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  Appliance No : 2015/0075/F
Parish : KETTERINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr M 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.

2  Appliance No : 2014/1302/O
Parish : CAISTOR ST EDMUND

Applicants Name : Mrs Val Hope
Site Address : Land North of Heath Farm Caistor Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 16 dwellings (5 affordable, 11 market) and proposed access to the south of Caistor Lane.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to AGREE that the scheme is now acceptable in planning terms and consequently to agree that officers confirm to the Planning Inspectorate that the Council do not wish to contest the current appeal.

1. Conditions pursuant to the outline include the following and any other considered necessary by the Director of Growth and Localism:
2. Outline Permission Time Limit
3. Standard outline requiring RM
4. In accord with submitted drawings
5. Standard Estate Road
6. Wheel cleaning facilities
7. Highway Improvements – Offsite
8. Surface Water
9. Surface water - management and maintenance of drainage ditches
10. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
11. Boundary treatment to be agreed
12. In accordance with ecology report
13. Tree protection
14. Renewable Energy - submission of details
15. Programme of archaeological work
16. Slab level to be agreed
Updates

Local Member comments (already circulated to members)

If the PC asks for a postponement, I ask that it is granted.

Application should be refused as being development in open country (ENV 8).

The report (para 3.18) refers to 'the benefits of providing additional housing where there is a need to do so'. I do not believe that there is any demonstrable need in Caistor St Edmund. I do not believe that the marginal lack of a 5-year land supply outweighs this.

If the committee is minded to approve the application, I ask that it includes the requirement referred to in the original report to add a footpath provision to Caistor Lane.

Additional letter of comment received from a local resident with the following comments (summarised) (full version already circulated to members):
Little has changed since the first application
Substantial heavy vehicles would still be using the farm track
Conflict with the proposed dwellings and unneighbourly farm uses given their close proximity to the farm
The access track will not be wide enough to allow two HGVs to pass
The 5 year supply is a balancing act and takes time to balance and this shouldn’t be a reason to allow this site to be approved
The site was not deemed appropriate as part of the site allocations process
Planning policies should not be dropped just because there is no 5 year supply of housing

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3 Appl. No : 2015/0827/O
Parish : HETHERSETT

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

Decision : Members voted 6-3 for REFUSAL

Refused

1. The proposal is isolated from the main settlement of Hethersett and is therefore in an unsustainable location, contrary to NPPF and SNLP ENV8.
Applicants Name: Abel Developments
Site Address: Land South East of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk
Proposal: Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following approval under the outline application (2015/1233) for residential development including access.

Decision: Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE with conditions

Approved with conditions.

1. In accordance with amended drawings

   Note – Requirement to fulfil the requirements of the conditions attached to the outline approval

   Subject to no new material issues being raised on amended plans.

Updates

The following responses have been received on the basis of the amended plans:

SNC Design Officer – The scheme achieves 9 Greens and 3 Ambers as part of the Building for Life Assessment

NCC Highways – Observations
1. A size 5 turning head should be provided on the private drive serving plots 9-14.
2. The turning head adjacent the pumping station should be designed to size 3 dimensions.
3. Given the distance between the plots 1 & 8 and their respective parking spaces it is likely this could result in some on-street parking.
4. Who will maintain / adopt the pedestrian crossings over the drainage feature between the footway and the open space.
5. With respect to surface water drainage it is noted the intention remains that this will be adopted by Anglian Water. Whilst this may be the intention, as noted in our earlier comments the Highway Authority is unaware at this time that Anglian Water have agreed to adopt the proposed drainage system. Unless such evidence is provided the Highway Authority will not consider the proposed road for adoption.

A revised plan has addressed points 1 and 2. With regard to point 3 this has not been addressed, however, it is considered that whilst it would be preferable to having the parking closer, on balance, this would not be a reason to refuse the application and in any event it could compromise the overall layout which is considered to be successful. It is envisaged that the PC will adopt these along with the open space. Point 5 is noted, however this is a point that will be addressed through the discharge of those conditions relating to surface water drainage which will be done formally under a separate application.

Env Agency – They have confirmed that the scheme does not fall to be considered under their remit, this is now the responsibility of NCC as lead local flood authority.
SNC Play and Amenities Manager – No objection.
SNC Landscape Officer – No objection given a tree protection plan is included as part of the outline approval.
SNC Env Protection Officer – No objection.
SNC Flood Defence Officer – no comments received.
SNC Ecologist – No objection.
NCC Flood and Water Management – no comments received.

On a point of clarification, the reference in the Environment Agency’s comments (1st bullet
point para 3.6 of the report) to an increased discharge rate (0.9l/s to 1.7l/s) was formally agreed as part of condition 5 of the outline approval for the site (2015/1233).

5 Appl. No : 2015/1115/DC
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Applicants Name : Miss Jessica Miln
Site Address : Land north of the A11 at Park Farm Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Discharge of condition 5 of planning application 2011/0505/O – Design code

Decision : Members voted 8-0 to AGREE that the Design Code be approved pursuant to condition 5 of planning permission 2011/0505.

6 Appl. No : 2015/1181/RVC
Parish : BRAMERTON
Applicants Name : Mr David Murrell
Site Address : Land North of Church Farm The Street Bramerton Norfolk
Proposal : Variation of Conditions 3 and 11 and removal of condition 15 of planning permission 2013/0087 (replacement of approved office block with dwellinghouse)

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit – submission of final reserved matters for this plot required to be submitted by 20.09.2016
2. Reserved matters
3. Amended plans
4. Boundary treatment
5. External materials to be agreed
6. Contaminated land – submit scheme
7. Water efficiency
8. Surface water drainage
9. Ecology
10. Demolish existing buildings on site
11. Slab level
12. Retention trees and hedges
13. No additional windows at first floor

Updates

Additional comments from SNC Property team

The commercial element forms part of the overall consented scheme and it may therefore be appropriate to consider the viability of the whole site rather than the office unit in isolation if the applicant wishes us to consider a viability case in advance of demand (or lack of it) being proven.

Additional neighbour comment on the following grounds:
Support the application – as a small business owner we do not believe this site to be
Development Management Committee

16 September 2015

appropriate for commercial use for a number of reasons including very poor broadband and mobile signal
For a modern business to operate these are a must and this site does not provide either
Splitting the office into smaller office units would cause parking issues and could prove disastrous for local residents

Even the 2 units proposed could pose a risk to local residents, particularly children, as there will be an unacceptable level of traffic, staff and clients during the week

It is well documented that visibility to the highway is poor and access to the site is narrow at best; increased traffic is dangerous and unnecessary

A residential dwelling will result in significantly less traffic which surely can only be a good thing

Conversion to a dwelling is more in keeping with the surrounding area and would significantly reduce the risk of incident to local residents

Other Applications

7  Appl. No : 2015/1673/F
Parish : GREAT MOULTON

Applicants Name : Mr Adam Price
Site Address : Hope Valley Low Common Road Great Moulton Norfolk NR16 1LP
Proposal : Change of use to mix of three Gypsy and Traveller residential pitches, garden and vehicle parking area and paddocks for the keeping and breeding horses

Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL

Refused

1. Detrimental to highway safety contrary to IMP8
2. Unsustainable Location
3. Insufficient information – Ecological report, a detailed plan of areas at risk of flooding and emergency flood plan

Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to remove all caravans or mobile homes, structures, materials, equipment which have been brought onto the land in connection with the use within 1 year.

Updates

Letter received from Richard Bacon M.P

Do not believe that the Aslacton/Great Moulton/Fornsett area to be a suitable location for the proposed development

The development fails to meet a number of the criteria set out in Para 4 & 11 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites: - 1) Cannot provide accommodation from which education, health, welfare and employment can be accessed. 2) Local roads are single track and wholly unsuitable to use by pedestrians. Understand Highways have objected. 3) Conflicts with Policy 16 of JCS.
Fully appreciate that SNC must give full and due consideration to any application for planning consent that comes forward, I would be grateful if you can nevertheless ensure prompt and robust action to enforce planning conditions should breaches occur.

3 further letters of objection raising the same concerns as set out in the agenda

Letter from agent circulated to all members

### 8

#### Ap. No
2015/0505/RVC

#### Parish
FORNCETT

**Applicants Name**: Mr Adam Gallagher

**Site Address**: Caravan at Laynes Farm Gilderswood Lane Forncett St Peter Norfolk NR16 1LN

**Proposal**: Removal of condition 3 of appeal decision ref APP/L2630/C/10/2138732 to allow permanent use of the land for residential purposes and for the standing of residential caravans for human habitation and associated domestic items.

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously to AUTHORISE the Director of Growth and Localism to recommend to the Planning Inspectorate that the application would have been refused for the following reasons

1. Detrimental to highway safety contrary to policy IMP8
2. Detrimental to the character and appearance

Members also voted to APPROVE enforcement action to remove all caravans or mobile homes, structures, materials, equipment which have been brought onto the land in connection with the use within 1 year.

**Updates**

Confirmation from NPLaw that the applicant meets traveller status test as set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

### 9

#### Ap. No
2015/0930/H

#### Parish
LODDON

**Applicants Name**: Mrs Monique Bourns

**Site Address**: Ingloss Coach House Ingloss Lane Loddon Norfolk NR14 6ED

**Proposal**: Creation of a bridge to traverse ditch and create new access, and retention of oil fuel storage tank.

**Decision**: Members voted 7-1 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE (contrary to officer recommendation)

Conditions to be determined by officers

**Reasons for overturning Officer Recommendation**

The proposed additional access was considered not to adversely affect the setting of the listed building.

**Updates**

Paragraph 2.1 application 2015/0552 has now been approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/1124/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandwood Estates Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at 93 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 9AX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed 5 detached two storey dwellings and 2 detached bungalows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Members voted 7-0 for APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit
2. Standard outline requiring reserved matters
3. In accordance with approved plan
4. New Water Efficiency
5. Footway on Silfield Road to be widened
6. Provision of access/turning area
7. Tree protection
8. Ecology mitigation to be agreed
9. Details of foul water disposal to be agreed
10. Contaminated land
11. Materials
12. Landscaping and Boundary Treatments
13. Site levels

Subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement to provide one affordable dwelling on site.

**Updates**

Response to re-consultation from County Highway Authority:
No objections, the revised layout is satisfactory from a Highways perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/1203/F</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Sell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cold Harbour Cottage Common Road Gissing Norfolk IP22 5UR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of Log Cabin building to provide annexe accommodation for family member with learning difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Members voted 8-0 for APPROVAL (with 1 abstention) (contrary to Officer Recommendation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Personal Consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Remove when no longer required for applicant's brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for overturning Officer Recommendation**

Members noted the application was contrary to policy, but weight was given to the personal circumstances of the applicant and that temporary consent would only be permitted.

**Updates**

Paragraph 5.3 line 6 should be policy DM 1.3 not DM 3.1
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12  
**Appl. No:** 2015/1295/F  
**Parish:** SWARDESTON

Applicants Name: Vello Ltd  
Site Address: Land East of Intwood Lane Swardeston Norfolk  
Proposal: Residential development of 2 dwellings, cartshed garage and associated external works.

Decision: Members voted 8-0 for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
5. Slab level to be agreed  
6. New Access Construction over verge  
7. Access – Gradient  
8. Access Gates – Configuration  
9. Visibility splay, approved plan  
10. Provision of parking, services  
11. Retention trees and hedges  
12. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
13. Foul drainage to main sewer  
14. Surface water  
15. New water efficiency

13  
**Appl. No:** 2015/1362/F  
**Parish:** REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

Applicants Name: Dr Marie Bouvet  
Site Address: 3 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ  
Proposal: Change of use from Fitness Studio/Therapy Centre to Veterinary Practice. Alteration of interior stud wall configuration of building.

Decision: Members voted 8-0 for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted details  
3. Ventilation system details  
4. No generators, air handling plant  
5. Limited opening hours for customers/deliveries  
6. Noise management  
7. Link use to first floor flat

**Updates**

Letter received from Sarah Higgins, a customer of the existing Cherry Tree Vets surgery in Diss

The ward at the surgery needs to be kept calm and quiet during the night to ensure that the animals being cared for feel safe and re-assured. Light, noise and activity therefore needs to be kept to a minimum.
Cherry Tree Vets provide an excellent round the clock service and the quality of professional care provided by Marie and her staff is exemplary.

14  
Appl. No : 2015/1363/LB  
Parish : REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

Applicants Name : Dr Marie Bouvet  
Site Address : 3 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ  
Proposal : Change of use from Fitness Studio/Therapy Centre to Veterinary Practice. Alteration of interior stud wall configuration of building.

Decision : Members voted 8-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Listed Building Time Limit
2. In accord with submitted details
3. Ventilation system

Updates

Linked with Item 13

15  
Appl. No : 2015/1438/F  
Parish : BRAMERTON

Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs N & J Walker  
Site Address : Land East of Orchard House The Street Bramerton Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 140kw solar photovoltaic panel array on part of the two acre field used as amenity land

Decision : Members voted 6-3 for REFUSAL

Refused

1. Contrary NPPF and SNLP policy IMP15 due to harm to settling of listed building and Conservation area

Updates

Further comments from District Member Cllr. Vic Thomson in support of the proposal

Understand the duty to protect listed assets

The adjacent approved residential development to the south side has the affordable housing section as close to Orchard House as the proposed array of solar panels.

Applicants have carried a lot of work to restore Orchard House, undoing harm caused by previous inappropriate alterations. The proposed solar array will help to assist this work on the house.

Solar array will provide for more than 32 houses.

Solar array at least 70 metres from the house and will take up less than half of the two acre paddock. It will not be visible from the listed building, neighbours or from the street.

No objections have been received.
Array is a static project so once installed requires minimum maintenance and will cause very little sound disturbance.

Harm to the listed building is minimal and is outweigh by the benefit of green energy and benefit in assisting restoration of Orchard House.

Given the works already completed on the house and the applicant’s co-operation with Conservation Officers I believe we will have an improved listed asset because of this project.

Neighbour comments from Mrs Sally-Ann Meadows supporting proposal, which should have been included in the Committee Report.

Photovoltaic panels are a source of clean sustainable energy and therefore there is a need to support such initiatives, particularly as Bramerton is a working village and not a museum.

The neighbour at The Old Rectory has a professional background in global conservation and development and believes we should make every effort to support this type of development in the heart of our own communities.

Very little impact on the village and the proposal would provide valuable habitat for wild flowers and wild life. There has been some erosion of suitable habitat for small mammals in the village, although it has a healthy population of Tawny Owls and this proposal would help preserve their habitat.

Applicants have already demonstrated their commitment to the natural and built environment in the heart of the village with restoration works carried out at the Orchard House site. Residents will benefit from this low impact initiative.

Neighbour comments from M.H. Eastoe supporting proposal, which should have been included in the Committee Report.

This proposal is a good idea, better than houses

(Correction in final sentence of paragraph 4.15 “does not accord with the requirements of…”)

16  Appl. No : 2015/1477/F
      Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

      Applicants Name : Mr M Hooper
      Site Address : Moor View Semere Green Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4NT
      Proposal : Erection of bungalow to form annex to Moor View for accommodation of additional staff (Bed and Breakfast establishment)

      Decision : Members voted 8-1 for REFUSAL

      Refused

      1. Does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF, The Joint Core Strategy and Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan

17  Appl. No : 2015/1607/F
      Parish : MUNDHAM

      Applicants Name : Mr Matthew Gray
      Site Address : B and G Spreaders Toad Lane Mundham Norfolk NR15 1EL
Development Management Committee

Proposal: Change of use from repair and maintenance of agricultural machinery to an open B1 and B8 use. Changes to the permitted operating times to Monday to Friday from 6:30 to 18:00 and Saturday from 7:00 to 14:00. Erect a 2.4 metre high palisade fence to the rear and side for the creation of external storage compound.

Decision: Members voted 8-0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Limited Hours of Use

18 Appl. No : 2015/1836/O
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr T Skitmore
Site Address : Land south east of 9 Spinks Lane, Spinks Lane, Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 5 new dwellings and garages with highway improvements.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to delegate authority to the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

1. Standard time limit
2. Approval of details
3. In accordance with submitted drawings
4. Tree protection plan to be agreed
5. Inclusion of swift boxes and sparrow terraces within development
6. Landscaping scheme to be agreed
7. Vehicular access works in accordance with submitted drawings
8. Visibility splays works in accordance with submitted drawings
9. Provision of parking and turning in accordance with submitted drawings
10. Provision of off-site highway works in accordance with submitted drawings
11. Off-site highway works to be implemented prior to first occupation
12. Water efficiency of 105 litres/person/day for all new dwellings
13. Foul water drainage disposal strategy and management to be agreed
14. Surface water drainage strategy and management to be agreed

Subject to completion of a S106 Agreement and pending no further substantive issues being raised.

Updates

Email received from Mr Parker summarising objections and asking that Members defer the application until the Appeal of the original application is determined. Information forwarded to Members of DMC as requested by Mr Parker.
4 neighbour additional objections have been received. A summary of these is as follows:

Compares this application with an earlier application made for a property within the Wymondham and Hethersett Gap, which was refused planning permission at appeal. The proposal was for only one dwelling, which would have a very limited effect on the shortfall in housing land supply. The inspector considered that the adverse impact of in this unsustainable countryside location within a gap is outweighed by the limited effect it would have on the shortfall in housing land supply and therefore the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character of the surrounding countryside and the maintenance of a physical gap, contrary to the objectives of Local Plan Policies.

Considers that the two cases are comparable in that it was argued by the applicant that a shortfall in the 5-year Housing Land Supply warranted an almost immediate acceptance of the Appeal and granting of planning permission.

Residents feel there is little difference between one and five in this case and hence the application 2015/1836 should be refused as it is only 5 houses and it appears the benefit is already conceded as limited.

Questions how the design of the dwellings will fit in with the 200 year old barns.

Notes that Officers are not minded to make a recommendation to defer a decision on 2015/1836 until the Appeal on 2014/0096 is finalised, but understand there is nothing in legislation to prevent this and suggest the Committee should be left to consider that as an option and decide accordingly.

Both refused application and this application are inextricably linked and comments from past.

Feels that this development is not sustainable and the 'harm' derived from it outweighs the advantages of building 5 properties and this justifies a refusal.

The site has been and is outside the Wymondham Development Boundaries and is outside development areas identified in the emerging Local Plan.

The site is in the Strategic Gap and specifically detailed in the 2012 South Norfolk Local Landscape Review.

The application (Design and Access Statement) fails to identify any of the design characteristics and hence does not accord with the NPPF.

Comments about poor site drainage, foul water discharge and the failure to connect to the main sewer.

Considers that the non-sustainable points outweigh the advantages arising from only 5 properties and warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Rural nature and possible safety on Spinks Lane will be threatened by extra traffic and lane widening.

Questioned why the committee report has been published on the same day that comments are due and questions the planning process.