Masterplan appears to provide several green corridors to address this requirement. The emerging Site Specific Allocations document also sets out draft policy requirements for footpath/cycle links to NRP and Little Melton.

Other Policy Requirements
The emerging Site Specific Allocations document sets out draft policy requirements for the sites in Hethersett, including that they should be masterplanned together. It is recognised that this application has been developed over a significant period of time, and at this advanced stage, the Illustrative Masterplan can possibly only allow for development on adjacent sites, which it seems to do. Additionally, community facilities and open space seem to accord with those needs already identified by local residents, and outlined in the emerging Site Specific Allocations document.

3.9 Landscape Officer
No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.10 SNC: Economic Dev
It is important that employment opportunities and commercial development are recognised and included in this substantial site – no objections are raised to the application.

3.11 Environmental Services (Protection)
No objection subject to appropriate conditions that deal with any possible ground contamination.

3.12 NCC – Planning Obligations
1 form entry Primary School required – costs to be met by the developer (£5 million)

A pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school would be required. (Plus additional land for a larger school.)

£1,737,054 contribution towards secondary and sixth form provision required.

A minimum of 25 fire hydrants.

£71,760 towards library provision (£60 / dwelling)

3.13 National Planning Casework Unit
No comments received

3.14 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
Concerns over the impact on Beckhithe Meadow CWS. A management plan directing walkers away from sensitive areas should be submitted. Measures should be put in place to minimise light pollution. Green Infrastructure?
3.15 Fisher German (Gov. Pipeline)  
The applicants have taken their requirements into consideration, and the proposal is broadly acceptable subject to conditions requiring the precise location of the pipeline to be located on site using trial holes; there shall be no construction works within 10 feet of the pipeline; proposed road and service crossings to the required standards with consent from the S0S for Defence.

3.16 Highways Agency  
No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.17 The Ramblers (Norfolk Area)  
No comments received

3.18 Ministry Of Defence  
No objection

3.19 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
No comments received

3.20 Norfolk Gardens Trust  
No comments received

3.21 Housing Strategy Manager  
After extensive discussion and negotiation with the applicants based on detailed financial appraisal we have reached agreement on the affordable housing aspects of this application, which will be enforced through a S106 Agreement covering the following:

- Affordable housing will comprise 20% of the dwellings to be built
- 70% of the affordable housing will be for rent and 30% will be for sale
- The mix of property types and tenures meets needs, and will be located throughout the site
- There will be a clawback arrangement so that additional affordable housing will be funded through commuted sums if property values increase
- The Council will have the option to buy land at a fixed price, providing the possibility of increasing the amount of affordable housing on the site towards the policy target of 33%

On this basis I am satisfied with the affordable housing aspects of the application.

3.22 Sport England  
Open space provision for football could preclude provision for rugby or cricket. Suggest flexibility in terms of pitch provision.

Contributions should be made towards the improvement of existing indoor sport provision (as none is proposed on site). Pro Rata costs set out in SE response.

3.23 NCC: Historic Environment Service  
No objection, subject to conditions.

3.24 English Heritage  
General advice, but in particular they raise the issue of floodlighting to the sports pitches and its potential impact on the heritage assets to the north of the site.

3.25 Natural England  
General advice regarding protected species, County Wildlife Sites and Green Infrastructure.
3.25 Anglian Water Services Ltd
Upgrading the existing network and a new pumping station and sewers is required. The development will also need to contribute to up-sizing of the Yare Valley Sewer to mitigate spills at the Trowse Lane pumping station overflow.

These works are outlined within the FRA and should be conditioned.

A drainage strategy has been agreed with the developers which will ensure that there is no downstream flooding from the foul sewerage network. Full details of this strategy will need to be secured by condition.

3.27 Environment Agency
No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.28 NCC Highways
No transport objection to the application subject to a S106 securing the Travel Plan funding and appropriate conditions requiring various off-site highway works.

3.29 Garden History Society
No comments received

3.30 Hethersett Society
Object
- Infrastructure would be unable to cope
- Moving Hethersett closer to Cringleford

3.31 National Grid
No comments received

3.32 Play And Amenities Area Officer
No comments received

3.33 SNC: Ecologist
Considers the broad principle of the development and its impact on ecology acceptable, subject to the approval of an appropriate ecological management plan, and the following:

- The applicant may need a slight tweak to the illustrative masterplan to include a buffer for Great Crested Newts down the side of the eastern section (currently in the strategic gap) of 20-30m. The buffer zone will need to include amphibian fencing and tunnels under the three site access roads along the boundary of eastern development, alongside Colney Lane. If this is not possible the applicant needs to consider an offsetting scheme. This will form part of the Natural England licence application.

- Before a licence is applied for the applicant needs to prepare a methods statement for Great Crested Newts work. A site for the compensation pond and terrestrial habitat creation/enhancement will have to be confirmed before the licence is applied for. SuDS should be left out of the newt licence mitigation.

- An Ecological Management Plan be made into part of a Section 106 agreement, containing methodology of the maintenance of each informal recreation, green spaces and networks of corridors and woodland buffers and SuDS, to be submitted and signed off by South Norfolk District Council. This plan will be separate to the newt licence mitigation plans.
3.34 First Eastern Counties (bus service)  
Raise concerns with some of the proposed junction arrangements causing significant delays for the buses.

3.35 County Council – Minerals and Waste  
No objection. The requirements of Policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy have been met.

3.36 Local Residents  
118 individual letters of objection received raising a number of issues. A representation has also been received from a group of concerned residents collectively known as ‘Hethersett Our Way’. The comments made by this group are a fair reflection of the concerns raised by individual local residents, and for information I have attached the response as appendix 2 to this report.

4. **Assessment**

**The Site and Proposal**

4.1 The site has a total area of 86.25 ha. There are 2 main elements, the first is the main development area situated to the north of Hethersett; the second is a proposed extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride site. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 The land to the north of Hethersett proposed as the village extension has a development area of approximately 83.59 ha. It is an arable landscape with fields separated by hedgerows and / or drainage ditches. In the eastern part hedgerows have been degraded and lost, some having been replaced by lines of bramble. This area is more level where it is close to the village edge, but falls away towards the watercourse valleys to the north and west. The land rises again to the north of this site.

4.3 A further 2.66 ha is outlined for a proposed extension to the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride site to provide up to 250 additional spaces and additional land to be used as a dedicated slip road off the A11 and for further possible expansion of the site in the future. The site falls away from the village towards the A11 to the south. The gentle, but frequent, undulation in the landform in this area creates an intimate scale to local views and, when combined with vegetation, results in a small visual envelope of the proposal site. Significant views of the eastern part of the proposed site can be afforded from Colney Lane.

4.4 The Planning Application proposes a residential led mixed use development on the land to include the following:

- Up to 1,196 dwellings;
- Local Centre;
- New primary school;
- Extension to existing secondary school;
- Sports pitches, recreational spaces, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces;
- Associated highway infrastructure, including land for an extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride, and land for a new slip road from the A11 directly into the Park and Ride site.

4.5 The application is in outline form only, which reserves the details of all matters (except for access) for determination at a later date. This application includes plans and supporting information that indicate the broad parameters of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed development.
4.6 The original application submitted in October 2011 was amended in October 2012, as a consequence of further design work following the public consultation exercise; progress with adjacent development sites (i.e. the Gladedale site, Great Melton Road); discussions between the Council and the applicant and additional technical work. The changes were consulted upon during October/Early November 2012, and they included the following:

- Small area to the south of the Colney Lane/Braymeadow Lane junction. This is to ensure the cycle route is on Highways land/Landowners Consortium land in this location;
- Small area around the Colney Lane/Norwich Road junction to accommodate cycle provision;
- Site access from Great Melton Road to reflect Gladedale’s proposed latest vehicular access arrangement – this change has resulted in the site area being reduced slightly (by approx. 0.8ha) from that originally submitted.
- Hethersett Athletic Football Club and public sports pitches are proposed to be relocated to the east, the flattest area of the site, reducing earthworks and providing a gateway to development, to act as an interface between the village and the open countryside;
- A new area of housing proposed where the football pitches were previously located
- Reduced development density in the parcel adjacent to Colney Lane the site to reflect a more rural character;
- Revised SUDS strategy to reflect further discussions with the Environment Agency, and the changes in layout.

4.7 The proposed development is expected to be delivered in phases. The following phasing has been suggested in order to provide some indication of what could be the anticipated development programme and phasing for the proposed development.

- Phase 1 (2013-2017) incorporating 371 dwellings in two sub-phases, land for a mixed-use centre, primary school, secondary school extension, shared-space on Back Lane between the secondary school and development area, traffic calming on Little Melton Road/Henstead Road, a new southern access link road between the site and Back Lane/Churchfields and the provision of 2.66 hectares of land for an extension of the Park & Ride site and the provision of land for a dedicated slip-road access from the northbound A11;
- Phase 2 (2017-2018) incorporating 99 dwellings in two sub-phases, diversion of Burnthouse Lane to form a new eastern access road linking to Colney Lane through the development area, provision of football pitch and club house for Hethersett Athletic Football Club, downgrading of existing Back Lane to pedestrian/cycleway link, signalisation of B1172 Norwich Road/Colney Lane junction and Colney Lane cycle link; and
- Phase 3 (2018-2021) incorporating 299 dwellings in two sub-phases, provision of contribution towards improvements at the B1108 Watton Road/Hethersett Lane junction, provision of additional football pitches and internal network connections;
- Phase 4 (2021-2023) incorporating 216 dwellings and internal network connections, provision of land for Park & Ride extension and its access; and
- Phase 5 (2023-2025) incorporating 211 dwellings, community gardens and allotments, and a new western access link road forming a junction with Great Melton Road/New Road.

4.8 As the site is located outside the current development boundary in an area of open countryside (as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003), the application is clearly contrary to saved local plan policy ENV8. The proposal should therefore be refused unless there are material considerations that dictate otherwise. In my opinion, the following material considerations need to be taken into account in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Hethersett for further development of at least 1,000 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026.
- There is an acknowledged lack of a 5-year housing supply within the Norwich Policy Area (currently 53.3% years supply in the NPA.) The recently published National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5-year supply also includes an additional buffer of 5%.

- The sustainability of the site’s location, having regard to Hethersett being a location for major expanded communities as set out in Policy 10 of the JCS.

- The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years.

- Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

4.9 It is noted that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents and Parish Councils raising a number of issues. In view of this, the representation of the ‘Hethersett Our Way’ group is attached in Appendix 3 being typical of the range of objections received. Local members have also raised a number of concerns. Taking on board the comments raised, in my opinion, the critical issue that members need to address is the principle of the development having regard to:

- The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, the identification of the majority of the site as a preferred allocation for residential development, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing.
- Development within a ‘strategic gap’
- The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability and the impact on the landscape and ecology
- Drainage & flood risk
- Highway impact (including cycleway and pedestrian links)
- Education
- Proposed community facilities
- Green infrastructure
- Layout and design
- Jobs and economic growth

4.10 Other environmental issues that need to be considered include the proximity of a Government pipeline, HV electricity cables and pylons, archaeology and heritage impacts, and wider green infrastructure implications.

NPPF, JCS & the 5-year land supply of housing

4.11 The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not remove the need to assess the proposed development having first had regard to the development plan, however the relevant planning policies referred to need to be up-to-date. The GNPD has accepted that there is a 5-year land supply deficit with the Norwich Policy Area, and as Section 6 of the NPPF points out, where this is the case, the relevant development plan policies cannot be up-to-date. Whilst material considerations then need to be taken into account, the NPPF advises that development should be approved unless the ‘adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’.

4.12 In terms of sustainability, the site is well located in relation to the secondary school, whose playing fields are adjacent to the site's boundary, and other facilities including the village hall. The village has a range of local facilities dispersed throughout it with there being two clusters of facilities located on the convergence of routes. The primary cluster is located around Queen’s Road, Great Melton Road and Henstead Road, which is within walking/cycling distance of the site. The second cluster is located at the Norwich Road end of Queen’s Road.
4.13 Hethersett has good bus links to Norwich and Wymondham, and it is well located for the Norwich Research Park, Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital, the University of East Anglia to the north-east of Hethersett, and Longwater Business and Retail Park to the north.

4.14 It is noted that many residents feel that the site should not be considered ahead of specific sites having been allocated for development through the Local Development Framework process. However, taking the above into account I feel that the development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application. The proposal meets the NPPF's key objectives for sustainable development, including promoting sustainable development, delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, good design, taking account of climate change, dealing with flood risk and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

**Strategic Gap**

4.15 The existing Strategic Gap is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map by Local Plan Policy ENV2. This includes a green wedge to the east of Hethersett to maintain a gap with Cringleford, and a wedge to the southwest of Hethersett to maintain a gap with Wymondham. The policy states that "inappropriate development" and other development which would erode the gaps between the built up limits of settlements, or which would otherwise undermine the general quality of openness of these gaps, will not be permitted.

4.16 However, to some extent it can be said that policy ENV2 is out of date, as we are currently re-assessing the geographical boundaries of the Strategic Gap in order to prepare the final version of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD Development Management Policies DPD. Consideration should also be given to the fact that the Council is seeking to allocate part of the existing Strategic Gap for development.

4.17 The applicants have undertaken a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that assessed the local landscape and townscape in and around the proposed development site to the north of Hethersett and also the proposed extension to the Thicket Park and Ride. It evaluated the potential effects of the proposed development upon the landscape resources and visual receptors and identifies appropriate mitigation where there are residual effects. The overall conclusions are that the visual impacts are most apparent at viewpoints closest to the development site, which would be as expected. From most other viewpoints, including towards Little Melton and Great Melton the impacts were assessed as low or negligible, with the occasional moderate adverse impact from certain viewpoints.

4.18 The LVIA also confirms that the development maintains a physical and visual separation between Hethersett and Little Melton which is reinforced by the electricity pylons running to the north of the site, and Hethersett and Wymondham to the west. I would concur with these conclusions.

4.19 Although the majority of the proposed development accords with the preferred allocation, the proposed development to the east of Burnthouse Lane (approx. 100 dwellings as well as playing fields and the proposed new football club house), is located outside this preferred area and within the Strategic Gap. This designation seeks to maintain a visual gap with Cringleford to the east, and therefore the assessment of the impact of this development needs to consider the extent to which it would erode this gap.

4.20 This impact causes me some concern, as the development breaks out beyond Burnthouse Lane, which I consider to be a natural boundary to the larger development, minimising its impact on the strategic gap with Cringleford. The applicants have recognised this concern, and have offered a compromise solution that would preclude residential development on land currently identified in the emerging Strategic Gap designation to the west of Colney Lane (including the part of the site to the east of Burnthouse Lane), for 3 years and until such time as the emerging strategic gap policy is tested and adopted through the Local Plan process. This provision can be set out in a condition or section 106 legal agreement.
4.21 Subject to the condition outlined above, I am satisfied that the development can take place without significantly eroding or undermining the general quality of openness of the gaps between Hethersett and Little Melton, Wymondham and Cringleford, and in accordance with the aims of JCS Policy 10 and local Plan policy ENV2.

Infrastructure

4.22 As I have already stated, Hethersett is a location for major expanded communities as set out in Policy 10 of the JCS, and is therefore considered to be a sustainable location for development. However, JCS Policy 20 requires development to bring with it infrastructure essential to secure sustainable development. The applicant’s response to this requirement can be summarised in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Requirements</th>
<th>Infrastructure Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate transport infrastructure including the implementation of NATS and the construction of the NDR and improved public transport.</td>
<td>Land for extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride, and a new slip road from the A11. New and improved, frequent bus services. Pedestrian and cycle routes on and off site. Junction improvements to B1172 Norwich Road/Colney Lane junction and B1108 Wotton Road/Hethersett Lane junction. Financial contributions – to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable or supported housing</td>
<td>Up to 33% affordable housing provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social infrastructure, including education, healthcare, police and emergency services.</td>
<td>Education provision – primary school including pre-school provision, and secondary school expansion. Financial contributions for services and facilities where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities.</td>
<td>Local Centre including D1 community facility or doctor’s surgery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and renewable energy generation.</td>
<td>20.5% of energy provided through renewable sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation measures.</td>
<td>Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water achievable. Mitigation measures ensure a 20% reduction in water demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).</td>
<td>Masterplan incorporates SuDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic sewers.</td>
<td>Financial contributions towards upgrades off-site. Provision of sewers on-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space and green infrastructure, including habitat creation, pedestrian and cycle links, allotments, recreation facilities, parks, trees, hedgerows, woodland and landscaping.</td>
<td>A total of 24.87 ha of open and recreation space provided as part of the development including general leisure and informal children’s play areas, formal children’s play areas, woodland, allotments, community gardens and orchards and sports pitches. Pedestrian and cycle routes on and off site. Structural landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utilities, including waste management/recycling/composting facilities.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street furniture.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ecology

4.23 Policy 1 of the JCS, and local plan policies ENV13 and ENV14 requires development to have no impact on European protected species and habitats, and to seek to maintain and enhance existing biodiversity. Development should also contribute towards a wider Green Infrastructure network allowing for wider access to the countryside.

4.24 The Masterplan Process considered ecology throughout by designing out areas of potential conflict so aspects of the scheme provide potential beneficial ecological enhancements, which are integral to the scheme, rather than being mitigation for the scheme. The assessment of the site identifies the following important species and habitats:

- River Wensum Special Area of Conservation (SAC), 5.5 km to the north (international significance);
- Eaton Chalk Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), 3.1 km to the east (national significance);
- 11 County Wildlife Sites (CWSs) within 2km of the Development Area (the nearest is Beckthorpe Meadow, adjacent to the north-west boundary of the site) (County significance)
- Common and pipistrelle bats (District significance);
- Barbastelle and brown long-eared bats (Local-District significance).

4.25 The Masterplan for the site has considered ecology throughout by designing out areas of potential conflict so aspects of the scheme provide potential beneficial ecological enhancements, which are integral to the scheme, rather than being mitigation for the scheme. As a result, the assessment demonstrates that there are no unacceptable effects on these receptors.

4.26 Although there are some areas of UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat at the site, the assessment considers that none are considered to be particularly high quality examples when judged against others within Norfolk. Although there is the loss of some UK BAP hedgerows, other UK BAP habitats on the site, such as a block of lowland woodland and a pond, will be enhanced by the scheme.

4.27 Local Plan Policy IMP25 requires proposals involving outdoor lighting schemes to demonstrate that the proposed lighting has no detrimental impact on sites of nature conservation value. The Ecology assessment considered the likely impact of proposed new lighting on ecology. Myotis, barbastelle and brown long-eared bats (and some invertebrates) are sensitive to artificial light, so the presence of artificial lighting would result in the displacement of these light sensitive species. However, as explained above, the scheme has designed in appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. For example, the north planting screen and attenuation ponds will provide some additional habitat along the northern fringe that will not be directly illuminated, thus it should be suitable for the rarer, light sensitive bats.

4.28 The District Ecologist has assessed the scheme, and, subject to some minor amendments and additional mitigation (including additional provision for reptiles and amphibians), and subject to the submission of an appropriate ecological management plan, raises no objection to the principle of development, which is considered to accord with relevant development plan policy, as well as the requirements of Section 11 of the NPPF.

Landscape impact

4.29 Local Plan Policy ENV 8 requires that development outside of development limits in the countryside must respect the intrinsic beauty and diversity of the landscape, and be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design. Local Plan Policy IMP2 requires all new development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping to ensure that the development will be integrated into its surroundings. JCS Policy 1 also requires development to contribute towards providing a multi-functional green infrastructure network, open space and wildlife resources and links between them both on and off site and integral to the development.
4.30 The applicants have suggested that the undulating nature of the local landscape and the frequent occurrence of hedgerows, trees and woodland, mean that the visual envelope of the proposed residential development is constrained to views in close proximity to the edge of the site. They are not proposing to screen out the proposed residential development using planting but rather to soften its visual impact and to aid its integration with the existing development and landscape through the creation of a strong green network and the use of well-designed buildings that contribute positively to local character. I would generally agree with this approach, and that the wider landscape impact of this proposal is unlikely to be significant. However, the development within the strategic gap should minimised, so as to restrict the visual impact of the development when viewed from Colney Lane. I therefore reiterate my previous comment that development to the west of Burnthouse Lane should only come forward after the emerging strategic gap policy has been tested and adopted through the Local Plan process.

4.31 The visual envelope of the proposed extension to the Park and Ride site reduces its visual impact due to the screening effects of the existing planting. Lighting columns may extend beyond the tree canopy, however, this is seen in context of the existing Park and Ride site and neighbouring road services area.

4.32 Local Plan Policy IMP25 requires proposals involving outdoor lighting schemes to demonstrate that light spillage and glare are minimised, particularly in areas of open countryside or on the edge of settlements. The effect of lighting on the night-time scene was assessed in the applicant’s Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and the impacts upon night-time views will be primarily limited to those views from which the development is directly visible. It is considered that it may be possible to see some light spill and glow from distant views but these would be seen within the context of the existing glow from Hethersett and the Park and Ride. I would concur with the assessment’s conclusion that the careful use of lighting that reduces light spill and glare associated with residential developments would reduce any likely impact on night-time views.

4.33 Taking the above into account I feel that the proposed development is capable of being sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, design and the provision of a high standard of landscaping, in accordance with Local Plan policies ENV 8, IMP 2, IMP25, and JCS Policy 1.

4.34 Taking into account the infrastructure to be provided / enhanced with the development, and the acceptable impact in terms of landscape and ecology, I consider the site to be sustainable and capable of contribution towards the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

Drainage & flood risk

SURFACE WATER

4.35 As part of the environmental impact assessment the applicant’s have been able to confirm that the site is not at risk of flooding (i.e. being located within Flood Zone 1, low risk). The assessment has also resulted in a surface water drainage strategy being produced, to which the Environment Agency raise no objection.

4.36 The strategy allows attenuation of the storm water spread across the site via a system of 11 balancing ponds. The ponds have been strategically placed to provide catchment to mimic pre-development runoff and to suit the phasing of the proposed construction. Currently there are three existing watercourses which are responsible for the greenfield runoff, two of which are all believed to be tributaries of the River Yare. The final outfalls into the three existing watercourses each represent greenfield runoff calculations.
4.37 Consideration has been given to the impact the development may have on third parties, particularly with regard to surface water runoff. Due to the underlying soils being of clay strata, the permeability of the soils is likely to be relatively poor, thus the provision of soakaways will be potentially isolated and less efficient. Although SuDS will be sued where possible, the majority of drainage will be provided through attenuation to balancing ponds.

4.38 It is intended that the storm water drainage within the public highways on site will be adopted by Anglian Water. The balancing ponds will be adopted either by Anglian Water or the Lead Local Flood Authority (County Council) following the establishment of a SuDS Approving Body. Anglian Water shall also be adopting private drainage.

It has been demonstrated that that the site will not suffer flooding in the future as a result of surcharge from the nearby watercourses or drainage systems proposed within the proposal. The Environment Agency have confirmed the proposed rates of discharge to the existing watercourses will be at a controlled rate and that betterment will be achieved from the existing situation, and that the ponds are sized to ensure that they can cater for the 1 in 100 year storm event.

4.39 The surface water drainage for the extension to the Park & Ride site will be dealt with via shallow soakaways and permeable paving, and the Environment Agency raise no objection to this approach.

Foul Water

4.40 Anglian Water has confirmed that the wastewater treatment works at Whittingham has capacity to accommodate the proposed development. They have also confirmed that the existing sewerage network will need upgrading and that a new Section 98 pumping station and sewers will be required, along with a contribution towards the upsizing of the Yare Valley Sewer. These required works are outlined in the developer's Flood Risk Assessment, which is supported by Anglian Water.

Taking the above into account I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 1 and Section 10 of the NPPF.

Highway Impact (including cycleway and pedestrian links)

4.41 Local Plan Policy IMP6 and Section 4 of the NPPF require the consideration of traffic generation and that development should not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.42 The design of the new transport infrastructure supporting the proposal has been considered with regards to minimising the impact of the development on the existing highway network. This includes measures to encourage reduced car usage, and the provision of sufficient infrastructure to ensure the highway network can accommodate additional traffic requirements. A significant amount of modelling (particularly in respect of the Thickthorn junction and other key junctions on the network) and design work has been undertaken in order to demonstrate that the transport strategy is capable of mitigating the traffic impact from the development.

4.43 The development is proposed to be developed over five phases with various elements of the mitigation package being delivered before/during each phase. It is considered that the development is in a sustainable location with bus services that can be diverted into the site and enhanced as per the submitted Bus Strategy. The site is within easy walking and cycling distance of facilities within Hethersett and improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure are proposed as part of a submitted Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy, and will include the following:

- Back Lane re-designated between Colney Lane and Churchfields to a pedestrian and cycle route;
- Cycle and pedestrian routes provided along Colney Lane towards Norwich Research Park;
- Cycle provision at the Colney Lane/B1172 junction;
- Little Melton Road improved with pedestrian footpath and cycleway;
- Pedestrian links to connect to existing footpaths and Rights of Way for access to the countryside;
- Footpath and cycle route to Hethersett village centre.

4.44 In terms of traffic the three main access points to the development will be from Churchfields, off Colney Lane and off Great Melton Road. The access points will be linked by a spine road though the site off which all other access will be taken. Limited access is proposed off Hensleade Lane. Off-site highway improvements are proposed at the Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads which will be signalised. Improvements to Great Melton Road and to the New Road junction will also be required.

4.45 A travel plan will be an integral part of this development, helping to reduce the reliance on the car. To further enhance sustainable transport land is also being made available to expand the Thickthorn Park & ride site.

4.46 NCC: Highways has accepted the proposed access arrangements and do not raise any objections in principle. The Highways Agency also accepts the strategy and supporting modelling work. Both authorities have now confirmed that an acceptable package of mitigation measures has been agreed, and that the traffic flow and junction capacity assessments demonstrate that the proposed vehicular traffic generation can be accommodated within the highway network.

4.47 Subject to securing the required Travel Plan funding, and the package of off-site highway improvement works, the development accords with the requirements of Local Plan Policy IMP8 and Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Education

4.48 JCS Policy 10 states in relation to growth at Hethersett that "education provision remains to be resolved but may require the relocation of the existing junior school and/or high school to new sites plus additional pre-school and primary provision". The supporting text (paragraph 6.22 of the JCS) explains that the secondary school at Hethersett is on a constrained site and on-site expansion is difficult. A solution will need to ensure that children have the opportunity to attend school local to where they live. It states that new primary schools and pre-school provision will be required for all the growth locations.

4.49 These education requirements for Hethersett were identified by the Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study and are included at Appendix 7 to the JCS as "priority 2" projects:

- 60 place pre-school (Ref ED7) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021;
- 1 FE place primary school (Ref ED8) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021;
- Expanded secondary school provision (Ref ED10) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021.

4.50 It is evident that there is not sufficient capacity at pre-school, primary or secondary school levels to accommodate the likely school age children arising from the proposed development seeking State sector places and that further school capacity will need to be provided at all levels to accommodate the needs of the proposed development. Therefore, the proposed development incorporates land for a new primary school incorporating pre-school provision, with additional land reserved for further expansion of the primary school. The developer will bear the costs of providing a 1-form entry Primary School, and a pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school will also be required.
4.51 The development also includes provision of land for the expansion of the High School, with additional land reserved for further expansion of the High School should this be deemed necessary to address wider deficiencies. A £1.7 million pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school will also be required.

4.52 Subject to the above provisions, the application accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 10.

Proposed community facilities (inc. recreation space and open space provision)

4.53 JCS Policy 10 requires the expansion of the existing village services. The Masterplan includes the provision of a Local Centre with uses that are complementary to Hethersett Village, including approximately 1200 sqm of retail floor space, 350 sqm of small business units (B1a), and 300 sqm of floor space for a community facility (D1 or D2), such as a doctor’s surgery, or for indoor sports. Housing with accommodation to encourage home working is also proposed.

4.54 This provision of retail floor space is also in accordance with LP Policy SH09, which requires sites to be reserved for local shopping uses in major residential development.

4.55 The development accords with Local Plan Policy LE17 by providing a total of 24.87 ha of open space, 2.72 ha in excess of the Council’s standards. Furthermore, taking into account SuDs, school playing fields (and reserved playing pitch areas) and the proposed Hethersett FC football pitch (secured site) the amount of multifunctional green space provided in the development is 34.66 hectares which is around 41% of the site. This goes beyond Natural England’s aspiration for 40% of new development to be multifunctional green space. Including private gardens would bring the figure to way over 40% multifunctional green space aspirations. Over 75% of the multifunctional open space will be publicly accessible, above Natural England’s aspiration of 50% publicly accessible land.

4.56 The 24.84ha of open space and recreation provision can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Open and Recreational Space</th>
<th>Area in hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Leisure/Informal Children’s Play</td>
<td>15.44 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Children’s Play</td>
<td>0.74 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Children’s Play within Development Parcels</td>
<td>0.15 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>3.19 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment/Community Gardens/Orchards</td>
<td>0.9 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethersett Athletic Club Shared Pitches with Public</td>
<td>3.24 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squares</td>
<td>1.21 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.87 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.57 Again, subject to the provision of the above facilities, the application accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 10.

Green infrastructure

4.58 The landscape strategy for the site aims to retain the majority of existing vegetation and boundary trees and integrate these elements with the Masterplan proposals. It also aims to enhance the existing open boundaries of the site with proposed woodland buffer planting to help integrate the development into the surrounding countryside to the north.
4.59 As well as promoting a wide natural buffer area to the north of the main built-up area, the landscape strategy creates three large parkland areas, the western area being a ‘growing’ park providing allotments and orchards. The central area of open space will be developed as a formal leisure park. The eastern open space area will be mostly laid out to sports pitches. All the open space areas will be easily accessed by a comprehensive footpath and cycleway network, linking in to existing rights of way and providing opportunities to access into the wider countryside and Norwich Fringe in accordance with the requirements of Policy LE110.

4.60 It is intended that a key part of the landscape strategy will be ecological mitigation. Where possible the landscape will be designed to provide wildlife habitat, including the use of plants known to be of wildlife value. The SuDS network will provide additional wetland habitat, ultimately forming a network within the site with links to the wider countryside and Norwich Fringe.

4.61 Subject to the provision of an appropriate ecological management strategy, I consider the proposals to be in general accordance with all relevant policies relating to the provision of green infrastructure, open and recreational space.

Government pipeline

4.62 Local Plan policy UTL12 requires that all development takes full account of underground pipelines, so as to avoid any additional public risk. A Government Oil Pipeline passes by the eastern tip of the development area, crossing in a north westerly direction. There is a 3 metre construction easement for the outside face of the pipeline in both directions. This easement has been accommodated as a constraint in the Masterplan, and this will help to ensure that the pipeline is adequately addressed in any detailed planning proposals forthcoming in the area. The application therefore accords with the requirements of policy UTL12.

HV Electricity pylons

4.63 There are high voltage electricity pylons to the north of the proposed development area. The National Grid have confirmed that there is no legislation in place regarding the distance of development adjacent to, and under High Voltage overhead power lines, and their association with Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs). However, they will require allowable working zones.

4.64 This zone has been accommodated as a constraint in the Masterplan, and will be considered during the construction works. The area of the site closest to the high voltage electricity pylons is set out as a linear park providing a buffer zone between the overhead lines and development. The nearest residential development is more than 80 metres distant from the pylons, with the majority of development in excess of 200 metres from the pylons.

Layout & design (inc. housing mix)

4.65 As this is an outline planning application, the assessment of design and layout issues can only be undertaken at a broad strategic level on the basis of the submitted Masterplan and the Parameter Plans at this stage. The submission of later reserved matters applications for the detailed design and layout within each development phase will allow opportunity for detailed evaluation of proposals against the design principles set out in the Masterplan, Parameter Plans and Design & Access statement as and when schemes are submitted. Any outline approval will also require a detailed Masterplan/Design Code to be submitted and approved for each development phase.
4.66 JCS Policies 2 and 10 requires that major growth, such as that at Hethersett, will be master-planned as attractive, well-serviced, integrated, mixed use development of the highest possible standards, well related to existing development, and creating a strong sense of place. Local people should be given the opportunity to shape development. JCS Policy 1 requires development to be located and designed to address climate change.

4.67 Local Plan Policies TRA1, 2 and 3 require that the siting, layout and design of development makes provision for and safeguards pedestrian and cycle links to improve accessibility by non-car means.

4.68 The recently adopted South Norfolk Place-Making Guide requires new development to be designed to have a positive character that is appropriate for the place where it is located, the type of development to be provided, and the likely lifestyle of occupiers.

4.69 Generally the Masterplan incorporates a clear and well-connected layout, offering a variety of experience and character, while maintaining an overall coherence. The "character area" approach has been adopted to divide the larger site into neighbourhoods of distinct identity, with Community Hubs, to ensure Hethersett North will be an engaging and varied place with a distinct range of places.

4.70 The layout incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) of swales, pools and ponds, which enhance the amenity of the development. Green spaces and squares provide major focal points within the development, acting as meeting places and sources of orientation.

4.71 The design principles for the Masterplan have been developed out of an appraisal of the character of Hethersett and its immediate setting. The overall design concept is based on a strong landscape strategy that aims to enhance the existing natural features of the site, through a network of green corridors and open spaces that link to Hethersett and the countryside beyond. Within this framework the development establishes three anchor parks, each with a distinct character based on their use and a neighbourhood hub that strengthens the existing community cluster of the village. In addition to these, a connected series of community focal points is created that establishes a hierarchy of greens, new town gardens, greened streets and squares. While the landscape strategy begins to establish some of the main components of these areas the Masterplan or a subsequent Design Code will need establish the detailed design of these components to ensure that they function as attractive and usable spaces that enhance the overall character of the development.

4.72 Although the Masterplan indicates that provision will be made for single storey dwellings if and where considered appropriate, there is a commitment to meeting the 15 Lifetime Homes criteria, which will help to ensure that a high proportion of new homes will be able to support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.

4.73 Pedestrian and cycle routes provide connections to essential facilities and amenities between the development areas and into the neighbouring village of Hethersett. Walking routes where possible have been designed to accommodate convenient access through the development with connections into the surrounding pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, including the provision of an off-road cycle route on Colney Lane, offering the potential to link into the NRP and N&NUH.

4.74 The existing settlement edge of Hethersett forms the southern boundary of the site and is defined by suburban 1960s/90s housing, some early local authority housing, 20th and 21st century housing and the edge of playing fields associated with Hethersett Secondary School. The proposed development appears to respect these edges by proposing a linear corridor of open space and landscaping along the edges of the existing built up areas and by providing a site for additional playing fields adjacent to the school. The proposed corridor helps to protect the visual amenity of the existing properties and integrate the site into the existing settlement.
The design of parking will ensure the streets are safe and attractive, ensuring the visual impact of cars are kept to a minimum, in accordance with Local Plan Policy IMP6.

The Council’s Design Officer has assessed the scheme against the 12 Building for Life criteria, and has concluded that, subject to the further submission of a Design Code, the Masterplan for the site will enable high quality designs to be submitted at reserved matters stage, appropriate for the site’s setting and context. Although in outline form only, the application is considered to accord with the required design approach required by JCS Policy 2.

Archaeology and heritage impact

An Archaeological Assessment has been undertaken to assess the likely significant effects of the proposed development on archaeological remains. The site has been the subject of two phases of archaeological field evaluation, and the results of the first phase accompany the application. Norfolk Historic Environment Services (NHES) have confirmed that there are no deposits of national significance likely to preclude development within the application boundary. NHES are happy for the further field evaluation work on the results of less than national significance to be required by condition, in accordance with par. 141 of Section 12 of the NPPF.

The LVIA identifies a Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) to the south west of Hethersett on the edge of Wymondham and to the south of Thickthorn roundabout. There are a number of Listed Buildings in the area, mostly Grade II. The LVIA considered the potential impact on the Listed Building on Cedar Road, which is located on the opposite side of the road to the southern boundary, but is screened from the proposed development by the existing tree belt. The assessment confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the visual setting of Listed Buildings or SAMs. I have received no objection from the Conservation Officer, and I am satisfied that the development can be accommodated without having a significant impact on any heritage assets, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Local Plan Policy IMP9 requires that new development does not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. Other Local Plan policies relating to impact on residential amenity include LP Policy IMP10 (Noise) and IMP25 (Outdoor lighting). Although any direct impact on residential amenity from development will be assessed at the reserved matters stage, it is important to consider the more general impacts in terms of noise, lighting, and air quality.

The Noise Assessment demonstrates there will be only slight impact on existing residents from traffic noise as a result of the development of the main site and that the Park and Ride extension will have negligible impact. The assessment also confirms that there is little potential for residents of the new development being affected by existing noise sources e.g. from existing roads or the factory to the north of the site. SNC Environmental Services raised no objection to the scheme in this respect.

The Air Quality Assessment demonstrates there will be no unacceptable impact on health or residential amenity from changes in air quality as a result of the construction of the development, or from traffic or energy generation following completion of the development. The assessment also confirms that the potential for residents of the new development being affected by odours from Little Melton Food Park is not significant. It has also been demonstrated that the new residents of the proposed development would have an acceptable standard of residential amenity in terms of noise, air quality/odour and external lighting.
4.82 Again SNC: Environmental Services raise no objection to the scheme in this regard, and therefore in general terms I am satisfied that the proposed development will not significantly harm the residential amenity of nearby residents from noise, air quality/odour, or lighting, and so is in accordance with Local Plan Policies IMP9, IMP10 and IMP25.

Planning Obligations

4.83 In order to achieve the infrastructure improvements required by JCS Policy 10, the developers will be required to enter into a S106 legal agreement that will help to provide for off-site highway improvements, local centre (including retail and small business units and community facilities), education provision, enhanced bus services, safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes, and enhanced public access to the countryside. The completed legal agreement will also include trigger points for provision of the enhanced facilities or financial contributions, which will enable them to be brought forward through the progression of the development.

4.84 Affordable housing (20% of the development) will be secured within the agreement, along with a 70/30 split of rent and shared ownership, with affordability in perpetuity. There will also be a clawback arrangement so that additional affordable housing will be funded through commuted sums if property values increase.

5. Conclusions

5.1 The development conforms to Policy 10 of the JCS as it proposes a level of growth in a Norwich Policy Area settlement that is identified as a Key Service Centre for at least 1,000 homes. The evaluation of the proposal against local Development Plan polices would suggest that the proposal meets the majority of relevant JCS and Saved Local Plan policies. It is accepted that the site would constitute development currently outside of the village's existing development boundary, however, the adoption of the JCS; the lack of five year housing land supply; the Government's commitment to a "presumption in favour of sustainable development" in the NPPF; the GNDP's own evidence which confirms that land north of Hethersett is the most appropriate direction for growth; and the acknowledgement that development to the North of Hethersett for over 1000 homes is its 'preferred option' for growth.

5.2 It has been demonstrated that land to the north of Hethersett is a sustainable location for the development. It is within close proximity to the existing services and facilities at Hethersett and can be accommodated without eroding the openness of the gap between adjacent settlements. The site delivers the necessary improvements to infrastructure needed to support a sustainable development, including school expansion land, highways improvements, drainage and community facilities. An assessment of alternative locations for development around Hethersett also helps to demonstrate that Hethersett North is the most appropriate location for growth. Development to the north of Hethersett would therefore meet the objectives of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and the benefits of allowing the principle of this development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any adverse impacts.

Jobs and economic growth

5.3 Section 1 of the NPPF requires the planning system to do everything it can to support sustainable economic growth, as well as to promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities. This is further supported by the requirements set out in JCS Policy 5. The development of this site would create jobs (estimated by the applicant as 99 FTE construction jobs). Further jobs would be created upon completion of the development, through local shops and services. A development of this size will over time, help to sustain and grow existing facilities, as well as providing for new facilities for existing and new residents of the town.
5.4 The development of this site clearly accords with the requirements of Section 1 of the NPPF and Policy 5 of the JCS.

6. Reasons for Approval

6.1 It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The demonstrable lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application. The development conforms to Policy 10 of the JCS as it proposes a level of growth in a Norwich Policy Area settlement that is identified as a Key Service Centre for at least 1,000 homes.

6.2 The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8 and ENV2, which are given due weight as they remain partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 20 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.
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'Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,650 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11'
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Introduction

This document has been prepared on behalf of ‘Hethersett Our Way’ (HOW) in response to the outline planning application submitted by Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners for the erection of a residential led mixed use development of 1,196 dwellings and associated commercial, leisure and community uses and the extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride relating to land north of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road.

The proposed development will stretch approximately 2km across the north of Hethersett village. HOW seeks to protect the character of Hethersett and its rural setting and ensure that any new development is sustainable and does not have a negative impact on the quality of life for either existing or new residents of the village.

HOW is active in voicing its concerns over the current planning application by Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners. Whilst HOW recognises that Hethersett has been identified to accommodate new housing, it wishes to ensure that the any such development is subject to due process and is of an acceptable scale for Hethersett.

The current application has been submitted in advance of an adopted Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Accordingly, there has only been limited consultation to date from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) with respect to how this allocation should be distributed, where it should go and how this might be best achieved.

HOW objects to the timing of the current planning application and believes that it has been brought forward in order to take advantage of the LPA’s current position with respect to limited progress made on the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

HOW acknowledges that the proposed application is a departure from the Development Plan and would therefore be referred to the Secretary of State should the LPA be minded to approve planning permission.

At the time of writing, several documents were unavailable to view via the LPA’s on-line planning system including elements of the Environmental Statement, Design and Access Statement and Visual Impact Assessment. Accordingly, HOW reserves the right to make additional comments based on this information becoming available in the future by SNDC.
Planning Considerations

HOW have a number of concerns relating to the posed development with respect to its potential impact on Hethersett village, existing and new residents and the surrounding countryside including flora and fauna. These are discussed in detail within the consultation response and fall under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply
- Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact
- Health
- Infrastructure /Drainage & Flooding
- Highways & Parking
- Service Centre
- Ecology
- Phasing Plan
- Recreation & Open Space
Principle of Development

The proposed application seeks to provide a total of 1,196 new dwellings within Hethersett.

Hethersett village is identified as a Key Service Centre within the recently adopted Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2011. Hethersett is allocated at least 1,000 dwellings and may be suitable to accommodate a proportion of a floating requirement for an additional 1,800 dwellings within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

South Norfolk Council is currently consulting on its South Norfolk Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) as part of its ongoing Local Development Framework process. This document, when published, will inform how the above allocation will be accommodated within Hethersett.

It is accepted by HOW that Hethersett, as a Key Service Centre, must play its part in meeting the identified housing need as set out within the JCS. However, this process must be subject to the full Local Development Framework (LDF) process which involves the production of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD. This document will be subject to full public consultation by the LPA and independent examination by the Planning Inspectorate prior to adoption.

Given the size and strategic significance of the proposed application, it is considered to be premature with respect to the preparation of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD and should not be considered favourably by the LPA until this document has been subject to full consultation and independent examination.
Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply

Whilst HOW accepts the principle of new housing within Hethersett, the proposed quantum of housing at this location (which exceeds the JCS allocation by almost 200 dwellings) is not considered to be appropriate in planning terms for the various reasons set out within this statement.

HOW is aware that the GNDP cannot, overall, demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply within the NPA (which includes Hethersett). However, to place this figure into context, paragraph 11 of the GNDP Five Year Supply of Housing Assessment Base Date 1st April 2010 (February 2011) confirms this figure reflects the fact that Local Plans for the area made allocations on the basis of achieving the 1999 Norfolk Structure Plan target of 1,195 units per annum in the NPA, rather than the higher EoE and JCS requirements. However, it is anticipated that once new site allocations are made to accommodate the JCS level of growth, the level of delivery will also increase significantly.

In identifying and maintaining a rolling 5 year supply, paragraph 54 of PPS3 ‘housing’ requires LPA’s to include sites which are:

- Available – available for development now;
- Suitable – in a suitable location that would contribute to sustainable, mixed communities;
- Achievable – there is a reasonable prospect of housing being delivered in a five year period.

Paragraph 69 of PPS3 provides guidance to LPA’s in determining planning applications. It advises that regard should be had to:

- Achieving high quality housing;
- Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people;
- The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability;
- Using land effectively and efficiently; and
- Ensuring the proposed development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives eg addressing housing market renewal issues.

Paragraph 71 of PPS3 confirms that where an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites cannot be demonstrated, LPA’s should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in PPS3, including the considerations set out in paragraph 69 (above).

In assessing the proposed development against the above policies, the benefits of a development and its proposed contribution towards addressing any shortfall in housing supply must be weighed against the criteria in paragraph 69 of PPS3 and relevant material considerations.

In this case, HOW acknowledges the proposed development would provide a significant contribution towards the GNDP identified housing targets. However, the quantum of development is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the village and fails to comply with criteria within paragraph 69 of the PPS3 as set out within this Statement.

Furthermore, due to the size of the proposed development, it is not considered to create a sustainable development in accordance with the objectives of paragraph 54 of PPS3 or the Government’s draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was published by the Coalition Government for consultation on 23rd July 2011 and forms a material consideration in the determination of this application.
Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact

Strategic Gaps

Saved policy ENV2 of the Local Plan Proposals Map identifies Strategic Gaps around Hethersett which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area. Policy ENV2 confirms that:

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

![Insert Map 31A above shows the extent of this Strategic Gap (shown as brown hatching). This policy is now out of date and is being replaced by emerging policy within the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.]

JCS Policy 2 ‘Promoting Good Design’ states that all development proposals will respect local distinctiveness, the historic hierarchy of villages and their landscape, and maintain important strategic gaps.

JCS Policy 10 specifically identifies the importance of maintaining strategic gaps between Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford.

The emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD aims to reinforce the objectives of the above policies and shows the suggested extent of the strategic gaps between Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford on Map B (shown below). The suggested ‘Draft Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks’ policy states:

"Development which would erode, or otherwise undermine the openness of the Strategic Gaps /Important Breaks, identified on the Proposals Map, between the development boundaries of the settlements (Wymondham – Hethersett and Hethersett – Cringleford) will not be permitted."
The proposed Strategic Gaps remain as per Insert Map 31A under saved policy ENV2. In consideration of the above, the proposed application would occupy a large area of land to the North West corner which is identified as part of the Strategic Gap. In particular, this relates to land forming part of Phase 2 of the development for 257 dwellings.

According to the proposed Master Plan layout, the majority of this land would be built development (i.e. housing) and is considered to undermine the openness of the Strategic Gap in relation to both Cringleford and Little Melton contrary to the aims and objectives of criteria set out within paragraph 69 of PPS8; saved policy ENV2, JCS policies 2 and 10 and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

HOW would like to see the removal of the area of land identified as Phase 2 of the development as part of a revised Master Plan layout.

Landscape Impact

Saved policy ENV 8 states that all development in the countryside must respect the intrinsic beauty and diversity of the landscape and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside. It must also be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design, while avoiding creating ribbon development or an unduly fragmented pattern of development.

Saved policy IMP 2 requires all new development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping to ensure that the development will be integrated into its surroundings. In particular, landscaping schemes should:

i) Include a site survey of existing landscape features on the site, and proposals for the protection, conservation, or enhancement of those that make a positive contribution to the area;
ii) Reflect the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape;
iii) Make use of native species to help integrate developments ecologically into their setting;
iv) include the planting of new trees;
v) maximise the nature conservation and environmental value of the new landscape;
vi) ensure that proposals respect local topography in terms of height, gradient, scale and shape; and
vii) include measures to ensure the establishment and future maintenance of the landscaped areas.

It is acknowledged that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted by the applicant in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to the existing townscape. However, HOW does not accept the findings of the LVIA with respect to the impact of the proposed development and its assessment against saved policy ENV2 which concludes "...the development can take place in accordance with the aims of LP Policy ENV2, without eroding the gap or undermining the general quality of openness of the gaps between Hethersett and Little Melton, Wymondham and Cringleford" (P.36).

HOW believes that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the character of the surrounding countryside and would erode a large area of land falling within the Strategic Gap designation which serves a vital spatial planning function and is specifically protected under saved policy ENV2. In particular, HOW are concerned that the proposed development would result in:

- A significant erosion of the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Cringleford, effectively extending the village by approximately 0.5km to the east towards Cringleford; and
- a significant erosion of the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Little Melton to the north which would be reduced from over 1km to approximately 570m from dwellings to the south of the village along Burnthouse Lane.
Health

Doctor's Surgery

Information provided within the Environmental Statement and Planning Statement concludes that the proposed application would have a negligible impact in terms of health services and facilities within Hethersett and the wider Greater Norwich Sub Region.

In particular, the Planning Statement (Paragraphs 10.45 & 10.46) confirms the potential impact of the development has been assessed by reviewing the current healthcare facilities and demands within the local area and assessing the likely demand of the new population on the capacity of these facilities. It concludes that taking into account the existing capacity identified within the Hethersett Surgery, the proposed development would result in a requirement for extra capacity to be created at the Surgery for 1-1.5 FTE GPs to meet the needs of the proposed development.

The proposal makes an indicative provision for a Doctor's Surgery of 300sqm identified within the Local Centre.

HOW is concerned that whilst these assumptions are based on the Norwich Growth Area Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study they do not in fact reflect an accurate picture of the current levels of demand on the Doctor's Surgery at Hethersett. HOW is also concerned that these figures fail to take into consideration the consequential impact of an additional 1,196 new dwellings to the existing Surgery and the health needs of individual villagers.

HOW have consulted directly with the Surgery's Practice Manager on this issue to identify existing capacity and explore options for expansion/re-location. The Surgery confirmed it has a large catchment area which extends well beyond Hethersett including numerous surrounding villages. It is currently struggling to cope with existing demand and is not convinced that the estimated figure of an increase of 1-1.5 FTE GPs would be sufficient to adequately address the increase in patients arising from the proposed additional new housing. It has also confirmed that patients moving to the 'Whispering Oaks' development at Wymondham are registering at Hethersett surgery rather than medical centres in Wymondham. This is placing even more pressure on facilities in Hethersett.

Notwithstanding the proposed additional 300sqm, it is considered that due to the large scale of development being proposed at Hethersett, there would appear to be insufficient capacity at the Doctor's Surgery to deal with the increase in population from the proposed development which would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of health services and patient care.

The Surgery has indicated that ideally they would need to move into larger premises. However, the Surgery has limited scope for expansion due to the nature of the existing premises. Any expansion plans would involve building into the adjacent car park area which would reduce the number of car parking spaces at the practice. Re-location is also difficult as there are limited opportunities within Hethersett which would be as accessible as the current location.

Due to these constraints, it is considered that the most appropriate scenario would be to maintain the existing surgery and to have an additional small walk-in surgery forming part of the new Local Centre as proposed. This would help to provide more equal access to health care services for new residents and help reduce demand on the existing Surgery.
HOW acknowledges that at Paragraph 10.48 of the Planning Statement, the applicant confirms discussions are on-going with the Hethersett Surgery's Practice Manager to consider how best to deliver expanded surgery facilities. It is recommended that such discussions continue with a genuine commitment to ensure that the provision of health care services within Hethersett do not suffer as a result of the proposed development.

High Voltage Power Lines

The submitted Master Plan layout proposes to locate residential properties within less than 100m of high voltage (400KV) National Grid power lines. The row of pylons are located north of the application site and run east-west between Hethersett Little Melton.

For over the last 30 years, scientific research has been conducted on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields (ELF EMFs) and childhood leukaemia. Continued research in this field has shown evidence of an association between childhood leukaemia and power lines. In recognition of this, a Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAGE) was set up in 2004 to investigate the supposed link. SAGE is made up from stakeholders representing a broad spectrum of views, including campaign groups, relevant industries, and the Government. It brings together many areas of expertise, including those with significant expertise in scientific and policy-making disciplines, as well as voices representing sections of the public. SAGE is funded equally by Government, the electricity industry, and the charity CHILDREN WITH LEUKAEMIA.

The SAGE report considered what precautionary measures should be considered in relation to ELF Electromagnetic Radiation. A key recommendation was to introduce a moratorium on building new homes and schools within 50m of high voltage power lines to protect children from the increased risk of leukaemia. To date, this has not been implemented by the Government.

In 2005 the British Medical Journal published a paper ‘Childhood cancer in relation to distance from high voltage power lines in England and Wales: a case-control study’. The study found that children living within 200m of high-voltage power lines were 70% more likely to develop leukaemia than similar children living more than 600m away. And those living between 200-600m away had a 20% increased risk.

In 2007 Dr Howard Moseley, the Dartford Labour MP who chaired the SAGE group, said the Government should act on their advice and adopt the precautionary principle in this instance.

He said: "The most recent scientific research has indicated that there may be a link between childhood leukaemia and proximity to electricity pylons. It would be wrong to wait any longer before taking action."

Given the potential significance of this issue to public health, it is noted that there is no reference to Electromagnetic Radiation within the applicant's Environmental Statement. A brief sentence (Paragraph 5.4.1) within the ES Non-Technical Summary refers to the pylons but only in the context of their visual appearance. As a minimum requirement, this should be addressed within the ES and the applicant should provide an Electromagnetic Impact Assessment in order to enable the IPA to fully assess this issue and the risk to human health.
Drainage

Foul Sewerage Treatment

HOW understands that sufficient capacity exists at the Whitlham Sewage Treatment Works subject to the upgrading of relevant sewer infrastructure and that site falls within this catchment area. Accordingly, there are no objections raised in relation to this issue.

Foul Drainage/Flooding

Anglian Water has confirmed that the development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. It has requested that a drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.

However, the ES confirms that the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has shown the proposed development site is not at risk of flooding now or in the future as a result of surcharge from nearby watercourses or drainage systems. The mitigation proposed will also improve the current situation for local residents with regards to localised surface water flooding (Paragraph 4.25).

HOW would like clarification from the applicant and the LPA with respect to how this issue will be addressed as part of the proposed application.

Surface Water Drainage/Flooding

The ES Non-Technical Summary states that consideration has been given to the impact the proposed development may have on third parties, particularly with regard to surface water run-off. It confirms that the drainage strategy for the main site includes soakaways and storm water attenuation via a total of 10 balancing ponds (Paragraph 4.26).

Hethersett has a history of flooding from surface water drainage. HOW is concerned that the proposed development would only exacerbate this problem. It is considered that there is insufficient information provided within the FRA and Drainage Strategy with regards to this issue.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)

As identified above, the proposed development seeks to utilise a number of balancing ponds as part of its SUDS strategy. HOW is concerned over the issue of standing water and the potential of these ponds to smell during summer months. In particular, where these are located adjacent or close to residential areas, recreation areas or areas adjacent walkways/footpaths. Furthermore, HOW wish to know how these ponds would be maintained with respect to the collection of rubbish. If the intention is for these to be fenced to prevent the collection of debris and for Health and Safety reasons the design and visual impact of this should be discussed within the application submission.
Highways & Parking

Thickthorn interchange

HOW understands that, as part of the proposed development, the applicant would be expected to make a financial contribution towards capacity improvements to the Thickthorn (A11/A47) Junction as required by iCSP policy 10 and the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS). The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study confirms the anticipated improvement works to the junction will amount to a cost of £45m.

HOW would like clarification from the LPA/Highways Authority as to the level of contribution sought from the applicant as part of the proposed application.

Access off Colney Lane

The junction of Colney Lane and Norwich Road (B1172) is intended to provide a primary vehicular route into the eastern side of the proposed development.

Colney Lane itself is considered to be a narrow road and is not well suited to deal with increased traffic flows which would include the addition of bus services making passing difficult.

The Transport Assessment (TA) confirms that, at certain times, capacity constraints are already present at the junction of Colney Lane and Norwich Road (B1172) and that mitigation work will be required irrespective of the proposed development (Paragraph 17.24).

Paragraph 17.91 proposes modifications incorporating signalisation of the junction as mitigation against the proposed development. Paragraph 17.92 concludes that: 'The physical constraints of the publicly maintainable highway at this junction restrict the ability to provide a larger signalised junction, nevertheless as the existing junction would already be experiencing severe capacity constraints in 2026 without the proposed development and associated measures, the cumulative impact of the proposals upon traffic flows at this location is considered to be negligible.'

The ES Non-Technical Summary goes further to say that the TA concludes: "The proposed mitigation measures offered will have an overall beneficial impact upon transport and movement up to 2026 as they will help offset capacity problems that would, in part, take place irrespective of whether Hethersett North is developed" (Paragraph 4.68).

HOW is aware that this junction is constrained by private land to the east, west and south. This effectively limits opportunities for any significant alterations at this location. Given that the junction is already in need of modification due to existing capacity issues, the increase in use from the additional dwellings would only exacerbate the problem. The proposed traffic lights are not considered to be sufficient mitigation on their own. The junction clearly needs to be expanded to accommodate peak traffic with the addition of a turning lane. However, as identified above, there appears to be insufficient land to accommodate this. Accordingly, HOW is very concerned that the junction would become congested and unsafe based on the current proposals.

Furthermore, HOW does not accept the conclusion of the TA that the cumulative impact of proposals upon traffic flows at this location is negligible in light of future traffic growth up to 2026 not associated with the proposed development and its impact on the junction. It also strongly
refutes that the proposed mitigation would have a beneficial impact on transport and movement up to 2026. Clearly, the addition of traffic from the proposed development compacted by inadequate mitigation would have a significant impact on the capacity of the junction and the resulting congestion and safety of road users. For example, Phases 1 (2013-2016) & 2 (2016-2018) of the proposed development on their own form over 50% of the total development and would add significant new capacity to the junction by 2018.

HOW considers that this issue has not been adequately addressed within the TA and fails to take account of the full impact of the proposals to this junction.

The applicant’s red line drawing includes land forming part of the garden of the old Police House dwelling and land to the east of Colney Lane. HOW would like clarification from the applicant that this land is indeed available in order to demonstrate that the development can be implemented as proposed.

Intensification of Churchfields Road

Whilst a primary vehicular route is proposed to the eastern part of the new development from Colney Lane, it would appear from the proposed Movement and Access (Drawing No: 005) layout that Churchfields Road will also become a primary vehicular route serving the centre of the new development. This road is relatively narrow and has unrestricted parking resulting in vehicular obstruction. Furthermore, it is already a busy bus route and HOW is concerned about its ability to cope with additional traffic (both construction and operational) due to the scale of development proposed and the potential negative impact that this intensification may have on road safety and congestions during peak hours, particularly at the junction with Norwich Road.

Access to Henstead Road

The proposed Master Plan for the site confirms that there will be limited access to Henstead Road from the new development. The PS and ES Non-Technical Summary also confirm that traffic calming measures are proposed on Little Melton/Henstead Road as part of Phase 1 of the development (2013-2016).

HOW is concerned that restricting access from Henstead Road would only create problems, particularly for new residents whom will naturally wish to access services within the existing center of Hethersett. Henstead Road would also be used by residents of the existing village to access the new service centre (or other facilities) and restricting access will create poor permeability between the existing and new parts of Hethersett and force traffic into using other, less direct, roads.

Whilst traffic calming measures are acknowledged, HOW would not wish to see access to Henstead Road restricted as is currently proposed. Instead, in order to accommodate an increase in traffic from the proposed development, road surface improvements would be required.

Creation of a Ring Road

The proposed access restrictions at Henstead Road could also lead to the creation of a Ring Road around the proposed new part of Hethersett. The GNOP Design Review Panel provided feedback to the applicants following a presentation in September 2010. One of the key recommendations within
their feedback was that the proposed development did not result in the creation of a Ring Road which: ‘…could become a rat run causing a barrier through the development’.

HOW would like assurances from the applicant and the Highways Authority that the proposed restricted access to Harstead Road will not result in the creation of a Ring Road.

Existing Road Network

HOW notes that no improvements to road infrastructure within the existing village is planned as part of the proposed application. Given that there would be a considerable increase in the number of vehicle movements to the existing roads in Hethersett, it would seem appropriate that the proposed development should help contribute towards a scheme of highways improvements.

Cumulative Impact

The IA does not appear to take into consideration the cumulative highway impacts from the delivery of other strategic growth within the GNDF area and neighbouring authorities, along the A11 corridor. For example, future development at Wymondham is likely to comprise in excess of 2,000 new dwellings and Cringleford has been identified for approximately 1,200 new dwellings. This will add a significant volume of traffic to the A11, particularly during peak hours and will impact upon the junctions at Churchfields and Conney Lane.

HOW would like to see additional consideration of cumulative impact addressed within the IA.

Manual for Streets

HOW would like confirmation from the applicant and the Highways Authority that the proposed application is compliant with the current version of Manual for Streets with respect to proposed:

- roads & junctions;
- parking spaces and layouts;
- turning areas; and
- surfacing materials.

Parking

Whilst it is recognised that the level of car parking within the development will be subject to detailed design, HOW is concerned over the impact of additional car ownership on existing facilities within Hethersett as a result of the proposals. For example, the local Tesco store has limited car parking facilities and would naturally become a destination choice of many new residents. This could well lead to an increase in on-street parking and result in road safety issues and increased congestion within the village. Similar concerns are raised in relation to the Library.

HOW wish to see this issue and associated mitigation measures addressed within the IA.
Neighborhood Centre

Location and Accessibility

The proposed neighborhood centre will contain shops and essential village services and facilities to principally serve the residents of the new development. This has been located at north of Hanstead Road and would sit within the western side of the new development.

HOW have reservations about the siting and resulting accessibility of the local centre for new residents. For example, dwellings located close to Colney Lane to the east of the application site forming part of Phase 2 of the development will be located approximately 1.2km away from the new local centre. This is not considered to be ‘local’ to these occupiers and is beyond a reasonable walking distance.

HOW proposes that due to the size of the development (2km in length) even if the centre was re-located to the middle of the new development, dwellings at the edge would still have to travel approximately 1km to access these services. HOW considers this layout to be unsustainable as it will only encourage use of the private motor vehicle and demonstrates further evidence of why this proposal is overdevelopment.

Furthermore, HOW is concerned that the size and range of facilities at the new centre will be insufficient to serve the amount of new residents resulting from the proposed development. As Hethersett has expanded over the years, the range of local facilities has not grown accordingly leaving an existing shortfall in provision. Accordingly, the new development is likely to further increase the need to travel and would not accord with the government’s objective of creating sustainable communities.
ecology

The ES does not appear to identify any significant ecological features on the application site. Table 6.1: Summary of Residual Impacts (Page 25) of the ES Non-Technical Summary confirms the loss of hedgerows at the site would only have a 'minor adverse' ecological significance and any loss or disturbance to habitats would be minor adverse or negligible. It states that there will be a minor 'net gain' benefit with respect to new foraging habitat.

Paragraph 4.30 of the ES Non-Technical Summary acknowledges that several areas of habitat on the application site qualify as UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat. However, it states: 'none of the areas are considered to be particularly high quality examples when judged against others within Norfolk'.

Furthermore, paragraph 4.32 states that: 'Overall, the development will result in a minor adverse impact on a small number of the VERS but some impacts are likely to be beneficial'.

HOW is concerned over the substantial loss of BAP habitat hedgerows as a result of the proposed development and at the way in which the quality of this BAP habitat has been assessed within the ES. It is not considered appropriate to dismiss the significance of the habitat quality on the basis of comparisons elsewhere within the county. Clearly, the BAP habitat must be assessed with respect to its local significance and the direct impact of its loss to wildlife within both the application site and the surrounding area.

HOW wishes to support the formal consultation response from Natural England that 'like for like' hedgerow replacement planting be incorporated into the proposed Master Plan layout.

Norfolk Wildlife Trust (NWT) has commented on the application. HOW wishes to support the concerns of NWT with respect to the absence of a site wide Management Plan. This should demonstrate how the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented. Without, such a document, it is not clear how or by what mechanism the suggested enhancements would take place.

HOW is also supportive of NWT's comments regarding the promotion of green infrastructure from within the proposed development site to surrounding countryside. Green infrastructure is specifically encouraged within JCS policy 10 to ensure the long-term sustainability of proposed development areas such as Hefferson (Paragraph 6.24). HOW would wish to see continued discussions from the applicant with the Green Infrastructure Steering Group should the LPA be minded to approve this application.
Phasing Plan

Phasing Options

The proposed Phasing Plan shows the central area of the site being development as part of Phase 1. It is understood that previous phasing plans presented to the community showed land to the east of the site being developed in the first instance. HOW is concerned that should the proposed development be approved and not proceed as planned, the village could be left with a blighted scheme. The main access route to the development is expected to be via Colney Lane but the access roads from this are set to be delivered as part of Phase 2 and not Phase 1.

Construction Traffic Routes

It is not clear from the submission documents which road(s) would be used to provide access for construction traffic as part of Phase 1, but it is assumed that either Back Lane and/or Churchfields are the most likely.

HOW seeks clarification from the applicant on this issue and would strongly object to the use of Churchfields as a construction access to the site. This road is within a residential area with numerous young families and is already a busy route with existing bus services. Accordingly, it would be unsuitable to accommodate additional heavy construction traffic which would result in noise nuisance and disturbance, road muck and traffic safety issues.

HOW would prefer construction traffic to access Phase 1 of the site via Colney Lane and Back Lane.
Recreation & Open Space

Sports Pitches

It is noted that there is a total of 8 new sports pitches proposed as part of the new development. Of these, 2 are designated for the existing Secondary School, 3 are designated to Hethersett Athletic FC and a further 3 to the general public as part of a neighborhood park. Given the relative size of Hethersett (including the proposed development) this is considered by HOW to be an overprovision of sports pitches. Concentrating a disproportionate number of sports pitched within a small area of the site is not considered to represent good use of space or principles of good urban design.

HOW acknowledges that feedback given by the community during the public consultation events favoured additional recreation provision over a new county park. However, HOW would like to see a more diverse range of informal and formal recreational uses which would appeal to a larger spectrum of the community particularly at the eastern end of the development.

In particular, there are many young children within Hethersett and the provision of a skate park should be considered by the applicant in conjunction with additional community consultation.

Secondary School Extension

HOW acknowledges that additional playing fields have been provided to the exiting Secondary School to enable future development on the existing grounds. However, they are very concerned over potential road safety issues arising from students having to cross Back Lane.

Whilst a pedestrian crossing is shown on the Master Plan, HOW does not consider this to be either practical or safe as students would inevitably attempt to cross unsupervised. Accordingly, HOW would like to see a small footbridge provided at this location in order to secure a 100% safe means of crossing Back Lane.

Allotment Provision

A local Action Group within Hethersett has been seeking new allotment land for a number of years. Over 40 people have expressed an interest in having an allotment. Parish Councillor, Jackie Sutton, has been helping to identify appropriate sites but there has been little success to date.

HOW therefore welcomes the provision of allotments within the proposed development. However, these are considered to be poorly located at the far North West corner of the site and would be inaccessible to a large number of residents (both existing and proposed). Given existing demand within the village the proposed area of allotments would be insufficient. It is understood that allotment were shown on previous Master Plan drawings within the green buffer zone for the existing village following a meeting in March 2010.

HOW suggests that an additional area of land is allocated for allotments to improve accessibility from both new and existing residents and to cater for existing and future demand. This is specifically encouraged within Objective 9 and policy 20 of the KIS as part of providing green infrastructure within new development and by helping to secure sustainable development.
Planning Considerations Summary

Principle of Development

HOW does not object in principle to the location of new housing development within Hethersett as identified within the GRDF JCS. The current proposal seeks to force the LPA to determine the application before it has had the opportunity to prepare its Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD in accordance with government requirements. However, due to the quantum of development proposed, HOW considers the proposed application to be premature with respect to the preparation of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD and should not be considered favourably by the LPA until this document has been subject to consultation and independent examination.

Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply

HOW objects to the scale of the proposed development which exceeds the target set out within the JCS by approximately 200 dwellings. Notwithstanding the fact that there is not a 5 year housing supply within the NPA, the resulting scheme is considered to be unsustainable overdevelopment and conflicts with wider strategic objectives such as maintaining an important Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Cringleford contrary to guidance within both PPS1, PPS3, the saved Local Plan, and emerging local and national planning policy.

Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact

A large area of the proposed site (particularly Phase 2) would fall within a Strategic Gap as identified within both saved policy ENV2 of the Local Plan Proposals Map and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD. HOW considers this would undermine the openness of the Strategic Gap which serves a vital spatial planning function and have a significant impact on the character of the surrounding countryside in relation to both Cringleford and Little Melton contrary to the aims and objectives of saved policy ENV2, JCS policies 2 and 10 and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

To this end, HOW wish to see the removal of the area of land identified as Phase 2 of the development as part of a revised Master Plan.

Health

Due to the large scale of development proposed at Hethersett, there would appear to be insufficient capacity at the Doctor’s Surgery to deal with the increasing of population. HOW is very concerned that this would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of health services and patient care.

The siting of new housing within less than 100m from High Voltage (400kV) National Grid power lines is considered to prevent potentially significant health concerns to future residents. In particular, the potential link between Extremely Low Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields (ELF EMFs) and childhood leukaemia.

Infrastructure/Drainage & Flooding

Anglia Water has confirmed that the development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Hethersett also has a history of flooding from surface water drainage which appears
to have not been sufficiently addressed within the FRA. HOW is concerned that the proposed development would exacerbate these problems.

The proposed development seeks to utilise a number of balancing ponds as part of its SUDS strategy. HOW is concerned over the issue of standing water and the potential of these ponds to smell during summer months and their potential to collect rubbish and present a health and safety hazard to children.

Highways & Parking

HOW is very concerned that the proposed mitigation measures to the junction of Colney Lane and Norwich Road (B1172) will be inadequate to address the increased capacity pressures which would result from the proposed development. In particular, concerns are raised that the junction would become congested and unsafe based on the current proposals.

HOW have reservations over the deliverability of the proposed development based on the road to widen parts of Colney Lane using land to the east for which ownership is currently unclear.

HOW is concerned about the ability of Churchfields Road to cope with additional traffic and the potential negative impact that this intensification may have on road safety and congestion during peak hours, particularly at the junction with Norwich Road.

HOW is concerned that restricting access from Henstead Road would prevent new residents from accessing services within the existing center of Hethersett. It would also be used by residents of the existing village to access the new service center (or other facilities) and restricting access will create poor permeability between the existing and new parts of Hethersett and force traffic into using other, less direct, roads.

The proposed access restrictions could also lead to the creation of a Ring Road around the proposed new part of Hethersett which was specifically discouraged by the GNDP Design Review Panel provided feedback in September 2010.

Given the considerable increase in the number of vehicle movements to the existing roads in Hethersett from the proposed development, HOW would expect the applicant to make appropriate financial contributions towards a scheme of highways improvements.

The cumulative impact of other future large scale developments along the A11 corridor is considered by HOW to further increase capacity issues at both Churchfields and Colney Lane junctions with Norwich Road.

Neighborhood Centre

HOW has reservations about the siting and resulting accessibility of the proposed local centre for new residents. Residents of Phase 2 of the development will be located approximately 1.2km away which would not be sustainable as it will only encourage use of the private motor vehicle and demonstrates further evidence that this proposal is overdevelopment.
HOW is also concerned over the lack of local facilities (shops and services) proposed as part of the development and the potential impact this may have on increased use of the private motor vehicle contrary to the principles of sustainable development.

Ecology

HOW is concerned over the substantial loss of BAP habitat hedgerows as a result of the proposed development and at the way in which the quality of this BAP habitat has been assessed within the ES. HOW wishes to support the formal consultation response from Natural England that 'like for like' hedgerow replacement planting be incorporated into the proposed Master Plan layout.

HOW wishes to support the concerns of NWT with respect to the absence of a site wide Management Plan to demonstrate how the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented.

HOW is also supportive of NWT's comments regarding the promotion of green infrastructure from within the proposed development site to surrounding countryside as encouraged within JCS policy 10 to ensure the long-term sustainability of proposed development areas such as Hatherstett.

Phasing Plan

The proposed Phasing Plan shows the central area of the site being development as part of Phase 1. HOW is concerned that should the proposed development be approved and not proceed as planned, the village could be left with a blighted scheme as access provision to Colney Road is not included as part of Phase 1.

HOW strongly objects to the use of Churchfields as a construction access to the site due to its proximity to residential dwellings and existing bus services. HOW seeks clarification from the applicant concerning proposed construction traffic routes under each phasing plan.

Recreation & Open Space

HOW considers there is an overprovision of sports pitches within the Master Plan proposals. HOW would like to see a more diverse range of informal and formal recreational uses which would appeal to a larger spectrum of the community particularly at the eastern end of the development. This may, for example, include provision of a skate park subject to additional community consultation.

HOW are very concerned over potential road safety issues arising from students having to cross Back Lane to access the proposed new playfields. HOW would like to see a small footbridge provided at this location in order to secure a 100% safe means of crossing Back Lane.

HOW considers there is an under provision of allotments within the development and the proposed allotments are poorly located and inaccessible to a large number of residents. HOW suggests an additional area of land is allocated for allotments to improve accessibility from both new and existing residents and to cater for existing and future demand. This is specifically encouraged within Objective 9 and policy 20 of the JCS as part of providing green infrastructure within new development and by helping to secure sustainable development.
Conclusion

Overall, HOW has serious reservations over the impact of a development of this scale upon the quality of life for both existing and future residents and to the surrounding environment including flora and fauna.

For the various reasons identified above, the proposed scheme, which exceeds the JCS allocation by approximately 200 dwellings, is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the village. It would be unsustainable and would clearly erode an important Strategic Gap having a detrimental impact to the character of the countryside.

There is a clear lack of integration between both existing and new parts of the village and also within the new development itself as evidenced by the poor location of Allotments and Neighborhood Centre. In particular, the proposals provide very little in the way of genuine benefit to the existing villagers who as a group will be the most affected by the proposed development.

The majority of benefits would effectively be felt by new residents although there are serious concerns over the location of dwellings along the northern edge of the development within close proximity to High Voltage power lines and the overall provision of shops and services to cater for a scheme of this size.

HOW wishes to see these concerns addressed as part of a revised Master Plan layout which reduces the overall size of the development to an acceptable level which can be supported by the infrastructure, facilities and physical environment of Hethersett for the benefit of all. Only in this way can a successful development be achieved which delivers sustainable and healthy communities as required by the JCS.
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1. Application for the approval of the first residential reserved matters must be made before the expiration of 24 months from the date of this permission. The implementation of the approved reserved matters shall be within 18 months of the date of approval of the first of the reserved matters. Application for approval of the remaining reserved matters must be made within 10 years of the date of this permission, and the implementation of the last of the reserved matters to be approved must be within 1 year of its approval.

   Reason for the condition
   As required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development whatsoever shall take place in any phase (or any sub-phase) until the plans and descriptions giving details of the reserved matters for each phase/sub-phase referred to above shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These plans and descriptions shall relate to: appearance, scale, landscaping, open space/sports pitches, layout and levels of any building to be erected together with the precise details of the type and colour of the materials to be used in their construction.

   Reason for the condition
3. The submission of reserved matter applications pursuant to this consent shall comply with the following submitted parameter plans:

Drawing Number 001 Revision - Red Line Boundary
Drawing Number 002 Revision - Land Use Plan
Drawing Number 003 Revision - Developable Area
Drawing Number 005 Revision - Movement & Access - Vehicular
Drawing Number 006 Revision - Movement & Access - Pedestrian, Cycle and Bus
Drawing Number 007 Revision - Density
Drawing Number 008 Revision - Building Heights
Drawing Number 009 Revision - Landscape Strategy

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for the condition
For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the satisfactory development of the site in accordance with the specified approved plans, as required by the Spatial Vision and Spatial Planning Objectives of the Joint Core Strategy.

4. Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first of the reserved matters applications for the site, a site-wide Masterplan and Design Code for each phase of development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The Masterplan shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and parameters established in the outline application and shall include the following:

a) The character, mix of uses and density established through parameter plans at the outline stage to include block principles and the structure of public spaces;
b) The street hierarchy, including the principles of adopting highway infrastructure, and typical street cross sections;
c) The conceptual design and approach to the treatment of the public realm (including public art, materials, signage, utilities and other street furniture), the Neighbourhood Centres, landscape infrastructure, and proposed primary access points;
d) Details of the approach to vehicular and cycle parking across the entire site and parking for people with disabilities and for each building type, including the distribution of resident/visitor parking and cycle parking;
e) The approach to the character and treatment of the structural planting to the development areas;
f) The approach to the treatment of any hedge, footpath, tree or woodland features;
g) The conceptual design and approach to the lighting strategy and how this will be applied to different areas of the development with different lighting needs, so as to maximise energy efficiency, minimise light pollution and avoid street clutter;
h) Details of waste and recycling provision for all building types;
i) Measures to demonstrate how opportunities to maximise resource efficiency and climate change adaptation in the design of the development will be achieved through external, passive means, such as landscaping, orientation, massing, and external building features;
j) Details of measures to minimise opportunities for crime;
k) Details of Design Code review procedure and of circumstances where a review shall be implemented.
No development (apart from enabling works previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall commence until such time as the above details have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Furthermore, prior to the approval of reserved matters within each phase of development, a Design Code specific for that phase shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Design Code shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and parameters established in the outline application and shall include the following:

a) Details of key groups of buildings and other key landmark buildings including information about height, scale, form, level of enclosure, building materials and design features;

Reason for Condition

To ensure high quality design in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide, and to ensure that the determination of the detailed applications that will come forward on the site over a number of years will result in the delivery of a coordinated and high quality development.

5. No development shall take place within any phase or sub-phase until a detailed open space phasing plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The phasing plan shall include the following:

(i) the setting out the precise disposition of informal and formal open space, along with future maintenance arrangements, for each phase or sub-phase
(ii) full details of the planned delivery of the estate road network for each phase or sub phase,
(iii) the planned delivery and disposition of the community facilities, including the football ground and associated buildings, and the community centre.

Reason for Condition

To ensure high quality design in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide, and to ensure that the determination of the detailed applications that will come forward on the site over a number of years will result in the delivery of a coordinated development.

6. No development shall take place within any phase or sub phase, until details, including samples and colours where required, of the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development within that phase or sub phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indication as to these matters that have been given in the current application. The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason for the condition

To enable the local planning authority to control the colour, tone, texture and appearance of the materials used to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, as required by Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.
7. There shall be no development on site until a surface water drainage scheme for the main site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydorlogical context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall include:

- Infiltration testing across the site in accordance with BRE365, and the infiltration test results;
- The scheme will fully investigate the feasibility of infiltration SuDs as a preference. Details of the location and sizing of the proposed infiltration drainage systems to dispose of surface water;
- The discharge rate from each catchment (defined as 1, 2, 3) to the watercourse will be at the 1 in 1 greenfield run-off rate for that catchment;
- The proportion of final discharge allowance attributable to each phase and what remains for the following phases of development;
- Attenuation storage to cater for the 1 in 100 year critical storm plus allowance for climate change;
- Details of the proposed pipe network/conveyance network and calculations of its performance in the 1 in 30 year (piped) or 1 in 100 year rainfall events, including climate change;
- Details of conveyance routes from any surcharged SuDS elements/pipework;
- Details of future adoption and maintenance of the proposed surface water scheme for the lifetime of the proposed development.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Condition
To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

8. Works to provide the extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydorlogical context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall include:

- Infiltration testing across the site in accordance with BRE365, and the infiltration test results;
- The scheme will fully investigate the feasibility of infiltration SuDs as a preference. Details of the location and sizing of the proposed infiltration drainage systems to dispose of surface water;
- The discharge rate from each catchment (defined as 1, 2, 3) to the watercourse will be at the 1 in 1 greenfield run-off rate for that catchment;
- The proportion of final discharge allowance attributable to each phase and what remains for the following phases of development;
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- Attenuation storage to cater for the 1 in 100 year critical storm plus allowance for climate change;
- Details of the proposed pipe network/conveyance network and calculations of its performance in the 1 in 30 year (piped) or 1 in 100 year rainfall events, including climate change;
- Details of conveyance routes from any surcharged SuDS elements/pipework;
- Details of future adoption and maintenance of the proposed surface water scheme for the lifetime of the proposed development.

the scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Condition
To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

9. No development shall commence until the agreed foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Condition
To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

10. A) No development shall take place within any phase or sub phase until a Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of archaeological works for that phase or sub phase has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include:

1. An assessment of the significance of heritage assets present 2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording 3. The programme for post investigation assessment of recovered material 4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording 5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation 6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation 7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation

B) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A).

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A) and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason for the condition
To ensure the potential archaeological interest of the site is investigated in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy ENV9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
11. Prior to the completion of the 150th dwelling, a full detailed design for the works indicated on Bidwells drawing TR0021 dated 19th November 2012 rev A (Thickthorn Mitigation 4 lanes) shall be carried out. The full design shall be substantially in the form of that indicated on this drawing and shall be fully compliant with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and shall be approve and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.

Prior to the completion of the 250th dwelling, the works referred to above shall be constructed, complete and open to traffic and certified as such in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council.

Reason for Condition
To ensure that any proposed amendments to the strategic road network comply with current standards of highway construction and safety, and to ensure that the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange continues to function as part of the strategic road network in accordance with Section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and for the reasonable requirements of safety on that road.

12. Ecological Management Plan
All reserved matters applications for each phase or sub-phase shall be accompanied by an Ecological Management Plan. No development shall take place within each phase or sub-phase until the Ecological Management Plan has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include measures to be taken to improve the biodiversity value of the site, including the planting and management of public areas, ancillary measures such as bird and bat boxes, lighting of sensitive areas and a timetable for implementation. The recommendations of the Ecological Management Plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable for construction before the completion of 75% of the dwellings within each relevant phase.

Beckithhe Meadow ecological buffer zone
An ecological buffer zone of shall be provided at the Beckithhe Meadow CWS and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development. No residential or commercial development shall take place within the zone that will extend for 10m from the designated boundary of the Meadow. This area shall only be accessed for the purposes of drainage, management, maintenance, informal recreation and shall not include land within private gardens. The details of the protection plan and method statement for the existing protected trees, a planting scheme, lighting and a timetable for implementation and provisions for future management and maintenance of the zone shall be included within the Ecological Management plan. The buffer zone shall completed within 1 year from the date of commencement of phase 5 of the development.

Colney Lane ecological mitigation zone
An ecological mitigation zone shall be provided alongside the proposed Colney Lane cycle lane within the red line of the planning application to provide a continuous length of wildlife habitat/features except where access roads/routes pass through it. The buffer zone will need to include amphibian fencing and tunnels under the three proposed access roads along east boundary of the development. If this is not possible there will need to be an off-setting scheme. The details of the buffer zone shall be included within the Ecological Management Plan and shall be implemented within 1 year from the date of commencement of phase 2 of the development.

the scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason for Condition
To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

Great crested newt licensing
All reserved matters applications for each phase or sub-phase shall be accompanied by appropriate survey data for great crested newts (with appropriate survey data to be defined by the Natural England guidance active at the time of such application(s)). These surveys will update the survey work and conclusions of the outline application and determine the presence-absence of great crested newts and the requirements for European Protected Species Mitigation licensing.

Reason for the condition
In order to safeguard the ecological interests of the site in accordance with Policy ENV14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and to enhance the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

13. Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development hereby permitted full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) for each phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following:
   i) Roads, footways, cycleways, foul and on-site water drainage
   ii) Access arrangements
   iii) Parking provision in accordance with agreed standards
   iv) Loading and turning areas

Reason for the condition
In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

14. Before any dwelling or building is first occupied the road(s), footway(s) and cycleway(s) shall be constructed to binder course surfacing level from the dwelling or building to the adjoining County road in accordance with the details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

   All footway(s) and cycleway(s) shall be fully surfaced in accordance with a phasing plan to be approved in writing prior to the commencement of development by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Highway Authority.

Reason for the condition
To ensure satisfactory development of the site in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

15. Development shall not commence on any phase of the development until a scheme detailing provision for on site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period.

Reason for the condition
To ensure adequate off street parking during construction in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
16. A) Prior to the commencement of any works within any phase of development a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Access Route which shall incorporate adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Norfolk County Council Highway Authority together with proposals to control and manage construction traffic using the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' and to ensure no other local roads are used by construction traffic.

B) For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development will comply with the Construction Traffic Management Plan and use only the Construction Traffic Access Route and no other local roads unless approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason for the condition
In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

17. No works shall commence on any phase of the development until the details of Wheel Cleaning facilities for construction vehicles for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development permitted will use the Approved Wheel Cleaning facilities provided referred to above.

Reason for the condition
To prevent extraneous material being deposited on the highway in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

18. A) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Interim Travel Plan has been submitted, approved and signed off by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, such a Travel Plan shall accord with Norfolk County Council document `Guidance Notes for the Submission of Travel Plans` or be produced using the Workplace Travel Plan Generator Tool, www.worktravelplan.net

B) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied prior to implementation of the Interim Travel Plan referred to in part A of this condition above. During the first year of occupation of each phase an Approved Full Travel Plan for that phase, based on the Interim Travel Plan referred to in part A of this condition shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The Approved Full Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied subject to approved modifications agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority as part of the annual review.

Reason for the condition
To ensure that the development offers a wide range of travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
19. The development shall be limited to 1196 houses and a total gross floor area of 1850 sq. metres within the Use Class categories A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and D1 as defined by the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order, 1987 (as amended), (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason for the condition
To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed in accordance with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

20. All reserved matters applications for each phase or sub-phase shall be accompanied by a landscaping scheme. No development shall take place within each phase or sub-phase until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:
   a) Proposed finished levels or contours;
   b) Means of enclosure;
   c) Car parking layouts;
   d) Other vehicles and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
   e) Hard surfacing materials;
   f) Minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc);
   g) Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communication cables, pipelines etc. indicating manholes, supports etc.).

Soft landscaping works shall include:
   a) Planting plans;
   b) Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
   c) Schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
   d) Implementation programme;
   e) A landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all non-domestic landscape areas.

If within a period of FIVE years from the date of planting, any tree or plant or plant planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or is destroyed or dies (or becomes in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective) another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason for the condition
In the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy SP1 and IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

21. No trees or hedges shall be cut down, uprooted destroyed, lopped or topped, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the previous written approval of the local planning authority. Any trees or hedges removed without consent shall be replaced during the next planting season November/March with trees of such size and species as agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason for the condition
To ensure that the trees and hedges are retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

22. No works or development within any phase shall take place until a Tree Protection Plan (and accompanying Method Statement[s] if appropriate) for that phase have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details are to be guided by the recommendations set out in BS5837 Trees in Relation to Construction. Unless otherwise agreed, all approved tree protection measures are to be installed prior to the commencement of development work to implement this planning permission.

The approved tree protection measures are to be maintained in good condition and observed throughout the construction period. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the following activities may not be undertaken at any time within the identified Construction Exclusion Zones and fenced areas:
the storage and/or siting of: vehicles, fuel, materials, site huts or other buildings or ancillary equipment:
raising of lowering of ground levels;
installation of underground services, drains etc.;

Reason for the condition:
To ensure existing trees are protected during site works in the interests of the visual amenity of the area and the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

23. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until an investigation and risk assessment has been completed in accordance with a scheme to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The written report(s) shall include:
(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
(iii) human health,
(iv) property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
(v) adjoining land,
(vi) groundwaters and surface waters,
(vii) ecological systems,
(viii) an appraisal of remedial options if required,
(ix) A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason for the condition:
To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and
ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with policy UTL15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan

Note
This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

24. No phase or sub phase of the development shall commence (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) until:
   1) the approved contamination remediation scheme has been carried out in full for that particular phase or sub phase,
   2) a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out for that particular phase or sub phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for the condition
To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with UTL15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

25. In the event that contamination that was not previously identified is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and a scheme for the remediation and validation is to be agreed with the LPA. If the contamination is deemed significant, in terms of the risk, then only the development affected by the significant contamination shall cease and not recommence until the agreed remediation scheme has been carried out and a validation report demonstrating its effectiveness has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for the condition
To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with UTL15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

26. All reserved matters applications for each phase or sub-phase shall be accompanied by details of existing and proposed ground levels and ground floor slab levels of the buildings relative to Ordnance Datum Newlyn. Such details shall also provide comparative levels of eaves and ridge heights of adjoining properties and details of the levels of any existing or proposed boundary treatments. No development shall take place within any phase or sub phase until these plans have been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason for the condition
To ensure that the development approved does not have any adverse effect on the amenities of local residents or on the character and appearance of the area, as required by Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
27. All reserved matters applications for each phase or sub-phase shall be accompanied by a lighting plan. The lighting plan shall include details of the location, design, level of illuminance (in Lux), and orientation of all artificial lighting, including floodlighting at the sports pitches (for the relevant phase) and lighting furniture to all buildings, walkways, amenity areas, and car parks. No lighting shall be erected until these details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Condition
In the interests of the amenities of local residents and to minimise light pollution in accordance with Policies IMP9 and IMP25 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

28. No development shall commence on site until a scheme has been submitted to and agreed by the Council for the provision of one fire hydrant (served by mains water supply) for every 50 dwellings forming part of the development and no dwelling shall be occupied until the hydrant(s) serving the property or group of properties has been provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition
To ensure adequate water infrastructure provision is made on site for the local fire service to tackle any property fire.

29. No dwellings shall be built on the part of the site between Burnthouse Lane and Colney Lane until after three years from the date of this consent and only then if this area of land has been excluded from the Strategic Gap policy as adopted within the Development Management Policies Document (or its equivalent) and defined on the Adopted Proposals Map; or the Council agree in writing that the dwellings within this area can be built.

Reason for Condition
The area of the site between Burnthouse Lane and Colney Lane is partly within an area designated as a Strategic Gap under policy ENV2 of the Local Plan. This designation seeks to maintain a visual gap with Cringleford to the east. However this designation is currently under review. Not allowing residential development within this area for 3 years will allow time for the emerging strategic gap policy to be tested and adopted through the Local Plan process.

30. The Masterplan required to be submitted under condition 4 shall include provision for vehicular and pedestrian access to the Council’s preferred site for Housing with Care to the north of Grove Road.

Reason for Condition
To ensure that the development hereby permitted does not prejudice the future delivery of the Council's preferred Housing with Care allocation.

31. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until funding for, or (as may be the case), provision of the works and facilities summarised below have been secured by legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the County Council.

A) The improvement of education facilities serving the Development, including the provision of land for a primary and secondary school;
B) Provision and extension of additional library facilities for the library service which serves the Development;
C) Provision of play areas, recreational space and amenity areas commensurate with the development hereby approved, along with a strategy for their future maintenance;
Reason for the condition
To ensure that adequate infrastructure and community facilities and affordable housing are provided to accommodate for the development in accordance with the aims and objectives of NPPF Sections 4, 6 and 8 and JCS Policies 4 and 7.

32. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, no works shall commence on site until a detailed scheme for the off-site improvement works as follows:-

a) Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads (signals);
   b) the footway/cycleway along Colney Lane as far as the A47 overbridge;
   c) the access to the development from Colney Lane via a Right Hand Turn Lane, and;
   d) improvements to Great Melton Road and to the New Road junction to bring it up to a Type 1 access Road standard

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason for condition
To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor in accordance with Saved Local Plan policy IMP8.

33. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to above shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason for condition
To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed, in accordance with Saved Local Plan policy IMP8.

Reasons for Approval

1. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The demonstrable lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application. The development conforms to Policy 10 of the JCS as it proposes a level of growth in a Norwich Policy Area settlement that is identified as a Key Service Centre for at least 1,000 homes.

The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, can be
accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8 and ENV 2, which are given due weight as they remain partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 20 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

1. **NOTE:** It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the Public Highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. This development involves work to the public highway that can only be undertaken within the scope of a Legal Agreement between the applicant and the County Council. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary Agreements under the Highways Act 1980 are also obtained. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's Highways Development Management Group based at County Hall in Norwich. Please contact David Higgins on tel. 01603 222789 or david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the applicants own expense.

2. **NOTE:** This development involves a Travel Plan to be implemented. Please note that it is the applicants' responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary Agreements under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or Highways Act 1980 are also obtained. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's Highways Development Management Group based at County Hall in Norwich. Please contact Ian Dinmore 01603 224248 or ian.dinmore@norfolk.gov.uk.

**Committed Sum for Travel Plans**

The Highways Authority levies a charge to cover the on-going costs of reviewing and monitoring a Travel Plan annually. The Highways Authority also requires a Bond to ensure that the Travel plan targets are met. Both the Bond and the monitoring charge are secured by a Section 106 Legal Agreement. This is in addition to the sum payable for Planning Obligations covering infrastructure, services and amenities requirements.

An online survey tool is available to assist with annual monitoring. For further information on the survey tool, please contact Ian Dinmore 01603 224248 or ian.dinmore@norfolk.gov.uk.

This permission refers only to that required under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and does note include any consent or approval under any other enactment, bylaw, order or regulation and specifically any consent required under the Building Regulations 1991. The attached notes for applicants are also part of this decision notice.

Where development involves the demolition or part demolition of a listed building, no works can be undertaken (despite the terms of any consent granted by the Council) until notice of the proposal has been given to English Heritage, 62/74 Burleigh Street, Cambridge, CB1 1DJ and they have either been given reasonable access to the building for at least one month following the grant of consent, or have stated that they have completed their record of the building or that they do not wish to record it. A form is enclosed, if appropriate.
On behalf of the Council

Date of Application: 1 November 2011
Date of Decision: 22 July 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/1223</td>
<td>Ashwellthorpe And Fundenhall 94 The Street Ashwellthorpe Norwich NR16 TAA</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling.</td>
<td>Mr David Naunton</td>
<td>Delegated Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2600</td>
<td>Costessey Subdivision Of Garden Of 35 Margaret Road Olive Road Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>New 2 bedroom bungalow on land to the rear of 35 Margaret Road.</td>
<td>Mr Dale Thompson</td>
<td>Delegated Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0276</td>
<td>Diss 37 Mere Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4AG</td>
<td>Erection of signage; a graphic panel.</td>
<td>Aldi Stores Ltd</td>
<td>Delegated Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0451</td>
<td>Alburgh Land East Of Hope Cottage Station Road Alburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>Erection of code level 6 dwelling including a observatory.</td>
<td>Mr Mark Thompson</td>
<td>Delegated Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/0832</td>
<td>Broome Land To Rear Of 179 Yarmouth Road Broome Norfolk</td>
<td>Erection of two storey residential dwelling with detached garage</td>
<td>Mrs Alison Neilsen</td>
<td>Delegated Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2015

by Anthony J Wharton BArch RIBA RIAS MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 May 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/14/2225546
Land at Cricket Field, Alburgh Road, Shelton, Norwich NR15 2SF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Groen against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2014/0288/F, dated 14 February 2014, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2014.
- The development proposed is a Family House at the Cricket Field.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

The Appeal site and the proposal

2. The 2.5 ha (or thereabouts) appeal site is a field which forms part of the open agricultural land surrounding the Grade II listed Shelton Hall. It lies a short distance to the north of the Hall and has been formerly used as a cricket field. It was laid to grass at the time of my visit and had recently been lightly mown. The north-eastern boundary of the field is formed by a landscaped strip of trees, shrubs and hedgerows to the west of Alburgh Road. Its north-western boundary also comprises a heavily treed and landscaped strip of land with open fields beyond and there are more open fields to the south west.

3. There are two public footpaths which cross the site. One runs from Alburgh Road towards the south west and is parrallel to the boundary. The other runs from the same Alburgh Road corner to a point about mid-way along the north-western boundary. There is an existing agricultural access to the site from Alburgh Road in the northern corner and in the opposite corner there is a pond and a picnic area.

4. The south eastern boundary of the site shares a hedgerow with a paddock or field and this area backs on to the access road to the Hall. A large barn, to the north west of the Hall, which was once linked to the Hall, is in the process of being converted into residential accommodation. A house, formerly known as Hall Cottage and the buildings of Lodge Farm are positioned on the east side of Alburgh Road, which is a continuation of Shelton Green further to the east.

5. The proposed house is described as a 5 bedroomed house (to code level 6) with a swimming pool, gym and car port. The 40m plus (in length), linear-shaped house would be oriented west-south-west, to east-north-east, with its westerly elevation approximately 20m or so from the south-western boundary. It has been located and designed with a view to it according with the special circumstances set out in the last bullet point of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This indicates that where, subject to certain criteria being met, isolated houses in the countryside can be found to be acceptable.
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6. The last bullet point refers to the need for the proposal to be of ‘exceptional quality or innovative’ in terms of design and specifically that such a design should:
   - be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
   - reflect the highest standards in Architecture;
   - significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
   - be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

7. The proposed new house is intended to accommodate the Appellants plus other family members, one of whom is disabled. The house has been designed to be sustainable, self-sufficient and capable of providing flexibility, comfort and ease of mobility for the family. It is considered that adaptation of the Hall and/or the conversion of the barn would not be able to meet the family requirements and particularly the mobility needs of the disabled family member. In terms of the concept for the design it is stated that the ‘form of a cricket pavilion’ has been adopted to both honour the location’s heritage and to create a light and elegant structure. I refer in more detail to the architectural design below.

**Relevant Policy**

8. The development plan includes the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS) which was adopted in 2011 and 2014 and the ‘saved’ policies from the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) adopted in 2003. The most relevant policies of the JCS are Policy 1 (Addressing Climate change and protecting environmental assets) and Policy 2 (Promoting good design). In the SNLP the most relevant policies are ENV8 (Development in the open countryside); ENV14 and 15 (Habitat and Species protection); IMP 2 (Landscaping); IMP 15 (setting of Listed Buildings); IMP8 (Safe and free flow of traffic) and TRA 19 (Parking).

9. Policies within the emerging SNLP, Development Management Policies (DMP) are also material considerations but, because this document has not yet been adopted, its policies can only be afforded limited weight. The Council has referred to DM1.3 (sustainable location of development); DM1.4 (environmental quality and local distinctiveness); DM3.1 (Housing Quality); DM3.9 (Design Principles); DM3.12 (Road safety and the free flow of traffic); DM3.13 (Provision of vehicle parking); DM3.14 (Amenity, noise and quality of life); DM4.2 (Renewable Energy); DM4.3 (Sustainable drainage and water management) and DM3.15 (Pollution, health and safety). The Council also refers to its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012 (SNPMG) and I have had regard to the relevant sections, particularly ‘Landscape Character’.

10. In terms of national policy the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and I have considered the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental in relation to this proposal. The most relevant NPPF policies are set out in section 6 (Delivering a wide choice of quality homes); section 7 (Requiring good design); section 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) and section 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment). Because Shelton Hall is listed Grade II, I have also paid special attention to section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA) and taken into account relevant Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

**The 5 year housing land supply situation**

11. The current position relating to the 5 year housing land supply in the District is relevant and there are differences between the Council’s position and that of the Appellants. Having requested clarification, it is now clear to me that under the
joint JCS, South Norfolk is effectively split into two housing market areas and that the 5 year supply is then measured in relation to the JCS. Figures in December 2014 showed that there was a 5.10 year supply in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) which covers Norwich City, parts of Broadland and South Norfolk and a 9.11 year supply (at April 2014) in the South Norfolk Rural Areas (which covers the remainder of the District and includes the appeal site). The August 2014 situation of 4.66 years, referred to in the decision quoted on behalf of the Appellant (APP/L2630/A/13/2196884) has been superseded.

12. The Council has also produced a figure for the South Norfolk element of the NPA which is 6.73 years). Consequently the figures show both the South Norfolk element of the NPA and the South Norfolk Rural Area, (which together cover the whole district), as having in excess of a 5 year supply. The same method of assessment of the 5 year housing supply, across all areas covered by the JCS, has been followed in other cases and I see no reason to question this approach.

13. On the basis of these figures and in the absence of any other evidence to the contrary, I consider that in accordance with the NPPF, South Norfolk District Council has provided for an objectively assessed housing need for its housing market area and that, overall, there is in excess of a 5 year housing land supply in the District as a whole. It follows that paragraphs 49 and 14 of the NPPF are not engaged as contended on behalf of the Appellants. The relevant development plan policies can be considered up-to-date with the NPPF and, having regard to paragraph 14, the appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Main issues

14. The main issues in this case are as follows:
   1. The effect that the proposal will have on the character and appearance of this part of the countryside having regard to the principle of development and whether or not the proposal accords with the paragraph 55 criteria;
   2. The effect of the proposal on the setting of the listed Shelton Hall, and
   3. The effect in terms of highway safety and whether or not the location for the proposed dwelling is sustainable.

The principle of development

15. The site is an agricultural field (used in the past as a cricket field) and is clearly outside any of the development limits as defined in the SNLP. The nearest buildings are the house and farm on Alburgh Road, together with Shelton Hall and the nearby large barn. There cannot be any dispute, therefore, that the proposal is for a dwelling in the open countryside. In principle, both local and national policies aim to prevent such development unless specific criteria are met. None of the normal exception criteria (such as dwellings for agricultural or forestry use) are applicable and on that basis alone the development is contrary to the development plan. However, in this case, it has always been stated that the design was conceived to meet the stringent criteria of the last bullet point of paragraph 55 of the NPPF and, therefore, that the material considerations indicate that a decision should not be made in accordance with the development plan.

16. It is contended that the Council has not provided a robust argument to support its refusal and that any initial concerns have been addressed within the design itself, or with the rigorous evidence and supporting documents from relevant experts. It is stressed that the designers have a wealth of experience in designing for rural areas and have previously secured planning permission for four 'paragraph 55 houses' and two 'PPS7 houses'. Be that as it may, each proposal
has to be assessed on its merits and I now turn to the criteria which must be met. The NNPF is clear that such a design should be assessed against all of the criteria set out in paragraph 55.

**Whether the design is truly outstanding or innovative and whether or not it raises standards of design in this rural area**

17. Turning first to the appearance and the specific architectural merits of the scheme, it is clear that this is a bespoke design which, in terms of physical appearance, makes some visual references to Shelton Hall; other surrounding buildings and the surrounding landscape. Having studied the drawings; the Design and Access Statement (DAS); the structural proposals and the proposed use of energy technologies, I agree with the Appellants that this is a balanced, elegant and practical design. The collaborative working of the specialists (Architect, Structural Engineer and other experts) has, in my view, produced a house design which, in itself, is out of the ordinary and one which certainly stands out in terms of its overall visual and architectural impact.

18. I also agree with the Appellants’ contention that *innovation* is not necessarily *invention* and that, in the spirit of the NNPF, *innovation* can refer to the use of better solutions that meet new and up-to-date requirements in order to produce sustainable development. The ‘better solutions’ in this case, include the proposed energy circuit created by the roof, the glass atrium and heat sink; the solar roof tiles; the rammed earth heat sink; the natural and mechanical shading; the green living wall; the trombe wall; the glazing; the low carbon materials and the heat pump technology.

19. Although each of these, in themselves, cannot be claimed to be truly ground-breaking or new; when used together, I consider that this combination of ‘better solutions’ in this design, can be said to be an innovative approach to the development of a single dwelling house. When coupled with the other engineering innovations, such as the roof; the rest of the structure and the aim to achieve level code 6 of sustainability, I consider that on balance the design meets the first criterion set out above.

**Whether or not the design reflects the highest standards in Architecture**

20. I consider that this proposal does reflect the highest standards of architecture. The design of the house itself was the result of extensive research through site visits, site history, and local input and consultant reports. The design was the carried out in a collaborative team effort which has resulted in what I consider to be a commendable and innovative project in terms of a house design.

21. In itself, the design utilises the latest techniques and technologies to provide a modern and energy efficient dwelling. It does so in an understated, simplistic, practical and elegant manner, which is far superior in terms of design than most of today’s normal, mundane, mass housing or single dwelling schemes. Taking all of the technological and design features together I find, therefore, that the design of the house meets this criterion. The house itself, therefore, accords with both local and national policies which require good design and with the NNPF policy by delivering a quality home.

**Whether or not the proposal enhances its immediate setting**

22. Having walked around the site, across the site (including along the two public footpaths), over surrounding land and along Alburgh Road, Shelton Green and other minor roads in the locality, I do not agree with the Appellants that the proposal would enhance its immediate setting. Despite the fact that I find the
proposal commendable and acceptable in design terms, I find that the siting of a structure of this size and bulk would detract markedly from, rather than enhance, its immediate setting. In my view, the result would be significant visual harm being caused to this particular part of the South Norfolk countryside.

23. Whilst accepting that the design could well enhance many other sites in the District and even one closer to other built form in the vicinity; in this particular location it is my view that no matter how well designed, the house would look markedly out of place on this open agricultural land. Despite the fact that the site was formerly a cricket field and that it still forms part of the Estate, it is now perceived as a spacious field in the open countryside. The existing setting forms part of the open surrounding farmland to Shelton Hall and any new dwelling, on such an exposed site would, in my view, detract markedly from the immediate setting, character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

24. The former cricket field does not appear to have ever been historic parkland, related to the listed building. Instead, it seems to have just been one of the nearest fields to the house which was large enough to provide the owners of the Hall and the farming community with a cricket pitch. Despite the wider than normal tree and hedgerow boundaries, it is still distinctly and visually related to the open agricultural land to the north and south west. Despite these extensive landscaped boundaries which clearly improved shelter to the cricket field, it is still perceived today as open countryside. The fact that two public footpaths cross the field reinforces my view that a dwelling house on this open field would be seen as being completely out of place in this rural location.

25. Whilst acknowledging that the size of the proposal is in keeping with the size and form of some of the local larger farm buildings, I do not accept the contention that it would reconnect these buildings to Shelton Hall and its Estate. I do not consider that the scheme can be said to re-establish the links to the historic past of Hall. The only historic links are agricultural or to its use as a cricket ground.

26. Even if there had been a large cricket pavilion or other structures on the land, these would have been positioned around the boundaries of the land, thereby relating more to the current pattern of buildings, lanes and tracks. They would certainly not have been positioned just off centre of the open part of the cricket pitch. I have no reason to question that the ‘rejuvenation of the settlement’ began when the Appellants restored Shelton Hall and that this process has been furthered by the creation of a new home within the former Tithe Barn. However, I do not accept that the design for the cricket field will ‘complete the hamlet’s progression into the future without undermining the historic legacy of the locality.

27. The historic legacy in the immediate locality results mainly from the Shelton Estate and the surrounding farms providing a truly rural setting for agriculture and its associated housing. I accept that this has changed over recent years with purely residential properties helping to create this rural hamlet. However, in this case, although it is contended that the new dwelling would be perceived as being part of the hamlet and would be seen as a ‘house growing out of the landscape’, I consider the opposite to be the case.

28. In my view such a large structure in this particular location would be perceived as an obtrusive, disparate and discordant addition to the landscape, seemingly appearing from nowhere and resulting in a stark and surprising three-dimensional intervention within the open field. Thus, despite the qualities of its design, its innovative nature, and the proposed landscaping, it follows that I do not consider that the proposal would enhance its immediate setting.
Whether or not the design is sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area

29. The defining characteristics of the area result from a combination of the open agricultural land; the narrow lanes; the farm buildings and the houses interspersed, at varying distances, along the lanes. Most of the buildings are closely related to the narrow lanes, or have small access roads from the lanes to dwellings and farm buildings. Shelton Hall itself is such an example, with a track giving access to the Hall and the adjacent former farm buildings.

30. In terms of the proposed house, I have already referred to its design references to the buildings in close proximity to Shelton Hall. In design terms alone, I consider that it would be sensitive to the character and appearance of other built forms this part of the District. However, it would be far from sensitive in terms of its siting on the former open cricket field. I have already referred above to the visual effect that this dwelling would have in such an exposed position and the effect would cause demonstrable harm to the defining key characteristics of the landscape, set out in the SNPMG.

31. Because of the size and positioning of the house, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the characteristics of the immediate area. As indicated above most of the other built form in the vicinity is well-related to the network of narrow lanes and access tracks. The appeal scheme, despite the proposed landscaping, would be perceived as a stark, disparate and discordant element. The qualities of its design cannot hide its overall bulk and massing. These factors would result in it being significantly and demonstrably out of keeping and not at all in harmony with the open nature of the agricultural land and the former open cricket field.

32. In conclusion, again due to size and positioning, I find that the proposal would be most insensitive to the defining characteristics of the area. It fails, therefore, to meet the stringent requirements of this criterion in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

The effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II listed Shelton Hall and other nearby heritage assets.

33. Having seen the listed Hall in its overall context and having viewed its surroundings, I consider that, as a matter of fact and degree, it has a very wide-ranging overall setting. This includes the immediate gardens to the house itself; the surrounding moat and nearby ponds; the Tithe Barn and other nearby former agricultural buildings.

34. Because of the historic relationship of the house to the immediate surrounding agricultural land, and in particular the former cricket field appeal site, I also consider that these areas add positively to, and form part of, the setting to the hall itself and the curtilage buildings which are deemed listed by virtue of Section 5 (1) (b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA).

35. On 25 March 2015 the PPS5 Practice Guide was withdrawn and replaced by 3 English Heritage Good Practice Advice Notes, 1, 2 and 3 (EHGPA Notes). In essence these documents follow the previous guidance relating to the protection of the settings of Heritage Assets. EHGPA Note 3 is relevant in this case and deals with the Setting of Heritage Assets. The NPPF makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset (in this case Shelton Hall and the deemed listed structures) is the surroundings in which the asset is experienced. The extent of a setting is not fixed and may change. It is indicated that elements of a setting may make a negative or positive contribution to its significance; may affect the ability to appreciate the significance or may be neutral.
36. The contribution of its setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views. Views which contribute more to the understanding of the significance of the asset include those where there are clear relationships between the asset and natural features; those with historical associations and those between heritage assets and natural or topographical features. The importance of the setting lies in what that setting contributes to the significance of the historical asset.

37. In applying these criteria to the particular setting of Shelton Hall, I have taken into account the Heritage Statement submitted on behalf of the Appellants. From the outline history of the Hall and its lands; from its historical development and from the analysis of the impact of the proposal on the designated Assets (including Shelton Hall; Shelton Hall Brick Barn; Shelton Hall Great Barn; St Mary’s Parish Church and the Old Rectory I do not consider that any of the assets will be substantially harmed. Clearly none of the assets are at risk of being lost but the question to be asked is whether there would be a positive, negative or neutral impact on the setting of any of these heritage assets.

38. I consider that, as well as the immediate links to the other historic buildings, the significance of the setting of the Hall lies in its historical and visual links and connections to the surrounding open estate farmland. The setting is typical of many others in this part of the District, where farm houses and associated buildings are set within an open agricultural landscape, interspersed along the narrow lanes with sporadic or scattered housing.

39. I have taken into account the topography of the land, views to and from the listed hall and other heritage assets; the openness of the former cricket field; the dense boundary treatment; the views across the site and its intervisibility with other built and natural elements within this part of the South Norfolk Landscape.

40. From all of my observations it is my view that the siting of a new dwelling house of this size on this particular site would neither preserve nor enhance the open rural setting of the heritage assets. I acknowledge that views to and from the site towards the historic buildings are limited due to the wide and dense boundary landscaping around the appeal site. However, I consider that the siting of the proposed house would result in harm being caused to the open rural setting of Shelton Hall and the other nearby listed buildings. Instead of being seen as closely related to the group of historic buildings, the proposal would stand out as being visually obtrusive and thus the overall pattern of the development within this part of the South Norfolk landscape would be significantly and detrimentally altered.

41. Whilst accepting that the harm to the heritage assets would be less than substantial, there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm. The appeal fails, therefore, on this issue.

The effect on highway safety

42. Norfolk County Council’s (NCC) Highways statement, dated 2014, sets out the highways case on behalf of the Council. It refers to the location of the site; its relationship to the highway network of the area; the basis of the highways objection and an assessment of the effect of the proposals. In terms of the access to the site the statement refers to the NPPF aims to ensure ‘safe and suitable access...for all people’.

43. The estimated traffic movements to and from the site are around 8 to10 vehicular trips per day and I have no reason to question this figure for a proposal
of this size and having regard to the family requirements. I agree with the NCC that, other than access on to the farmland for agricultural purposes, there is no notable existing vehicle generating use of the site. Thus, the proposal would lead to an increase of traffic on the existing road system.

44. Having considered the above figures and inspected the highways immediately adjacent to, and surrounding the site, I do not share the Highway Authority's concerns regarding highway safety. In my view, a safe access to the site for one dwelling could be achieved subject to the proposed conditions relating to the nature of the access; the visibility splay; a turning area within the site and relevant proposals for the surface water drainage being provided. In any case there are no objections from the Council relating to drainage.

45. The addition of the traffic generated by one dwelling will not, in my view, add significantly to traffic movements on this part of the network and on this part of the highways network. Despite the narrow lanes, frequent junctions and the general condition of the secondary roads I consider that a proposal for one dwelling in this locality would, subject to appropriate conditions, be acceptable on highway safety grounds. I, therefore, find in favour of the proposal on this part of the highways issue.

Whether or not the location is sustainable

46. With regard to the site being in a sustainable location, the NCC Highways document quotes from the local transport plan 'Connecting Norfolk - Norfolk’s Transport Plan for 2026' (CNNTP) and specifically to Policy 5 which aims to ensure that any new development is well located and connected to existing facilities, so as to minimise the need to travel and reduce reliance on the private car or the need for new infrastructure. It is considered that the proposal conflicts with the NPPF and with Policy 5 of the CNNTP.

47. On the basis of the evidence submitted by NCC there can be no doubt that this is not a sustainable location for new housing in general. There are no bus services within a reasonable distance from the site; the nearest shops are over 3km away and there are no safe cycling tracks in the vicinity of the site. It is clear, therefore that, irrespective of who lived in the proposed new dwelling, they would be heavily dependent on the use of the private car to access the necessary services.

48. However, I do not accept the contention that Shelton is not suitable for 'growth of this nature'. Putting aside any other issues, the proposal is for just one dwelling house and any such single dwelling in the general surroundings of the site would be as sustainable as the existing dwellings in terms of location. Whilst accepting that the aims of any sustainability policies of the development plan and the NPPF might not be fully met by any new housing in such locations, this is not a proposal for a small housing estate.

49. Instead, it is one which relies on the paragraph 55 criteria and where, in terms sustainability alone, the considerable benefits of the proposal would, (if acceptable in all other respects) far outweigh the fact that the new dwelling would be in an isolated part of the District. I therefore find in favour of the Appellants on this second part of the highways issue.

The Ecological and Arboricultural Matters

50. The Council’s fourth reason for refusal was on the basis that the Ecological Report was not sufficient to fully assess the impact of the development and it was considered that it would cause detriment to protected species and in particular reptiles and greater crested newts. However, following the full ecological report by
Finnemore Associates (submitted in May 2014), it is indicated that the Council has withdrawn its objections with regard to Ecological matters. Having read the report I agree that, subject to appropriate conditions, there are no ecological reasons which would dictate against the proposed development.

51. I have also studied the arboricultural report in conjunction with the landscaping scheme and I am satisfied that the existing trees within and surrounding the site have been appropriately assessed. None of the trees on or around the site would be lost and the relevant specimens close to any proposed development would be adequately protected during and after the construction period. I agree that, again subject to appropriate conditions, there can be no objection to the proposal on arboricultural grounds.

The proposed landscaping scheme

52. The thorough landscape report clearly sets out a description of the site; outlines the proposal; gives an overview and policy context and analyses the landscape character surrounding the site. It goes on to assess the effects of the proposal; to summarise the objectives of the scheme; to set out the features proposed and explains in some detail the concept of the scheme. The report also refers to the proposed planting (shown on drawing 1348/01- some trees named after cricket fielding positions) and covers the planting process; ground preparation and treatment; grassing and tree and shrub planting.

53. In relation to the overall concept of the landscaping scheme, the report states that the visual impact of the development is intended to be less than that which currently exists. It is also contended that the house would be enhanced by the setting and form of the proposed soft landscaping. On this latter point I agree that the landscape proposal could work well in terms of its conceptual design, with the design of the house itself. It is also clear that the intensification of planting around the boundaries could assist in general screening of the proposed new house from distant viewpoints.

54. However, with regard to the visual impact of the development being less than that which currently exists, I completely disagree with the contention that is put forward. What exists is an open field or cricket pitch, without any landscaping other than around the boundaries and I have already referred above to the physical impact of a dwelling of this size and bulk on the field. In my view, no amount of horse chestnut trees or other 'fielders' (whether in the 'slips' or the 'outer field') would be sufficient to allay the perception that the 'cricket pavilion' was inappropriately located on the 'wicket' near to the middle of the pitch.

55. Even if the trees in the 'outer field' (from 'deep mid-wicket' around to 'deep cover' and 'long-off') were fully grown specimens, the house would still be distinctly noticeable and, in my view, obtrusive within its newly formed landscape. Furthermore the 'fielders' at 'long slip', 'third man' and 'deep point' would lie to the north of the public footpath and would not assist in any screening of the building. The design concept overall might well achieve ecological and habitat enhancements on parts of the site but, overall, I do not consider that the landscaping scheme overcomes my concerns about the impact of the proposal on its immediate setting or the sensitivities of the appearance and characteristics of this part of South Norfolk.

The Planning Balance and my overall conclusions

56. I have found in favour of the proposal in relation to two of the criteria set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF. I have concluded that the design is innovative and
that it reflects the highest of standards in Architecture. I have also found no conflict with regard to policies on highway safety; the location and sustainability of a single dwelling in this locality; the effects on ecology and habitats and the effect on existing trees.

57. However, against these advantages, I have found that the proposal would not accord with the remaining criteria set out in paragraph 55, in that the proposed house would be significantly harmful to its immediate setting and would also be demonstrably harmful to the defining characteristics of this part of South Norfolk. It follows that I find the proposal to be contrary to Policy ENV8 of the SNLP and to paragraph 55 of the NPPF when considered in full.

58. I have also found against the proposal in terms of the impact on the setting of Shelton Hall and the deemed listed buildings in the immediate vicinity. The proposal is also contrary, therefore, to policy IMP15 of the SNLP and to the NPPF policies in Section 12 relating to the conservation and enhancement of the heritage assets. With regard to the DMP policies, I have only afforded them limited weight but, nevertheless, having taken into account the aims of Policy DM1.4, and those of the SNPMG, my concerns about the impact of this proposal on the environmental quality and local distinctiveness of the area are reinforced.

59. My overall conclusion is that the commendable design advantages of the scheme are significantly outweighed by the disadvantages and the harm which would be caused to this part of the open countryside. Even if paragraphs 49 and 14 of the NPPF had applied, with regard to the housing land supply, it would still be my view that planning permission should not be granted due to the adverse impacts of the proposal. These adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits identified, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

60. Finally, I find that, in terms of its design alone, this is the ‘right house’ and it would provide a quality home. However, it is the ‘right house’ in the ‘wrong location’ and, for the above reasons set out above, I do not consider that planning permission should be granted. The appeal, therefore, fails.

Other Matters

61. In reaching my final decision I have taken into account all other matters raised by and on behalf of the Appellants. These include the initial grounds of appeal; the full details of the application; the Design and Access Statement and its summary; the full details of the Heritage Statement; the responses to the Council’s decision and appeal submissions; the matters set out in the Ecology and Arboricultural Assessments; the matters covered by the Landscape Statement and the final comments submitted on 12 November 2014.

62. However, none of these factors alter my conclusions on the main points at issue and nor is any other matter of such significance so as to change my decision that the appeal should be dismissed.

Anthony J Wharton
Inspector
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Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 9 June 2015

by Mike Moore  BA(Hons) MRTPi CMILT MCIHT
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/14/3000987
Land East of Hope Cottage, Station Road, Alburgh, Norfolk, IP20 0BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Mark Thompson against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2014/0451/F, dated 6 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2014.
- The development proposed is the erection of Code Level 6 dwelling, including an observatory.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to planning policies that seek to protect the countryside.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises part of a grassed field with a frontage to Station Road. There are some nearby dwellings forming a loose-knit pattern of development on this road and also on Low Road. The appeal proposal is for a 2-storey, 4-bedroom dwelling of a modern and individual design.

4. The appeal site is outside any Development Limit or Village Boundary and therefore is within the open countryside as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) (LP). LP Policy ENV8 resists new development in such locations unless it falls within certain limited categories, including that it is requisite for agriculture or forestry or that it is justified to sustain economic and social activities in rural communities and demands a rural location.

5. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') was published more recently than the LP. In paragraph 55 it indicates that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. In this case, while there are other dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site, it is isolated from the main part of the settlement of the village of Alburgh and from any local services or facilities. The area has a rural character, the dwellings here being set in an agricultural landscape with fields to the rear. As such, the provisions of the Framework in this regard are relevant and a significant material consideration in this appeal.

www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate
6. Amongst the special circumstances in Framework paragraph 55 is the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design. To achieve this, a design must meet all of four criteria. The first of these are that such a design should be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, and that it should reflect the highest standards in architecture.

7. In this case, the house would include a barrel-vaulted roof which is partially cantilevered. Fine suspension rods attached to the curve of the barrel vault would provide a concealed support system, holding up the floor which would appear to hang independently from any support. The front wall would be a glass and steel curtain wall and would appear undullered as a result. The dwelling is also intended to achieve Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The proposed dwelling would clearly contain some innovative features and would be a distinctive architectural design.

8. The other criteria relate to the setting of the dwelling and the defining characteristics of the local area. This part of Station Road has a leafy, rural character derived from the trees and hedges and the spacing of the various dwellings. The proposed building would be no taller than the existing dwellings but would have a substantial footprint and a long front elevation. It would be sited close to the road and, while the existing boundary hedge on this frontage would be retained, it would be clearly seen above it and prominent in the lane.

9. Villages normally contain a mixture of the traditional and the new. The proposals here are not within the main part of the village. However, the nearby dwellings are of different time periods and architectural styles. Nonetheless, their pitched roofs, generally simple designs and appearance are typical of dwellings in a rural location.

10. The proposed dwelling has sought to draw from the rural vernacular and, in particular, traditional farm buildings. The barrel-vaulted roof is typical of some types of barns found in South Norfolk. The proposal has been designed to evoke the large open doors of a traditional barn building through the façade design and hierarchical structure of the two wings. However, the Design and Access Statement recognises that the form of the front wall as a glass and steel structure, suspended from above is rarely used in domestic properties, particularly in a conventional house. As such, the design would be significantly different from that of other dwellings locally and it would not be readily apparent that it was seeking to find references in farm buildings.

11. Due to its position, scale and contemporary design the proposed building would have an urbanising effect. It would be a visually dominant feature that would not sit comfortably with the nearby dwellings on Station Road and would be harmful to its immediate setting.

12. In terms of the tests in the Framework, irrespective of whether the building is truly outstanding or innovative or reflects the highest standards in architecture, for these reasons it would not significantly enhance its immediate setting nor be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area.

13. The appellant does not seek to justify the proposed development on the basis of the exceptions in Policy ENV8 or the other factors in Framework paragraph 55. I conclude that the proposed dwelling would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the
aims of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Policy 2, which seeks to ensure development proposals reflect local distinctiveness, and LP Policy ENV8.

14. The purpose of the planning system is the achievement of sustainable development. To achieve this, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought simultaneously. In this case the construction of the dwelling would support the local economy by providing some employment for builders and materials suppliers. The future occupants could potentially provide some support for local services and facilities.

15. In social terms, an additional dwelling would add to the housing stock. The appellant initially queried whether there was a 5-year housing land supply in the area, referring to a reliance on projected house completions. However, this is normally part of the method of calculation. An appeal decision referred to by the appellant\(^1\) relates to a site within the Norwich Policy Area. In this case, the site is within the Rural Policy Area, where the existence of more than a 5-year supply was confirmed in a recent appeal decision\(^2\) and this has not been challenged by the appellant. The details of the land supply have not been provided by either main party but in these circumstances the absence of a 5-year supply of land has not been demonstrated and therefore the development plan policies for the supply of housing are up to date. However, some limited weight can be attached to the extra accommodation that the dwelling would provide.

16. The proposed dwelling would be a bespoke house designed to meet the appellant’s home life and business requirements as an astronomer. He wishes to incorporate an observatory into the dwelling so that he can take images of the night sky from a rural location with low light pollution. However, personal circumstances rarely outweigh the more general planning considerations and the proposed dwelling would endure long after the personal circumstances of the appellant had ceased to be material.

17. In terms of environmental factors the Code level 6 construction standard is a factor in favour of the scheme. However, this and any other benefits would be clearly outweighed by the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the proposal.

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

_ M J Moore_

INSPECTOR

\(^1\) APP/L2630/A/13/2196884
\(^2\) APP/L2630/A/14/2211393
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with, ongoing investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeches Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>24.02.09</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Erection of Decking</td>
<td>26/10/09</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Mere Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELVERTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice served Enforcement Notice almost fully complied with Application submitted to address outstanding matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Loddon Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 29.12.11 Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj. to Fen Road</td>
<td>Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan</td>
<td>04.03.15</td>
<td>Further Enforcement Notice served re caravan Compliance date within 3 months of first occupation of the permitted dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTON</td>
<td>Change of use of barn to residential use</td>
<td>16.02.11</td>
<td>Successful prosecution for non-compliance with Enforcement Notice Notice now complied with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Standing of a caravan</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date extended one year to 14/09/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/0254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWNTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of Access</td>
<td>16/11/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27/10/13 Owner unable to comply at present due to personal circumstances Ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to The Drift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownthorpe Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Erection of buildings not connected to agricultural use</td>
<td>21/12/11</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Grays Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane 2012/8018</td>
<td>Change of Use of Land for the standing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>18/07/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice quashed upon appeal Planning Permission granted upon appeal NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAXLINGHAM THORPE Land on the North side of Windy Lane 2013/8069</td>
<td>Storage of a caravan</td>
<td>27/02/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 10 March 2015 Due to personal circumstances compliance delayed, ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAXTON Butterfly Barn Church Lane 2013/8087</td>
<td>Change of use of stable to residential dwelling</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 19/03/15 Residential use ceased, ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULBARTON Trevannon The Common 2013/8217</td>
<td>Untidy land</td>
<td>05/02/14</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 14/06/14 Ongoing monitoring, clearance is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET Saddleback Farm Station Road 2013/8230</td>
<td>Change of use of Agricultural building to use as a dwelling house</td>
<td>10/12/14</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 07/12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY Aldreds Yard The Loke Longwater Lane 2014/8013</td>
<td>Breach of Planning Conditions</td>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 17/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>Land to rear of Sugar Beet Norwich Road 2014/8218</td>
<td>Construction of hardstanding/roadway 01/04/15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 17/09/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enforcement Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of complaints</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015 As of 06/7/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Notices Issued</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 215 Notices Issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary stop notices issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENF-PROC 06/07/2015