Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives       Liberal Democrats

Mr J Mooney         Dr M Gray
(Chairman)          (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs L Neal

Mrs Y Bendle
Mrs F Ellis
Mr C Gould
Dr C Kemp
Mr G Minshull
Mr B Stone
Mr A Thomas
Mr V Thomson

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 14 October 2015

Time
10.00 am

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Owen Pugh  tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 6, and arrive at 1:30pm if you intend to speak on items 7 to 16.

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)

   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 25)
   To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Land north of High Street Ketteringham Norfolk</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1422/D</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Land north of Long Lane Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/1678/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land adj A47 and north of New Road Bawburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/0974/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land rear of 14 to 22 Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JL</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/1023/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land rear of 14 to 22 Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JL</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/1027/F</td>
<td>BARNHAM BROOM</td>
<td>Beggars Roost 89 Norwich Road Barnham Broom Norfolk NR9 4BU</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/1036/F</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>Land West of All Saints Church Church Road Wrenningham Norfolk</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/1266/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Ashgate House Ketteringham Lane Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/1427/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land north of Priory Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/1458/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land north of Suton Street Suton Norfolk</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/1810/RVC</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/1811/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/1812/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015/1889/H</td>
<td>SWARDESTON</td>
<td>32 Main Road Swardeston Norfolk NR14 8DF</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2015/1976/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>40 The Street Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JT</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEFERRED
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

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

7. **Planning Appeals (for information)**

7. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 11 November 2015
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

TIMING: In front of you there are two screens which tell you how much time you have used of your five minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after five minutes, at which point the Chairman will ask you to come to a conclusion.

MICROPHONES: In front of you there is a microphone which we ask you to use. Simply press the left or right button to turn the microphone on and off

WHAT CAN I SAY AT THE MEETING? Please try to be brief and to the point. Limit your views to the planning application and relevant planning issues, for example: Planning policy, (conflict with policies in the Local Plan/Structure Plan, government guidance and planning case law), including previous decisions of the Council, design, appearance and layout, possible loss of light or overshadowing, noise disturbance and smell nuisance, impact on residential and visual amenity, highway safety and traffic issues, impact on trees/conservation area/listed buildings/environmental or nature conservation issues.

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

Members of the public and press are permitted to film or record meetings to which they are permitted access in a non-disruptive manner and only from areas designated for the public. No prior permission is required, however the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting will ask if anyone present wishes to record proceedings. We will ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to the public and press to assist filming or recording of meetings.

The use of digital and social media recording tools, for example Twitter, blogging or audio recording is allowed as long as it is carried out in a non-disruptive manner.
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

| **Fire alarm** | If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point. |
| **Mobile phones** | Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode. |
| **Toilets** | The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber. |
| **Break** | There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long. |
| **Drinking water** | A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use. |

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Key to letters included within application reference number to identify application type – e.g. 07/96/3000/A – application for consent to display an advert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 |
| **D.M.P.D.** | Development Management 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

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

Yes

The interest is related to a pecuniary interest. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may make representations as a member of the public, but then withdraw from the room

Yes

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

No

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

Yes

Have I declared the interest as an other interest on my declaration of interest form? OR

Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate? OR

Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of? OR

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?

No

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 16 September 2015 at 10.00 am.

Committee
Members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), L Neal, Y Bendle, F Ellis, C Gould, C Kemp and B Stone

Apologies: Councillors V Thomson, G Minshull, A Thomas and M Gray

Substitute Members: Councillors N Legg (for V Thomson) and B Duffin (for A Thomas)

(Cllr L Neal left the room for agenda item 5, application 5. Cllr C Gould left for applications 9 and 10, Cllr N Legg left for application 10. Cllr F Ellis left for applications 12, 13, 14 and 17)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors) and the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine, C Trett, C Watts, H Bowman, T Lincoln and C Curtis).

46 members of the public were also in attendance

223. 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) 2014/1302/O</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbyed by Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3) 2015/0827/O</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbyed by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4) 2015/0253/D</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Lobbyed by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest (Knows the applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7) 2015/1673/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>Local planning code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>Lobbyed by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest (Member of Gypsy and Traveller Task Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8) 2015/0505/RVC</td>
<td>FORNCETT</td>
<td>B Duffin</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Lobbyed by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest (Member of Gypsy and Traveller Task Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Case Reference</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>2015/0930/H</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 11)</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
<td>2015/1203/F</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 15)</td>
<td>BRAMERTON</td>
<td>2015/1438/F</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 17)</td>
<td>MUNDHAM</td>
<td>2015/1607/F</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 18)</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>2015/1836/O</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

224. MINUTES
The minutes of the Development Management Committee meetings dated 22 July 2015, 10 August 2015 and 19 August 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

225. 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:
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.

(The meeting closed at 5.02pm)

_____________________
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<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>1</td>
<td>2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr M Austin</td>
<td>Land north of High Street Ketteringham Norfolk</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>This item was <strong>DEFERRED</strong> to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/1302/O</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Mrs Val Hope</td>
<td>Land North of Heath Farm Caistor Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk</td>
<td>Erection of 16 dwellings (5 affordable, 11 market) and proposed access to the south of Caistor Lane.</td>
<td>Members voted unanimously to <strong>AGREE</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
17. Provision of a fire hydrant
18. Contamination

Subject to S106 to cover affordable housing, open space and private management and maintenance of the private road

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>2015/0827/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>Mr G Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Land West of Myrtle Cottage Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Sub-division of residential curtilage and erection of detached dwelling and garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Members voted 6-3 for <strong>REFUSAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ctte 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 condition15 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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/1673/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Adam Price</td>
<td>Hope Valley Low Common Road Great Moulton Norfolk NR16 1LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/Fornbett 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  
**Appl. 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  
**Appl. 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
10  Appl. No : 2015/1124/O  
Parish : WYMONDHAM 

Applicants Name : Brandwood Estates Ltd  
Site Address : Land at 93 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 9AX  
Proposal : Proposed 5 detached two storey dwellings and 2 detached bungalows.  

Decision : Members voted 7-0 for APPROVAL  

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.  

11  Appl. No : 2015/1203/F  
Parish : GISSING  

Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs Sell  
Site Address : Cold Harbour Cottage Common Road Gissing Norfolk IP22 5UR  
Proposal : Erection of Log Cabin building to provide annexe accommodation for family member with learning difficulties.  

Decision : Members voted 8-0 for APPROVAL (with 1 abstention) (contrary to Officer Recommendation)  
1. Personal Consent  
2. Remove when no longer required for applicant’s brother  

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
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 outweighed 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 cooperation 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
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 splay 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 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.
Applications referred back to Committee

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

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

   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions
   1. Full planning permission
   2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
   3. Materials to be approved prior to commencement of development of day room above slab level
   4. Maximum 1 static residential caravan on site
   5. Keeping of horses for personal use only.
   6. Upgrading of access to highway standards
   7. Details of parking and turning area including surfacing to be approved and implemented within 6 months.
   8. Boundary treatment details to be submitted within 2 months of grant of permission and installed within 1 month of date of approval.
   9. Landscaping to be agreed and implemented within next planting season following grant of permission.
   10. Details of foul sewerage system to be submitted within 2 months of grant of permission and installed in accordance with approved details.
   11. Surface water drainage details to be approved prior to commencement of day room and concrete pad and installed in accordance with approved details.

1. **Background**

1.1 The application was submitted and made valid on 13 January 2015. It was reported to the Development Management Committee on 29 April with a recommendation of approval and was deferred because Councillors wished to gain more information regarding the traveller status of the applicant. Further information was sought from the Applicant by the Council and this was received on 3 June. The application was placed on the agenda for the meeting on 24 June but was deferred following the receipt of further information in a report from a Ketteringham Residents Group on 19 June. The applicant was invited to respond to this and submitted further information on 13 July.

1.2 The application was reported to a special meeting of the Development Management Committee on 10 August where the committee determined that the applicant does not meet the definition of gypsy/traveller for planning purposes as set out within national planning policy. The application is therefore now assessed on the basis of it being for a general residential caravan, rather than specifically for a gypsy or traveller. This follows advice from officers that a decision should be made on status and then the application should be deferred to consider the housing land supply position. The public and consultees were invited to comment on the proposal as a general
residential caravan application and the additional responses have been taken into account in producing this report. The applicant lodged an appeal against non-determination of the application on 21 July, however the appeal was not validated. The responsibility for determining the application therefore continues to lie with the Local Planning Authority and consultees and neighbours were notified accordingly.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 16 : Other Villages
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
Policy ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
Policy IMP 2: Landscaping
Policy IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
Policy IMP 9: Residential amenity
Policy LEI 14: Keeping of horses for leisure purposes
Policy HOU 22: Mobile homes

2.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

2.5 Development Management Policies
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
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD (Submission Version).

2.7 South Norfolk Place Making Guide (SPD).

3. Planning History

3.1 1980/3524 2 Stables and Tack Room and Adjoining 3 Hay Stores Approved 21/1/81

3.2 1981/1854 Erection of Loose Box Range for Horses (Application To Relax ‘Temporary’ Condition) Approved 5/6/81

3.3 1986/1035 Residential Development Refused 11/6/86

3.4 1989/1027 Erection of 3 or 4 dwellings Refused 20/7/89
4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council

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

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

4.2 Richard Bacon MP

- Concern that approving this application may lead to pressure to allow further traveller groups to occupy this land.
- Concern that development is taking place without planning permission
- Do not believe that Ketteringham is a suitable location for the proposed development as it has a lack of services and the roads are narrow with poor visibility
- Concerns about site drainage
- Site is outside of the development boundary
- The shortfall in provision of approved sites does not outweigh the negative impacts of the proposal
- If permission is granted any attempts to change the conditions should be resisted.

4.3 District Members:

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

Cllr Herbert (former Councillor): This must be determined by the committee because of numerous issues including public concern, development outside defined boundaries, not in accordance with Gypsy and Traveller policy.

Cllr Foulger: To be reported orally if appropriate.

4.4 Highways England No objection.
4.5 Network Rail
No comments.

4.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No comments received

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

4.8 SNC: Environmental Services
No objections

4.9 SNC: Flood Defence Officer
Initial response:
The hard standing area and the roof water from the proposed day room could be discharged to a soakaway within the meadow area to the east where it is unlikely to impact on No 5 High Street and may reduce the volume of water entering the ground behind No 5. Likewise the proposed package sewage treatment plant and tail drains could also be located in the meadow to disperse the discharge over a wider area.

A suitable condition was recommended to ensure that detailed surface water and foul drainage arrangements for the site were submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to any development taking place.

Following reconsultation comments received 8 September:

Conflicting information has been received from the applicant and objectors regarding the percolation tests that were carried out. It is possible that ground conditions may not be consistent across the whole site and some areas may offer better results than others and the drainage area could be extended over a wider area where results are at the poorer end of the acceptable scale.

It is important that a proper assessment is made by a competent professional person to ensure that the drainage hierarchy is followed and the most suitable option is used to protect groundwaters and prevent problems occurring on site or affecting neighbours in the future. Additional trial tests should take into account seasonal changes to ensure that any proposed facilities are able to work effectively.

If satisfactory disposal from a package sewage treatment plant cannot be achieved then the same will apply to a septic tank which will require a higher level of treatment through the soils. If it is found that infiltration drainage is not a viable option a possible alternative might be a sealed system such as a cess pool which will require an appropriate level of management to ensure that it is properly maintained and periodically emptied. This will ensure that groundwater is protected and avoid problems associated with saturated land and the potential for increased flood risk and pollution of groundwater as a result of additional discharge to ground from a package treatment plant.

4.10 NCC Highways
No objection to the use of the site for equine purposes. The existing access should however be upgraded.
With regard to the proposed residential use, the site is considered to be remote from local services which would render the residents reliant on the use of motorised vehicles. This aspect of the proposal conflicts with guidance in the Local Transport Plan for Norfolk and the NPPF.

4.11 Representations

41 letters of objection. Concerns regarding:

- Poor drainage at the site / increased flood risk
- Increased traffic on narrow country lanes
- Visual impact of development
- Site is outside of development boundary
- Impact on private water pipelines
- Out of character with the village
- Concern applicant is not a bona fide traveller
- Site unsuitable due to lack of public transport, local services, no footpaths or street lighting
- Concern that it will develop into a larger traveller site
- Concern about overlooking, loss of privacy and intervisibility
- The proposed development is located on the course of a historic network between a series of burial mounds at Five Ways, Ketteringham and the Ancient Roman town of Venta Icenorum. The proposal should be rejected until the archaeological importance of this location can be understood.
- Concern that the information provided in relation to site drainage does not conform to British Standards and it therefore has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that a package treatment plant could be accommodated. The site is also in close proximity to a groundwater protection zone.

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

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

Further report submitted from Ketteringham Residents Group on 19 June stating that Mr Austin does not have Gypsy heritage and does not lead a nomadic lifestyle and providing information to support this conclusion.

Following a further consultation on the basis of the application being assessed as a proposal for a general residential caravan with day room (not as a gypsy and traveller proposal), the following comments were received:
The residents were previously informed by Council Officers that the site would not be given permission for general residential use because it was sited in the countryside.

Concern that the Local Planning Authority is considering the application on a different basis to how it was originally presented, in that it is no longer being considered as a gypsy and traveller site.

If the application is approved, the Council will have effectively said that it doesn’t matter whether the applicant is a gypsy/traveller, and as a consequence, anyone anywhere is free to apply to live in that style. This will set a precedent for others to follow.

Even with a lack of a five year land supply, it is hard to see how the Council’s design principles of high quality sustainable dwellings can be overlooked/dismissed and standards dropped as this works against achieving sustainability. The proposal is against the Council’s place making and design principles.

Reference to an appeal case where the Ombudsmen awarded costs against a Council due to the impact on residential amenity [no information is provided regarding the detail of this case]

Concern that the aims of the NPPF are being ignored to achieve unrealistic housing targets.

Impact on the war memorial

The proposal does not comply with JCS Policy 16 because Ketteringham has no services other than village hall and services are not easily accessible by foot or cycle.

The proposal is not sustainable development as defined and required by the NPPF because:

- economic benefits are extremely limited;
- proposal is outside development boundary which seeks to protect the natural and historic environment;
- additional strain on already overloaded infrastructure;
- will not support growth and innovation;
- caravans are temporary so do not provide housing for future generations;
- limited impact on shortfall in housing land supply;
- remote from services so large degree of harm arising from reliance on use of car;
- appearance not of highest standard;
- adverse impact on amenities of existing homes - light, noise and loss of privacy;
- clearly visible from adjacent local footpath;
- serious health considerations due to proximity of A11;
- graffiti left on site does not contribute to ‘vibrant and healthy communities’;
- local people should be given power to shape their surroundings so appropriate weight should be given to the numerous local objections;
- proposal does not secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants;
- exacerbate local flooding;
- visual harm contrary to ‘recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’;
- greenfield land less suitable for development than brownfield land;
- no sustainable foul drainage available – cess pits are not sustainable due to high level of maintenance – last resort;
- will not use resources prudently; enhance the environment; minimise waste and pollution or mitigate and adapt to climate change.
5. **Assessment**

Proposal

5.1 The application is for the change of use of land previously used for equestrian purposes to the use for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for the standing of one residential caravan, erection of a day room and the erection of gates. The application is partly retrospective in that the applicant is now occupying the site and a static caravan has been placed on the land.

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

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

**Principle of Development**

5.4 Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It goes on to state that:

- *For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*

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

  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states:

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

5.5 As part of an inquiry hearing for an appeal concerning 650 dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area part of South Norfolk (application 2013/1494), which took place in mid-June, the Council has had to revise its approach to calculating the previous shortfall in housing delivery in relation to the five year period being assessed and it has been established that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area. The application site is located within the Norwich Policy Area, and therefore the provisions of paragraphs 14 and 49 apply.

5.6 This means that two assessments are necessary, firstly to establish whether the development is “sustainable development” as defined by the NPPF. Secondly, if it is considered sustainable, whether any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the polices in the NPPF, or whether specific policies of the NPPF indicate the proposals should be refused.
5.7 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF defines sustainable development as having an economic, social and environmental role. It goes on to stress in paragraph 8 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 but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

Economic Role

5.8 The NPPF highlights 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.”

5.9 The site is located adjacent to a proposed development boundary and settlement which has been identified as being suitable for small scale development. The proposal would result in some limited short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants contributing to the local economy and viability of local services. It is considered that the scheme would bring forward a modest level of economic benefit, and fulfils the economic role set out in the NPPF.

Social Role

5.10 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.”

5.11 As confirmed above, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and therefore there is a clear social benefit in delivering an additional residential site in this area.

5.12 Concerns have been raised by local residents and the County Highway Authority that the site is remote from local services and public transport. The closest bus stops are on Norwich Road, 1.8km from the site. Other facilities, such as the Infants and Junior School in Hethersett are approximately 2.6km away. Ketteringham does have a village hall, there is a nursery at Ketteringham Hall and some local employment in the vicinity of the site. There is no school, pub or village shop.

5.13 Whilst it is recognised that there are very limited services within the village itself, the site is well related to the existing built up area of the village which has been designated as suitable for infill and small scale residential development within the JCS. In addition the town of Hethersett and city of Norwich are both within relatively close proximity and contain a number of services. Although there may be a degree of harm arising from a likely reliance on the use of a car to access some services, the travel distances involved would not be significantly harmful in planning terms. In addition the small scale of development proposed does not lead to significant concern on this ground, when weighed against the benefits of providing an additional residential unit in an area of identified need in terms of housing supply.

5.14 Vehicle and pedestrian access would be via the existing access onto High Street. The Highway Officer has stated that visibility is acceptable. There is room on the site for four parking spaces which is sufficient for a development of the size proposed. Conditions regarding the upgrading and surfacing of the parking area and the provision of a suitable turning area within the site are recommended. The proposal would create very limited vehicle movements. The proposal accords with policy IMP 8 in that it would not impede the safe and free flow of traffic within the vicinity of the site.
5.15 Concern has been raised as to whether the type of accommodation (residential caravan and day room) forms a sustainable form of development. However paragraph 50 of the NPPF advises that “To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups within the community”. The proposal may not be of the highest standard in terms of appearance, but it would provide a more affordable type of dwelling unit that would meet a specific need and would therefore be consistent with the aim of providing a choice of accommodation.

5.16 Objections have been raised on the grounds of amenity impacts. The main objections relate to the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy. The houses in closest proximity that have the potential to be affected are the three immediately to the south and west of the site, no’s 5 and 6 High Street, and the property known as ‘Amathus’.

5.17 The proposed site plan shows that the concrete slab for the siting of the residential caravan and day room would be positioned to the north of the existing stable building, and the garden area would be to the west of this area. The day room and caravan would therefore be approximately 30 metres from the boundary with no’s 5 and 6 and 15 metres from the boundary with Amathus. The day room and caravan would be approximately 50 metres from the houses at no’s 5 and 6, whilst being approximately 47 metres from the house at Amathus. These are considered to be adequate separation distances, with the stable block providing a physical buffer that would further reduce the impact.

5.18 The site benefits from a degree of existing fencing and hedgerows that provide some privacy however a condition is recommended to ensure that a suitable fence is erected between the application site and the neighbouring occupiers no. 5 High Street and the fencing between Amathus and the site could be improved where appropriate, to ensure adequate privacy would be achieved. Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would accord with policy IMP 9 of the Local Plan in that it would not have a materially adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

5.19 Concerns have been raised about the position of the site in the middle of the village, and the fact the site is close to the village hall. However there are existing residential properties in close proximity to the village hall. Given the small scale of development proposed, the existing presence of other residential properties in close proximity to the village hall, and the separation distance between the village hall and the residential part of the site proposed, it is considered no adverse impacts would occur.

5.20 There have been objections on the grounds that the application would set a precedent for further similar development. However such proposals would require a planning application and would be assessed on their planning merits. Concerns have been raised regarding potential business use, however no business use is proposed and a condition could be imposed to control any business use of the site.

5.21 Further concern has been raised that there is no street lighting, mains gas supply and issues with the water supply. Whilst these matters may weigh slightly against the social benefits of developing this site for residential purposes, they are not in themselves significant enough to outweigh the social benefits overall. The proposal would contribute an additional residential property where there is a need and overall is considered to meet the social role identified within paragraph 7 of the NPPF.

Environmental role

5.22 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as “contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment: and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”
5.23 The site is located outside of any development boundary and therefore the proposal would result in a degree of encroachment on the open countryside. It would generally be well screened from the road, while glimpsed views would be possible from the public footpath. It is considered that the development would result in a small degree of visual harm in environmental terms; however this could be largely mitigated through some landscaping which could be secured via condition.

5.24 The main physical changes are the erection of a five-bar gate and fencing at the frontage, the erection of a day room, the laying of the concrete slab and the siting of a residential caravan. The day room would accommodate a kitchen, shower room and laundry room and would be 16 square metres in size. It would be single storey with a pantile roof and feather edge boarded walls. The building, pad and caravan would be sited further into the site, away from the road and would be partly screened by the stable building. The day room would have a pantiled roof and featheredged boarding which would not be out of keeping. There are a number of similar sized outbuildings to the proposed day room within the gardens of adjacent properties so the impact of this would not be significant. Subject to conditions, there would be no material conflict with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, and guidance within the South Norfolk Place Making Guide (SPD).

5.25 The site lies within the Environment Agency flood zone 1 which is the area of lowest flood risk, where residential development is considered compatible. However concerns have been raised by local residents that the site is subject to localised flooding, and there are concerns at both the suitability of the site for residential use and the potential for increased flood risk. The application advises that sustainable drainage systems would be used for the disposal of water from roofs and hard surfaces, and that foul drainage would be dealt with via a package treatment plant. Given the information at the time, the Council’s Flood Defence Officer indicated that systems to drain flood surface and foul water away from the caravan may be best accommodated by discharging in the meadow area to the east of the property to manage flood risk on the site and to the adjacent locality. It should be noted that the volumes of water are comparatively low given the scale of the proposed development.

5.26 Further reports have now been submitted by Professor Hey, on behalf of the Ketteringham residents Group, calling into question the drainage information provided. The applicant was invited to submit further information, and further percolation tests were carried out by the applicant, albeit in a location which has been called into question. The tests have been questioned by Professor Hey who is concerned that they were not carried out to a sufficient depth. Professor Hey has referred to holes that have been dug on neighbouring land, where the depth to the clay is less than is desirable and expected by standards for accommodating drainage water. It should be recognised that an investigation on other land does not necessarily mean that the findings are representative of the conditions prevailing on the site in question. In this respect therefore limited weight can be attached to this information because it does not relate to the application site directly.

5.27 On balance, there are clearly questions over the accuracy and adequacy of the site’s ground investigations. Although conflicting information exists regarding this matter, given the location within flood zone 1, the relatively small scale of development proposed, and the large amount of land within the control of the applicant to provide a suitable system, it is considered that drainage details can be sought by condition. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure appropriate tests are carried out by a professionally competent person to determine the final design for the foul and surface water disposal arrangements, seeking precise details of the proposed arrangements and location of the disposal point should a package treatment plant continue to be the proposed method of disposal and implementation of the system in a timely manner. In the event a package treatment plant cannot be accommodated, an alternative would be a sealed system such as a cesspool as per the drainage hierarchy. It should also be remembered that such drainage arrangements require Building Regulation approval and it would be best if the work was carried out in tandem. This would overcome any concerns about flood risk or pollution to groundwater. It would weigh slightly against the sustainability credentials of the proposal, but balancing this against the planning benefits of the proposal, would not cause harm significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.
5.28 Regarding the objection relating to the impact on the historic route between the burial mounds at Five Ways, Ketteringham and the Ancient Roman town of Venta Icenorum, the site does not carry any archaeological designation and no objections have been received from the Norfolk Historic Environment Service. With regard to concerns about the impact on the war memorial, it carries no formal planning designation and in any event is well screened from the site by a mature hedge so there would be no adverse impact.

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

5.30 In summary on the environmental role, there would be some limited harm brought about by the scheme as it represents a degree of encroachment into the open countryside, contrary to the provision of local plan policy ENV8 and does not benefit from a connection to a main sewer. However it would generally be well screened from public view and this screening could be further improved by condition. Subject to conditions controlling boundary treatments, landscaping, and the provision of appropriate drainage and sewage facilities, when taking the development as a whole, there would not be a material conflict with the environmental role of sustainable development as defined by the NPPF.

5.31 For the above reasons, when taken as a whole, the proposal is considered to represent sustainable development as defined within the NPPF. In addition, in the context of the absence of a five year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, nor are there any specific policies in the Framework which would indicate that development should be restricted in this case.

Other matters

5.32 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.

5.33 The application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) based on the size of the day room

6. Conclusion

6.1 For the reasons set out in this report, when taken as a whole, the proposal is considered to represent sustainable development as defined within the NPPF. In addition, in the context of the absence of a five year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole, nor are there any specific policies in the Framework which would indicate that development should be restricted in this case.

6.2 It is therefore recommended that the Development Management Committee grant planning permission.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2. **Appl. No**: 2015/1422/D  
**Parish**: STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name : Ingram Homes Ltd  
Site Address : Land north of Long Lane Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk  
Proposal : Reserved Matters for application 2014/2409/RVC - appearance and scale of houses, site layout and soft and hard landscaping

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions.

1. In accordance with submitted drawings  
2. Retention trees and hedges

Subject to no new material planning issues being raised in remaining consultation period.

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 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities  
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15 : Service Villages  
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.
1.5 Development Management Policies
   DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
   DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
   DM3.9 Design Principles
   DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
   DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
   DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
   DM4.2 Renewable Energy
   DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0828  An outline application erection of 24 dwellings and associated vehicular access, allotments, public amenity land and community car parking.  Approved

2.2 2014/2409 Variation of conditions 2 and 9 of planning permission 2013/0828/O (An outline application erection of 24 dwellings and associated vehicular access, allotments, public amenity land and community car parking) - To amend red line for access  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Original comments – We are happy with the plans and have no objections.
   Comments on amended plans - Recommend approval

3.2 District Member  To be reported as appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No comments received

3.4 SNC Design Officer  Original comments (summarised):
   - Various urban design aspects of the new development are fundamentally flawed, partly as a result of the poor masterplan.
   - Of particular concern is the pedestrian access through the very tight and over dense corner at the SW corner of the site. This is a critical access point as it links the housing with the community facilities to the west.
   - Question the buffer strip between the site and existing properties and whether this would be managed effectively. Consider rear gardens should be extended instead.
   - The layout needs to be changed to even out the density across the site and to avoid creating a poor environment and overly dense and cramped area of affordable housing.
   - A better public realm needs to be created in the central space linking through to a better designed link in the south west corner.
• Car parking needs to be thought out better to avoid unnecessary and excessive surface areas for example thinking about moving the car parking to a different side of a building.
• Buildings need to be orientated to create attractive frontage (particularly plot 1 which is key as the gateway building.)
• Materials palette needs to be thought through to create interest – subtle design features could be explored to avoid blandness resulting from the simple architectural form.

Comments on amended plans (summarised):
• One aspect of the design is that the private housing will have cedar and the affordable housing won't. Although this is a minor detail it will differentiate between the affordable and private housing and I think cedar should be applied in small areas.
• Over-sailing canopy areas should be removed from the affordable housing units.
• Otherwise, the general house designs are improved with simplified more coherent forms. The additional stack for plot 1 and south facing window will create a little more interest on the approach access road and Unit 18 addressing the footpath and corner with a gabled form and side elevation windows.
• The brick will work well with the grouping on contemporary forms being quite varied and more like later 19th/20th century agricultural brickworks. It will not look incongruous in view from the countryside. I would prefer clay pantiles for roofs but considering this is not in the context of historic buildings the type of concrete pantiles would be acceptable.
• Although the same brick will be used throughout this will enforce some distinctiveness for the development and I do not think it will result in too much of an 'estate' feel because the development is not so large - in some ways it will read like a larger agricultural development.
• As the buildings have a very contemporary appearance eaves/verges and window/door details should be kept very simple with minimal detailing.
• Some subtle variation in window colour could also create subtle differences between different house types.

3.5 SNC Environmental Services (Protection) No comments to make

3.6 NCC Highways Original comments (summarised) -
• Clarification on proposals requested and alterations to the proposed road layout, visibility splays, garage and parking provision required as well as off site highway works and footpath improvements.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) -
• The HA are satisfied that amended plan (15-03-100B) addressed the comments made on 22/07.
• With respect to the issue of the bus stop on the north side of Long Lane this has been discussed further. The developer is supportive of the principle of providing the bus stop and the HA are awaiting further details which include the proposed stop. Once these have been received the HA will comment further.
3.7 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager

Original comments (summarised) -
The application provides 8 affordable homes in accordance with the S106 Agreement. The internal floorspaces and layouts are acceptable. On this basis I have no objection to the application.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) -
Although the configuration of the affordable housing has been amended there is no change to the property types. On this basis I have no objection to the application as it is now proposed.

3.8 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Summarised comments

20/07/15
- As the site falls below our current threshold for comment and is not within the flow path of the updated Flood Map for Surface Water or adjacent to or within known flooding locations our standing advice will apply.

3.9 NCC Ecologist

Original comments (summarised) -
- The original ecologists comments (2013) commended the retention of the existing copse and also the new planting on the site. The new plans do not show the new copses and planting on the eastern and northern boundaries shown in the original Masterplan. There was no specific ecological condition attached to the original decision however condition 2 specified that the plans should be in line with the Masterplan. We assume that the Landscape Officer will review the planting detailed in the new Landscape Plan.
- There are no protected habitats and species on the site and aside from the points above we feel unable to comment further.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) -
- It appears that some changes have been made to reflect the comments made by the Landscape Officer. These changes are not material to our original comments which continue to apply.

3.10 SNC Flood Defence Officer

Original comments (summarised) -
- No surface water drainage information has been submitted with this reserved matters application. It is noted from the outline application that drainage features were proposed to be located within areas covered by this reserved matters application. We would request that the surface water drainage proposals be submitted with this application to ensure that all issues are fully addressed at this stage. Details of future management of drainage features located in landscaped/community areas should also be provided.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) -
- A drainage strategy plan has been submitted to show the surface water drainage proposals and these advise the site is to drain to a new infiltration basin designed using infiltration rates supplied with the outline application (2013).
- Whilst this is a RM application relating to appearance, layout and landscape it is important that it shows a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme for the site can be incorporated into those aspects of the site design.
• Whilst we have no adverse comments to make at this stage we would make a number of observations that need to be considered to enable the discharge of condition 11.
• Additional information is also required to demonstrate that the infiltration basin and drainage system, have been adequately sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 year storm event (including 30% for climate change), flood routing for exceedance flows and management of the infiltration basin.
• Consent should be sought from the sewerage undertaker if the proposal is to connect to the foul sewer.

3.11 Historic Environment Service
No objection subject to conditions (Summarised comments) -
• Condition 13 requires the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. We advised that this work should be undertaken prior to the submission of a reserved matters application but the archaeological evaluation has not yet been carried out. Designing the layout and submitting it for approval without the results of archaeological evaluation means that it cannot take into account any heritage assets that may be present and if necessary approve in situ through an appropriate design strategy.
• A brief for the work has recently been requested and we request that a geophysical survey is undertaken and the results submitted prior to the determination of this reserved matters application. The survey may highlight the need for trial trenching pre-determination and/or archaeological mitigation works.

3.12 SNC Landscape Officer
Original comments (summarised) -
• The scheme has moved away from the copse concept which is probably no bad thing as I can envisage difficulties with establishing and maintaining these, especially if they were not in public and/or single ownership.
• The hedged and treed boundary concept is acceptable but I would prefer to see more (ultimately) larger trees which in time would help to ‘anchor’ this scheme.
• Alternative planting specimens are suggested.
• Some of the tree’s position may cause issues with future growth; in particular those adjacent to the path and these should be set back from the edge in order to allow for the trunks’ increasing girth to be accommodated.
• The Landscape Management Plan needs reviewing as it is not the easiest document to follow and it does not fully accord with the Landscape Proposals drawing.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) -
• I would advise against dividing up the ‘buffer’ planting and allocating it to the new dwellings as in my experience this will make it very difficult to get a consistent and successful establishment of the feature.
• I would still like to see some more trees on the eastern boundary.

Comments on further amendments (summarised) -
• The revised Landscape Management Plan and planting details largely incorporate my previous comments.
3.13 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator
No further comments to make as this is a reserved matters application

3.14 Environment Agency
Comments (summarised) - No comments to make at this time as the applicant has not submitted information regarding surface water

3.15 Other Representations
3x letters of objection & 2x letters of support (with no additional comments)

- I think it will be dangerous because of the highways situation because of the new site on the opposite side of the road
- It is a dangerous road and is too narrow for all the traffic at school time
- Waiting for a tragic accident especially opening another road for the houses you are talking about with this development- these need to be stopped
- Dangerous roads lead to deaths
- Highways department should be aware of how small the country roads are and how the new roads coming out opposite one another is ludicrous and should not happen with the amount of cares using the road as it is
- Think safety before giving the go ahead - stop building
- Not a suitable site
- Access by new road east of 1 Long Lane is unacceptable
- Traffic volume has also increased down Long Lane with all of the building in Framingham Earl and Poringland, plus the provision of 50 new properties and roads in Windmill Gardens - this will make the new road unacceptable
- Access into my own property a concern [Hillcrest]
- At present the local bus service is in great difficulties with safely loading and unloading passengers needing to make use of the bus - again any further volume of traffic is unacceptable
- Concerns also that essential services in this area are all going to be overwhelmed
- The loss of privacy/ beautiful views enjoyed from the back of the properties nos. 1-18 Long Lane

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The application site is located to the eastern edge of Stoke Holy Cross, outside the development boundary (as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan). The site comprises agricultural land to the rear of the properties at numbers 1-18 Long Lane. The site is bounded to the east and west by mature boundaries interspersed with trees. The southern boundary of the site adjoins the rear gardens of the existing development.
4.2 To the west of the site is an existing play area, pre-school and area of hardstanding parking. The site is relatively flat although the ground slopes down to the land beyond the west boundary of the site.

4.3 The existing properties to the south of the site are two-storey semi-detached dwellings with individual frontages and access points onto Long Lane. Further along Long Lane to the south east of this site is a separate development site that is currently under construction by Hopkins Homes.

4.4 The application site benefits from planning permission for 24 dwellings with associated access, parking, allotments and amenity land. Outline consent was granted in 2013 (2013/0828). The approved access into the site was subject to a minor amendment as part of a subsequent application (2014/2409) and all of the original planning conditions were re-imposed onto this later decision notice.

4.5 It has been noted that a minor correction was required to the application description for this application and as such the application is currently subject to a further period of publicity to rectify this error. This is the reason authority is sought to delegate the decision to the Director of Growth and Localism, pending the completion of this consultation period and subject to no new material planning issues being raised.

4.6 Members may recall that the 2013 Masterplan included parcels of land to the west of the site which included indicative allocations for relocated play equipment and amenity land, parking and a provisional site for new allotments. The S106 Agreement included transfer arrangements for these elements of the site to the Parish Council with trigger points securing their delivery.

4.7 The site layout and the design of some of the dwellings have been subject to revisions during the course of this application following discussions with the agent.

Key issues

4.8 The principle of development on the site has been established at outline stage under application 2014/2409/RVC and included the scale of development and means of access to the site with all other matters reserved.

4.9 On the basis that the principle has been established by the aforementioned outline approval, the assessment of this application focuses on those matters remaining to be determined. These are the reserved matters of layout, appearance and landscaping, and will need to consider the key issue of residential amenity.

Layout

4.10 The site layout has been subject to extensive discussions with the Council's Design Officers and Planning Officers at both the outline stage and following the submission of the current proposal. The site layout is largely consistent with those details approved in the Masterplan. The proposal retains a focal point for the development in the form of the central parcel of amenity land around which the residential properties are situated. This area is considered to be appropriately located and of a sufficient size.

4.11 The observations of the Design Officer have resulted in amendments to the layout in the south-west corner of the site following officer concerns regarding the cramped form of development in this corner of the site. The revisions have resulted in a more spacious form of development that is more in keeping with the density throughout the rest of the development and is considered to be an improvement to the original submission. As these properties are the affordable housing units the Housing Enabling Officer has reviewed the revised scheme and has confirmed that it is acceptable.
4.12 The scheme includes a pedestrian linkage which flows through the site passing through the south-west corner. This footpath enables access to the community land to the west of the site and is in accordance with the details agreed at the time of the outline application. The improvements to the layout of the residential dwellings in this part of the site will enhance the appearance of this linkage and improve the relationship between these dwellings and pedestrians.

4.13 The development responds well to the principles of the design policies, in particular section 7 of the NPPF and JCS Policy 2. The final Building for Life Assessment score will be presented in updates to the committee.

Design and visual impact

4.14 A high standard of design is promoted throughout the National 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. At a local level JCS Policy 2 promotes good design and emerging Development Management policy DM3.9 sets out the aspirations for the District.

4.15 The application proposes a total of 24 contemporary dwellings, including 8 affordable units. The contemporary design concept results in a development that is distinctive, creating a clear sense of place within the site. In addition to the alterations to the affordable housing units further amendments have also been agreed to the form of plots 1 and plots 4 to 6. Officer concerns have been addressed by introducing design detail into the south elevation of plot 1 and improving the appearance of the rear projections of plots 4 to 6. The appearance of these dwellings is now considered to be acceptable.

4.17 Due to the simplicity of the built form proposed details high quality materials will be required throughout the site to create interest. The applicant has suggested a partial materials palette at this stage which the Design Officer has reviewed and confirmed is acceptable. Notwithstanding this point, full details of all materials will still be required to comply with condition 3 of planning permission 2014/2409.

4.18 The Design Officer has also suggested that the overall appearance of the dwellings could be further enhanced by simplifying the eaves, window and door details and slightly recessing the windows to create shadow lines across the dwellings.

4.19 The overall appearance of the affordable housing dwellings has been significantly improved by their repositioning within the site and as a result they now have a better relationship with the private dwellings. It has been suggested that some cedar boarding should be incorporated into these dwellings to further enhance this relationship between these properties and the private units and front canopies should be omitted.

4.20 At the time of preparing this report amended drawings reflecting these suggestions are awaited and a verbal update will be provided to committee as appropriate.

4.21 Public views into the site will be obtained from vantage points along Long Lane as well as the public amenity areas to the west of the site. The outline application recognised the significant views that will be available of the site and at that time proposed restricting dwellings along the eastern boundary of the site to a maximum of 1.5 storey in height plus the inclusion of additional perimeter planting. At this time plots 1-3 along the eastern boundary are proposed to be 2 storey in height with the remainder along this boundary being single storey. On balance whilst it is unfortunate that these dwellings are of greater height they are limited in number with the remainder along this boundary at single storey and I do not consider that it results in overall harm to the visual impact of the development.
4.22 The overall design of the site therefore considered to accord with the principles of those policies set out above.

Landscape and ecology matters

4.23 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.

4.24 The landscaping of the scheme is considered to be broadly acceptable and generally in accordance with the approved Masterplan. The principle difference between the outline and reserved matters application is the movement away from the 'copse concept' which the Landscape Officer has welcomed due to potential establishment and management issues associated with the original proposal.

4.25 The development retains a large area of amenity space with some specimen tree planting included to create interest. Further tree and shrub planting is proposed throughout the site as well as within the hedgerow boundaries around the site.

4.26 To the south of the site between the proposed and existing housing is a landscape buffer strip that is to be transferred to the Parish Council in accordance with requirements of the legal agreement. In order to avoid management and maintenance conflicts the developer has opted to retain this landscape strip as a single entity with planting eventually creating a thick hedgerow. Future responsibility for the management of this planting will lie with the Parish Council. The principle of this planted corridor was agreed at the time of the outline application to address concerns raised by the occupiers of the existing dwellings.

4.27 Following revisions to the landscaping proposals during the course of the application the Landscape Officer has confirmed that the planting schedule and Management Plan is acceptable subject to the revised plans showing the planting corridor as a single entity. These revised plans are to be submitted by the agent prior to the Development Management committee.

4.28 Overall the proposed landscape planting will create an attractive environment for the development with the specimen planting helping to integrate the scheme within its wider rural context. The proposed scheme is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of Local Plan Policy IMP2 and emerging Policy DM4.10 which require landscaping features to be incorporated into design proposals.

4.29 The approved planning permission did not include a specific ecological condition relating to the development of this site. Notwithstanding this, the County Ecologist has commented on the proposal noting only that the development has moved away from the 'copse concept' initially proposed. The Ecologist has referred the amendments to the planting scheme to the Landscape Officer who, as noted above, has welcomed this alteration to the scheme. No further comments have been received from the Ecologist who has not raised an objection to the application.

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

Residential amenity

4.31 Planning policies seek to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers to the site, as well as new occupants of the development. Local Plan Policy IMP9 is of particular relevance.
4.32 The relationship between the existing dwellings and the proposed properties, as well as the relationship between the new dwellings has been assessed and is considered to be satisfactory. The separation distances between the proposed and the existing dwellings, including the planting corridor, minimises the potential for significant harm caused by overlooking or loss of privacy.

4.33 Similarly, the separation distances between the existing and proposed units are such that no significant loss of light would occur.

4.34 In terms of the residential amenity the proposal is considered to be in accordance with section 7 of the NPPF, Policy 2 of the JCS and Local Plan Policy IMP09.

Highways

4.35 Access to the site was originally approved at the time of the outline application and was subject to a minor revision as part of the earlier planning application 2014/2409. The scheme does not compromise this approved access arrangement.

4.36 The internal site layout is acceptable in highway safety terms, including the delivery of acceptable on-site parking provision following revisions to the initial submission. The application is therefore in accordance with Policy IMP09 of the Local Plan.

4.37 The applicant has voluntarily entered into discussions with the Highways Officer about the provision of a bus stop in connection with the delivery of this site. These details are still to be agreed and finalised however it should be noted that the provision of an off-site bus stop was not a requirement of the outline planning permission and as such is also outside the details of this reserved matters application.

4.38 Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the current highway capacity however whilst these concerns have been noted the principle of the development and the access to the site were approved at the time of the outline planning application.

Surface water drainage

4.39 The outline and subsequent variation of condition planning permissions included a requirement to submit and agree both surface water and foul water drainage details prior to the commencement of works on site. Whilst the applicant has undertaken some preliminary site works to inform the SUDS and drainage strategy and some details have been submitted for review at this time it remains the applicant’s intention to discharge these conditions under a separate application at a later date. As such, although the comments of the Flood Defence Officer have been forwarded onto the applicant for review no further information is required at this time. The applicant has been made aware that final approval of the drainage strategy could affect the final reserved matters layout. Whilst the Environment Agency comments identified insufficient information has been received, they are no longer the statutory body for advice on surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority have are now the statutory consultee, who raise no specific issues, but this matter for the purpose of the reserved matters consent is considered to be sufficiently addressed.

Archaeology

4.40 As noted in the consultee comments above the Historic Environment Service has requested that preliminary archaeological investigations are undertaken on site prior to the determination of this application. This is to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice any heritage assets that may be present. However, whilst it is a requirement of the earlier planning permission that on-site archaeological works are undertaken these conditions do not stipulate that the works must be undertaken prior to the submission and determination of the reserved matters application.
4.41 Notwithstanding the above point, it is my understanding that the applicant is in the process of instructing these works to commence on site shortly in accordance with a brief to be agreed with the Historic Environment Service and that earlier (lesser) investigative works undertaken independently did not reveal any significant findings.

4.42 At this time no further details are required from the applicant regarding the possible archaeological interest of the site.

Affordable housing

4.43 Appropriate affordable housing provision is made on site. Eight units are provided in total on the site as per the Section 106 Agreement. Following revisions to the site layout the units are reasonably well integrated into the site with improved spacing between the units reducing the distinction between these properties and the private units.

Environmental Impact Assessment

4.44 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and the proposal is not considered to require an Environmental Statement, and will not lead to any significant impacts other than those raised and adequately addressed in the above report.

Local Financial Considerations

4.45 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.

4.46 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the outline consent was granted prior to CIL being implemented by the Council.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of residential development on the site has been established through the granting of the previous planning permissions on the site. The current reserved matters proposal have regard to the approved Masterplan and Design Guide and satisfy the planning policy framework, as set out above in the assessment of the scheme.

5.2 It should be noted that those conditions from the earlier planning permission continue to be applicable and will be required to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s.

5.3 On the basis of the above it is recommended that authority be delegated to the Director for Growth and Localism to approve the application subject to expiry of the full consultation period, subject to no further substantive issues being raised.

Contact Officers, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jo Hobbs 01508 533674 jhobbs@s-norfolk.gov.uk and Kate Fisher 01508 533960 kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2015/1678/F  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH

**Applicants Name**: Solarcentury  
**Site Address**: Land adj A47 and North of New Road Bawburgh Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Development of ground mounted solar photovoltaic panels and associated works including transformer substations, storage container, switchgear, DNO Cabin, access tracks, underground cabling, security measures and other ancillary equipment and landscaping

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions.

1. Temporary time limit of 25 years  
2. Decommissioning plan to be submitted  
3. In accordance with plans  
4. Visibility splay provision  
5. Parking/turning provision  
6. Construction traffic management to be agreed  
7. Archaeology reports to be submitted  
8. Ecology mitigation to be secured  
9. Surface water details to be agreed  
10. Noise management plan to be agreed  
11. Dust control to be agreed  
12. Hours of construction to be agreed  
13. Loud speakers restricted on site  
14. In accordance with landscape scheme  
15. In accordance with landscape management scheme  
16. Retention trees and hedges on site  
17. Tree protection to be agreed  
18. External lighting to be agreed  
19. CCTV to be agreed

Subject to outstanding highways and archaeology matters being resolved.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
**NPPF 01**: Building a strong competitive economy  
**NPPF 03**: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
**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
1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM4.2 Renewable Energy
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
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 2015/1275 Screening opinion for proposed development of ground mounted solar photovoltaic panels and associated works. Environmental Impact Assessment not required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils:
Costessey Town Council
Comments only - Queries about dazzling drivers on the A47 and how visible the installation would be from the A47 as the site is high. Whether it would affect the flight path into Norwich airport. A query regarding the use/misuse of good agricultural land and food security was raised.
Bawburgh Parish Council

No objections

Colney Parish Council

Comments only:
The site is adjacent the A47 and is directly at variance with features of all the landscape policies listed above. The application involves a dense array of solar panels that cover most of the site and number of small buildings and associated structures including security cameras and a wind sensor mast all enclosed by 2 metre high deer fence. Presumably post-construction traffic will be light but construction traffic may well affect the free flow of traffic with associated safety issues. Apparently visible outdoor lighting will not be used. The site will visible from the A47, especially to vehicles coming from the south and traffic using New Road. New Road is a narrow road linking Bawburgh and Bowthorpe. Inevitably this construction will detract from the existing the rural aspect and landscape setting.

The policies protecting the Yare valley were also reviewed by Chris Blandford Associates (CBA) for South Norfolk Council in 2012, Landscape Character Areas & River Valleys in the Norwich Policy Area, who endorsed the existing protection with minor adjustments. The Bawburgh area was classified as “High-Medium Sensitivity” in the Historic characterisation and sensitivity assessment of local landscapes carried out by Norfolk County Council 2009.

Solar Century commissioned Avian Ecology to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the solar farm. The appraisal comprised of a desk based review and a one day habitat survey carried out on the 18th June 2015. The report by Avian Ecology stated that the survey did not aim to produce a full botanical or faunal list but broadly identify the nature of the conservation of the site.

About 120 species birds and 10 species of bats had been recorded from Norfolk Biological Information Service (NBIS) within 2km of the site. 30 of the birds are on the red list of Birds of Conservation Concern. Some these were primarily associated with aquatic habitats hence unlikely to be frequent users of the site. The timing and short duration of the of the field survey meant that very few faunal observations were made. Arable fields are often downplayed as being of environmental importance. However, on similar agricultural land to that in Bawburgh, during the last five years a number of more detailed ecological studies have been carried out in Colney and Cringleford, all with similar results. The number of bird species recorded on arable fields adjacent the Bypass at Cringleford was 51 of which 41 were considered breeding or likely to be breeding. A total of 16 species are considered noteworthy because of their conservation status. Six species were on the Red list and ten on the Amber list. Wintering species numbered over 40 species; 8 on the Red list, 9 on the Amber list. It seems likely that similar results could apply to the solar farm site. Key farmland species including, skylark, linnet, kestrel, green woodpecker and whitethroat at particularly at risk because of low tolerance of human activity and/or permanent destruction of suitable habitat therefore more detailed ecological studies need to be carried out in Bawburgh.
It is felt a full Environmental Impact Assessment should be made for the solar farm site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 District Member</th>
<th>Requested application to be determined by committee with regard to landscape and highways impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Historic Environment Service</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.5 NCC Highways | A Construction traffic management plan including a traffic assessment is included within the Planning Application. The assessment indicates that the New Road route from the site to the east (to and from the Bowthorpe direction) will be used as the construction route for the deliveries. This route is generally acceptable for two way movement of light vehicles, but is relatively narrow for use by large HGV and there are only a small number of informal passing places. The route is not of sufficient width for the large HGV to pass each other. Appropriate traffic management of the delivery vehicles will therefore be required and I consider that this should include a number of temporary passing places should be formed along New Road between the proposed site entrance and Chapel Break Road in order to provide points where two large vehicles can pass each other. Provision for a carriageway width of 5.5m is required at these points.

The use of the New Road route to the west is not an acceptable alternative, owing to the very restrictive width of the carriageway where it passes under the A47.

There are no particular issues with the use of the use of Chapel Break Road, Although as this route is outside of the SNC boundary, you may wish to consult with Norwich City Council regarding this aspect.

In addition New Road is a relatively busy commuter route into and out of Norwich at peak traffic times. The use of New Road at these times by delivery vehicles is almost certain to result in some congestion. The Construction traffic management plan does cover this aspect and recommends that peak hour deliveries should be avoided.

The traffic assessment does clearly identify the likely traffic generation of heavy goods vehicles for the construction phase which is identified to last some 8 weeks and generate approximately 118 HGV deliveries over this period. The CTMP should be updated to include details of routing signage for the construction traffic and identify a location where the delivery vehicles can be parked in the event of any out of hours deliveries. Given the volume of HGV traffic there is the possibility of highway damage as a result. I will require the applicants to enter into a S59 Abnormal Wear and Tear Agreement covering the length of New Road from the site access up to and including the junction with Chapel Break Road, to ensure that any damage sustained during the construction period is rectified. This aspect can be covered in the Construction traffic Management Plan.
The current vehicular access which serves the field is currently a simple field entrance without any formal access radii onto New Road.

The proposal is for a new temporary access to be constructed onto New Road at the location of the current field entrance. In order to permit the swept path for a HGV to enter and exit it is recommended that a minimum width of 6m be provided with a 15m radius on the east side. The entrance should be constructed in accordance with the County Council's industrial access specification details for the first 15m back from the edge of the existing highway. The access will need to be designed with suitable surface water drainage provision to ensure that no surface water from the temporary access shall drain onto the highway.

Suitable wheel washing facilities will need to be provided adjacent to the access track close to the entrance to be used as appropriate for which cleaning of vehicles leaving the site so as to ensure that no mud or debris is carried out onto New Road. Notwithstanding this provision, the contractor shall continually monitor the condition of New Road and deploy additional road cleaning as appropriate.

A location is shown within the construction report to show the construction compound, although no actual details are included to show the on site parking and turning areas for staff vehicles, in addition to the loading and unloading areas for the delivery vehicles.

Comments on the amended construction traffic management plan and highways information - Awaited

3.6 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
No objection. Swales are proposed around the south and west of the perimeter of the site. Details of management of the grass beneath the panels and ideally a buffer strip to be placed after the most down gradient row of panels should be secured by condition.

3.7 Highways England
No objection

3.8 Natural England
No objection

3.9 NCC Ecologist
No objection subject to the biodiversity management plan being conditioned.

3.10 SNC Landscape Officer
No objection subject to the following comment and amendments:

I have reviewed the submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment contained and do not dispute its observations and findings.

Looking at policy DM4.7 and the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (NSBLPZ) in which the site falls, any development to be permitted should have regard to protecting the openness of the NSBLPZ and, where possible, should enhance the setting the Southern Bypass (A47). At present, views into the site from the A47 are limited by the existing vegetation which continues to mature. The proposed scheme includes further planting to augment this which will increase the screening in time. The height and positioning of the panels is such that they will not break above the vegetation line and as such I do not consider that it can be
argued that the openness of the NSBLPZ will be compromised. There will be some views of parts of the site from some of the long views (notably Viewpoint 8 at Stocks Hill), but largely the site is screen by the various vegetative blocks in the foreground. The site (and therefore the proposed scheme) does not conflict with any of the viewing cones/zones, southern undeveloped approaches or gateways as recommended by the Local landscape Designations Review undertaken by CBA in 2012.

I have some suggestions for additional enhancements for the proposed planting scheme, which could further enhance the screening effect and benefits for biodiversity:

- Hedgerow trees added to the proposed new hedge along New Road (at no more than 10-metre intervals), and also consideration to the use of some sections of ‘instant hedge’ near to the residential property of Clinkhill. It would also be good to see if the hedge could be extended alongside the entrance for a short way to ‘close-off’ the view into the site.

- It would be good to have some evergreen species within the tree belt mix, most probably holly. I question whether birch is the most appropriate choice as it is not particularly characteristic; field maple may be a better species.

In general the LEMP is a good document, however there are some points of detail (in addition to the points above):

- The planting needs to be undertaken during the first planting season once the development commences; the phrase “after construction” in 7.1.1 needs to be amended. This will be a temporary development and as such it is critical that planting is undertaken as soon as possible (and even in advance of the installation of the panels). The planting proposed is all outside of the security fencing, so planting works can be kept quite separate.

- I would prefer to have the hedges maintained at a height no lower than 3m (Section 5.1.5)

- If grazing by sheep is utilized, then it may be necessary to restrict their access to the central east-west wildflower meadow by electric fencing or similar.

My final note is concern about the red line for this application, which currently excludes most of the new planting areas. We need to be certain that the required and approved planting and management are intrinsically linked to the planning application/permission site. If not, we may have future issues if matters need to be enforced.

Comments on amended landscape details -

The revised Landscape Mitigation Plan (CE-NF0884-DW08b-FINAL) and Biodiversity Management Plan (V4 dated 1 October 2015) have incorporated my suggestions, so are now acceptable to me.

We should ensure that landscaping can be conditioned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>SNC Flood Defence Officer</td>
<td>County Council Lead Local Flood Authority to respond regarding surface water. In respect of foul water, request that if foul drainage facilities are proposed for the site further information should be submitted to support the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>No objection with the following comments (summarised): The construction of the solar farm on the 9.36 hectare site would impact lodge farmhouse, but to a low extent that would not harm the significance of the heritage asset in terms of the NPPF. The planting scheme to the southern boundary should be increased to mitigate the impact. If the Council was minded to approve the application, the planting scheme should be revised before any decision made and the Norfolk Historic Environment Service consulted regarding any impact on archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>SNC Environmental Services (Protection)</td>
<td>No objection but require further information regarding noise levels of operational plant and a condition requiring a noise management plan for construction and decommissioning and limit works to between 7am and 7pm Mon to Fri and 7am to 1pm on Saturdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Norwich City Council</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Health And Safety Executive</td>
<td>In relation to the gas pipeline across the site there is no objection to the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>National Grid (gas pipeline operator)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Fisher German (oil pipeline operator)</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Representations</td>
<td>Two letters of objection and one letter of support. Objections on the following grounds: • too close to village of Bawburgh • would be an eyesore from the picturesque village of Bawburgh • Concern if noise and glare became a problem would it be rectified? • Concern with loss of wildlife and whether mitigation measures would be effective • New Road is too narrow to take construction vehicles • Would it affect access to her property for herself and her B&amp;B guests? • Would devalue residential property and would want compensation • Concerns of narrow road and impact of traffic on this. • Concern that no traffic should go through Bawburgh Conservation Village • Would not want any disruption to the use of the road to Bawburgh and concern that any damage to three wheel shopper should be paid for if this occurs Support with the following comments: • Request road sweeping daily to New Road during construction • Request hedge screening alongside field/New Road once works complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Ensure all cable routing trenching along New Road is made good and replanted/seeded following completion

4 Assessment

The site and proposal

4.1 The site comprises all or part of a single large agricultural field, currently within an arable use, totalling 9.36ha within the application red line plan, although an area also in control of the applicant to be used for landscaping is shown within the blue line of the application.

4.2 The site is located between the village of Bawburgh to the west and Bowthorpe to the east. The A47 forms the western boundary of the site which is delineated by a mature hedgerow which has a small number of gaps.

4.3 Hedgerows and vegetation form the boundary of the northern, eastern and southern boundaries with agricultural fields beyond the hedges. Both the northern and eastern boundaries include mature trees with part of the eastern boundary being a plantation of trees. New Road also forms the southern boundary of the site.

4.4 The site is currently agricultural land located within Flood Zone 1. The agricultural land is made up of a mix of Grades 3b & 4 agricultural land, which is defined as ‘moderate to poor’. The topography of the site falls slightly from the northwest towards the southern boundary of the site.

4.5 There are no listed buildings on the site and it does not lie within a conservation area, there is however a listed building approx. 300m to the south of the site.

4.6 Access to the site would be from New Road through an existing gap in the hedge. Within the site the access track would then follow the southern boundary to the east before heading north into the site with two branches to feed the substations.

4.7 The solar panels would be pile driven into the ground and would have a maximum height of 2.75m. They would be arranged in rows (set apart approx. 4-5m) on an east to west alignment facing south.

4.8 The surface of each solar panel is constructed from toughened glass, beneath which is a non-reflective layer, electrical connections, silicon and a backing layer, all of which is set in an aluminium frame.

4.9 The equipment on site in addition to the solar panels includes a switchgear station buildings, a storage container, substations, a pole mounted satellite dish, CCTV around the site and deer fencing around the perimeter of the site.

4.10 The application seeks a temporary consent to enable 25 years operation on the site.

Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

4.11 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.
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.

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

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.”

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.

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.

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.

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.
4.20 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.

4.21 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”.

Local Policy

4.22 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.

4.23 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. Whilst this policy is not yet part of the Development Plan, as the Inspector’s report has been received confirming the plan is sound subject to minor modifications, this policy has been afforded significant weight in making this recommendation.

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

4.25 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

4.26 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’. 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.

4.27 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.

4.28 In this case in respect of previously developed land, whilst no sequential test has been submitted which looks at alternative locations for the development on previously developed land, recent reports submitted for the Yelverton solar farm application (2014/0411), to which the current application can rely, can be taken into consideration which demonstrated that there were no suitable sites within the district or 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.

4.29 With regard to agricultural land classification, an agricultural assessment including sampling has been carried out which identifies the site as largely being 3b (approx. 2/3rds), with approx. 1/3rd being on the Grade 4 land.

4.30 Best and most versatile land is defined in the NPPF as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the agricultural land classification. Therefore grades 3b, 4 and 5 are considered to be the poorer grades of land by default. As the site is on lower grade agricultural land the application is therefore acceptable in this respect.

4.31 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.

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

4.33 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.

Landscape

4.34 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.

4.35 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 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.
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.

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.

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.

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.”

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.”

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.

At present, views into the site from the A47 are limited by existing vegetation and the proposed scheme includes further planting to augment this which will increase the screening in time. The long-term landscape enhancements (improved and new hedgerows, hedgerow trees etc.) will be a positive long-term enhancement. The height and positioning of the panels is such that they would not break above the vegetation line and it is not therefore considered that the openness of the bypass protection zone or character of the wider landscape would be compromised.

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.

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.

The temporary site construction compound is of a temporary nature and as such would not result in any significant detrimental harm to the landscape.
4.47 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, that there are limited wider views of the site and that landscaping is proposed to help screen the solar farm from immediate receptors, it is not considered that the proposal represents a significant intrusion in the landscape or of the setting of Norwich.

4.48 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.

4.49 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

4.50 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.

4.51 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. Subject to conditions to control hours of construction and delivery and a noise and dust management scheme there is no objection in this respect from the Council's Environmental Services officers.

4.52 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. This is located in fairly close proximity to a nearby residential property and further information on noise levels are awaited from the applicant to enable further assessment. However, subject to appropriate noise levels being demonstrated and given there are existing background noise levels of the A11, it is not considered that the proposed onsite equipment required for the operation of the solar farm would likely result in any significant adverse impact on the amenities of those properties in terms of noise. Members will be updated at Committee.

4.53 There have been issues relating to 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.

4.54 In terms of impact of HGV vehicles along the construction traffic route, the construction traffic route would run east along New Road and through Bowthorpe, given the temporary nature of the construction period it is not considered that any adverse impacts on residential amenity result in respect of the temporary period of construction.

4.55 Subject to further planting along the southern boundary, the residential properties to the south would be well screened from the site by landscaping. 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.

4.56 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, and subject to a condition to secure precise details of location and range, 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 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.

In addition to the requirements of the Development Plan, section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also 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.

The only listed building nearby is Grade II* Listed Lodge Farmhouse approximately 300m to the south east of the application site.

Historic England have advised that whilst they would consider the proposals would have an impact on the Grade II* heritage asset, this would not amount to harm to its significance as it would not diminish the setting over and above the impact that the A47 and surrounding lakes has already created. The site of the solar farm adjacent to the A47, along with the presence of existing planting would have minimal impact on the heritage asset visually. They advise that this could be mitigated with a more substantial planting scheme to the southern boundary of the site which includes native hedge and tree planting.

In respect of the Development Plan and the separate duties under S72 of the Act set out above, Officers consider for the reasons set out above that the development is acceptable resulting in no adverse harm to the setting of listed buildings.

In respect of archaeology Historic England have indicated that there is a former Roman road to the immediate north of the site and this indicates that there has previously been Roman activity and that the Historic Environment Service should comment on the proposal regarding the impact, assessment of need and cope of works. Comments are awaited from Historic Environment Service in this respect and Members will be updated at Committee.

Highway considerations

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.

The Highway Authority whilst indicating no objection in principle, have advised that the construction traffic route utilising New Road is narrow in width and as such there would likely to be conflict of HGVs being able to pass but also other passing non construction vehicles along the route. They have indicated that appropriate traffic management is
therefore required and this should include additional passing bays along New Road in order to provide safe passing places. They also require restricting any construction traffic during peak periods, an agreement as part of the construction traffic management plan to require any wear and tear to be repaired and wheel washing to be conditioned. Further details of the on-site parking for staff and loading/unloading areas for delivery vehicles is also required.

4.67 In respect of the proposed access, the Highway Authority indicates that the access to be created is to be built to a higher standard in respect of its radius and also drainage is required.

4.68 The applicant has submitted further information in response to the Highway Authority's comments although at the time of writing the report, comments on these amended details are awaited from the Highway Authority.

4.69 The applicant disputes the need to provide an enhanced access. They instead propose a standard industrial access which is designed to an appropriate swept path of the intended vehicles, without the enhanced radius or drainage requested by the Highway Authority as they do not consider this to be necessary and proportionate to the temporary nature of the access (likely construction period approx. 8 weeks). Furthermore in respect of the construction traffic management, rather than providing further passing bays on New Road, the applicants propose the use of an active logistics plan for HGVs to address the issue of HGVS passing on New Road. This involves the management of HGVs to and from the site by a site manager calling in HGVs from off-site laybys once any existing HGVs have departed from the site.

4.70 The restriction of construction traffic to outside of peak times and the additional information required by NCC in respect of parking/loading areas has been provided.

4.71 Comments of the Highway Authority on the amended construction traffic management plan and highways and access information are awaited. Clearly the acceptability of the scheme from a highway perspective relies on an approach being agreed with the Highway Authority to ensure that the safe and free flow of traffic is not compromised and which is proportionate to the temporary (likely 8 week period) nature of the construction traffic. Members will be updated at committee in respect of this outstanding matter, and delegated authority is sought to resolve this matter.

4.72 The proposed construction traffic route would utilise the main roads running through the Bowthorpe area and officers therefore consider in respect of residential amenity, that there would no adverse impact as a result of this construction traffic route.

4.73 Highways England has confirmed no objection to the scheme.

Ecology

4.74 The actual site itself has low ecological value with limited semi-natural habitat on the margins of the site.

4.75 The submitted ecology report identifies the ecology of the site is largely limited to the field margins which will be unaffected. Subject to a condition securing implementation of the submitted Biodiversity Management Plan the County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to the application.

4.76 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

4.77 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.

4.78 The application site is in Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest flood risk. Key issues to consider are therefore surface water flooding issues.

4.79 The proposed panels will not prevent direct infiltration into the ground and the site remains landscaped with grassland/vegetation surrounding and beneath the arrays.

4.80 The Lead Local Flood Authority 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 swales as proposed is encouraged as is wildflower meadow planting.

4.81 Subject to a condition to require the swales, planting of wildflower meadow grass planting and monitoring of the site to assess whether any erosion channels are forming and require any further drainage strategy, the development is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy 3 in the JCS and paragraph 103 in the NPPF.

Employment

4.82 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

4.83 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.

4.84 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new floorspace would be created.

Environmental Impact Assessment

4.85 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening was undertaken under reference 2015/1275. 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.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The solar farm would have an 5 MW capacity 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, surface water drainage and biodiversity and impact of the development in these respects are acceptable or can be made acceptable through the imposition of planning conditions.

5.3 In respect of highway safety and the free flow of traffic, comments are awaited from the Highway Authority as to the acceptability of the measures proposed by the applicant, but delegated authority is sought to resolve this matter.

5.4 There will be some harm to the landscape character and landscape setting of Norwich, however it is considered that the harm is limited and this is considered to be outweighed by the overall benefits to the scheme of generating renewable energy.

5.5 The limited harm to the nearby listed building is acceptable given the additional tree planting along the southern boundary now proposed. The harm is considered to be less than substantial and the benefits of the scheme including public benefits of enhancements to landscaping are considered to outweigh this harm. Comments from the Historic Environment Service regarding archaeology and the measures required in this instance are outstanding.

5.6 On balance therefore it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in planning terms and is therefore recommended for approval subject to the outstanding highways and archaeology matters being resolved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

4. **Appl. No**: 2015/0974/RVC  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr Alastair Gourlay  
   **Site Address**: Land rear of 14 to 22 Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JL  
   **Proposal**: Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/1706/F - Revised layout of the access road  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
   1. Re-imposition of all conditions on 2011/1706  
   2. Fencing to be erected within 3 months of permission  
   3. Fencing to be retained and maintained at the agreed height  
   4. Planting and works to bank to be completed within 3 months of permission

5. **Appl. No**: 2015/1023/F  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr Alastair Gourlay  
   **Site Address**: Land rear of 14 to 22 Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JL  
   **Proposal**: Turning head at the end of the health centre access road  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
   1. Retained in accordance with approved plans  
   2. Fencing to be erected within 3 months of permission  
   3. Fencing to be retained and maintained at the agreed height  
   4. Planting and works to bank to be completed within 3 months of permission

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
   Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
   Policy 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 5: Streetscape  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise  
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
   TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
   TRA 19: Parking standards
1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be
given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph
216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the
emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which
found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies
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
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

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 2013/0505 Outline application for up to 100 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access
Approved

2.2 2011/1706 Proposed two storey health centre
Approved

2.3 2015/0382 Discharge of Condition 6 - Landscaping, 7 - cooling fan, 9 - external lighting, 11 - footway
crossing, of permission 2011/1706/F
Approved

2.4 2014/1663 Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission 2011/1706/F - Materials and
levels
Approved

2.5 2014/1464 Variation of condition of planning permission 2011/1706/F (Proposed two storey health
centre) - Minor revisions to approved drawings
Approved

2.6 2014/0764 Discharge of conditions 10 and 16 following 2011/1706 - Construction of a two storey
health centre.
Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council 2015/0974
Objects to this application.
The proposed fence is far too low and does not offer the privacy that affected residents should expect. The development detracts from the amenity of the neighbouring properties. The development of the site has breached a number of planning conditions. The dog leg in the road has no bearing on the oak tree and is not necessary. To retrospectively approve this plan would set a precedent for future applications and open the doors for other developers to flout planning conditions. Storm water run-off will be increased into Clearview Drive which is a known flood risk area. The Parish Council would like to see South Norfolk Council robustly address this issue by not permitting this breach of planning conditions.

Further comments on amended plans:
Poringland Parish Council objects to the amendment to this application. Concern is expressed at the height of the fence as this sets a precedent for other applicants, although the Council recognises the intention of the fence in offering privacy to the neighbouring properties following the road being built at the incorrect height. The Council would ask that any fence erected has concrete posts and gravel boards for improved stability. The Council also feels that the measures to mitigate flooding on either side of the new road, caused by the incorrect building of the road, have not been sufficiently set out.

2015/1023
Recommend refusal of the application as nothing should be approved until the layout and level of the road has been resolved.

Further comments on amended plans:
Poringland Parish Council objects to the amendment to this application. Concern is expressed at the height of the fence as this sets a precedent for other applicants, although the Council recognises the intention of the fence in offering privacy to the neighbouring properties following the road being built at the incorrect height. The Council would ask that any fence erected has concrete posts and gravel boards for improved stability. The Council also feels that the measures to mitigate flooding on either side of the new road, caused by the incorrect building of the road, have not been sufficiently set out.

3.2 District Member
Cllr Neal and Cllr Overton
To be determined by Committee in respect of breaches of planning conditions and impact on neighbouring properties.

3.3 NCC Highways
No objections to the revised highway layout of the access road. It is understood that the alignment of the road was changed on order to avoid a BT chamber.

3.4 SNC Landscape Officer
2015/0974 – No objection as there is no change to the section of the road with in the tree protection area of the TPO tree.

2015/1023 – No objection
3.5 Representations

Objection:

12 Stoke Road –
- The measures to address privacy and the height of the road are only what has already been constructed.
- The fence size will mean that we still have a loss of privacy on kitchen, living room and garden and less light in front garden.
- Large builders think they can build what they like and then gain retrospective consent. This is not right.
- Have been in touch with the parish council, MP and some of the doctors and they agree the road should be moved back to the original plan.
- The builders lied to me when constructing the kink in the road advising they already had consent for it.
- My suggestion of the developer gifting land to me and putting the fence along the road – their comment that this could not be done as might need to be used for services – question if this is true – they couldn’t fit in extra services or a cycle path. This is dead land.
- Does not want a 1.8m fence with trellis on top – this would result in loss of light to garden ad be a monstrosity.
- We had no objection to a straight road that wasn’t built at a higher level.

40 Clearview Drive –
- Road has been built approx. 1.2m higher than original ground level so this impacts on my privacy.
- Concern with impact of flooding from the bank.
- Would like to see an alternative solution rather than just trellis and what will be done re drainage.

Comments on amended plans –
- Would feel more comfortable with the proposal if there was a small retaining wall with a fence on top to help prevent any surface water issues in heavy rainfall.
- Would like my fence to stay as is and the new one to be located alongside.
- Don’t want the new fence around the bottom of garden as enjoy the birds and squirrels from this aspect.

14 Stoke Road –
- Negotiated directly with the developer a new higher fence but some of the cost was borne by us (approx. £3,000) as the contractor didn’t see that section being a problem.
- There is the expense of maintaining a higher fence.
- There have been some damage to the dwelling (cracking) and garden patio as a result of the access works.

4 Assessment

Description of proposals

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

1) 2015/0974 - Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/1706/F - Revised layout of the access road. This seeks to regularise a change in the horizontal alignment of the access road within the site, and;
2) 2015/1023 - Turning head at the end of the health centre access road. Whilst this turning head was shown on the original outline application, as it was not within the red line of the application, it requires its own planning permission.

4.2 Given that these applications are linked by site and the issues raised, it is considered appropriate to assess the impacts at the same time. The following assessment adopts this approach.

Site description

4.3 The site is located on northern side of Stoke Road which is to the north-west of Poringland.

4.4 The access in question is the new access for the medical centre which is now complete and occupied.

4.5 Residential properties sit on either side of access.

4.6 There is a TPO tree to the eastern side of the access as constructed.

Key issues for consideration

4.7 Key issues for consideration are the principle; residential amenity and highway impact.

Principle in the countryside policy area

4.8 The site is within the countryside policy area, however the site is proposed for allocation in the Council’s emerging site allocations document and also benefits from outline consent for 100 dwellings (ref 2013/0505) and the full consent for the medical centre (ref 2011/1706) which has now been completed and is operational. This application seeks to amend the road layout and add a turning head to the access road which relate to the approved medical centre and as such and given the planning permissions in place and emerging planning context, there is no issue with the principle of the proposal in the current countryside designation.

Background information

4.9 The following background information provides context and the current situation on site for these two applications:

- The access road has been constructed and is in use by the medical centre.
- The turning head has been constructed and whilst this was shown on the approved drawings for the medical centre, as it was outside of the red line of that planning application, still technically requires planning permission.
- The road has been erected at a varied horizontal alignment (i.e. the road as approved was straight, as built it has a slight kink towards no. 12 Stoke Road)
- The height of the access road is higher than the original ground level. The level of the road was approved under a discharge of condition application (ref 2014/1663). This stemmed from the need to avoid the roots of a tree at the access subject of a Tree Preservation Order. A non-dig construction was required. This has therefore resulted in the road height being raised above the original ground level thereby avoiding affecting the roots of the tree. This has resulted in the height of the road being approx. 0.9 m above the original ground level at its highest point and 0.25m above ground level at its lowest point. The road in terms of its height has therefore been built in accordance with the approved discharge of condition consent.
- There has been significant objection raised by local residents regarding the height of the access road and loss of privacy that results.
Residential amenity

4.10 There are two main issues to consider in respect of residential amenity:
1. The impact on residential amenity as a result of the raised road level and the extent to which these applications can address this.
2. The impact on residential amenity from the amendments which the applications cover—namely the amended horizontal road alignment and retention of the turning head.

4.11 Discussion has taken place with all immediate neighbours to understand their concerns. Officers have had considerable discussion and negotiation with the agent in order to address these concerns. Members are however advised that the concerns raised largely relate to the increased height of the road compared to original ground levels and the impact this has on privacy of the rear gardens of these adjacent properties.

4.12 The current applications submitted relate to the changed horizontal alignment of the road as built and the turning head outside of the original red line. In respect of road height, the road has been built in accordance with the details approved by condition. As such there are limitations as to what the Local Planning Authority can reasonably require the applicant to address in respect of the height of the road and the privacy issues that result.

4.13 Notwithstanding those limitations, Officers have fully explored the issues with the immediate neighbours and the applicants in order to try to find a reasonable solution to the matter for all parties. The key properties affected are 12 and 14 Stoke Road and 40 Clearview Drive, all of which immediately adjoin the application site and the access road in question.

12 Stoke Road

4.14 In respect of 12 Stoke Road, there is an existing 1.8m close boarded fence along the boundary of the rear garden and a 1.5m approx. fence alongside the access road in the front garden. The height of the road/path is approx. 0.8m higher than original ground level at its highest point adjacent to 12 Stoke Road (adjacent to rear garden).

4.15 The application originally proposed a 1.8m fence along the entire length with a 0.6m trellis on top as a solution to the privacy matter. The residents of 12 Stoke Road have advised that they have significant objection regarding privacy resulting from the height of the road as erected at the rear and the proximity of the road at the front. They also advise however that they would not want a fence any higher than 1.8m along their boundary, instead they request some of the access land be gifted to them and the boundary fence placed on the back edge of the footpath.

4.16 In respect of the height of the road, officers consider that there is increased overlooking of 12 Stoke Road by virtue of the height of the road. Officers would consider that a taller fence may alleviate some of this overlooking and the agents have confirmed they would be happy to erect a fence to a reasonable height (max 2.2m). However as the resident at 12 Stoke Road has indicated that he would not want a fence taller than 1.8m, the Local Planning Authority must assess whether a 1.8m fence in this instance is acceptable. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be overlooking from the raised road level to 12 Stoke Road, there is approx. 4m - 6.5m between the access road and the boundary of 12 Stoke Road where the road is at its highest point and as such it is not considered that the level of overlooking would be detrimental to the amenities of that property.

4.17 Locating a fence on the back edge of the footpath rather than on the current boundary line and gifting this strip of land to the owner of 12 Stoke Road has been explored, however this would represent a concern from both the applicant and the Local Planning Authority. From the perspective of the Local Planning Authority, locating a fence hard up to the road would not be appropriate visually as would not allow any space for planting to soften the entrance
to the medical centre and the future access to housing. The applicant has indicated that the visual amenity matter in addition to the fact that the land may be needed to run services down for the future housing development would preclude them from gifting this land to another land owner. It is not therefore considered that this is a reasonable or appropriate solution.

4.18 The solution proposed is therefore a 1.8m fence along the entire side boundary of 12 Stoke Road. In this instance given that this is not a matter that is of a direct control of this planning application as the road height is already approved; that the agent has offered a higher fence should the resident wish to mitigate any loss of privacy further; and the relative distance between the raised access road and the boundary therefore reducing loss of privacy, leads Officers to conclude that the boundary measures proposed are acceptable in this instance.

4.19 The changes in the horizontal alignment of the road have shifted the road towards the boundary of 12 Stoke Road at the front part of the site. The road is at the same alignment along the rear garden of the property, where the road is at its highest level, and as such the road is built in accordance with the approved plans adjacent to the rear garden.

4.20 This has brought the road significantly closer to the boundary in the front garden of 12 Stoke Road, however the road is also not so elevated at this point. A 1.8m close boarded fence is proposed along the boundary, which the owner of 12 Stoke Road has accepted, and it is considered that this is sufficient and acceptable in ensuring no adverse impact on the amenities of 12 Stoke Road would result. In respect of noise and disturbance through vehicular and pedestrian movement, whilst the road is closer to the boundary of 12 Stoke Road, it is not considered that this would be sufficiently greater to lead to any significantly adverse amenity issues to result.

4.21 In respect of the turning head and changes in alignment that are the subject of the two applications, officers therefore consider that the impacts of the road are acceptable.

14 Stoke Road

4.22 In respect of 14 Stoke Road, a 2.2m fence has already been erected along this boundary by the contractor on the site following concerns raised by the resident at 14 Stoke Road regarding the height of the road. 14 Stoke Road have confirmed that this has addressed the privacy issue of the height of the road but have raised concerns of costs incurred by them (part of the fence was paid for by the resident), whether there is sufficient drainage to ensure the ditch will not get flooded and the appearance of the banks.

4.23 In respect of drainage, the gradient of the bank is such that a narrow ditch between this and the boundary fence is created. However, the drainage from the road was adequately addressed in the design of the road so that no surface water from the road/footway would affect this area. All of the road surface water will be retained on the highway and drain into the road drain on Stoke Road. The only issue for surface water drainage is that which would come off the bank and that this would only likely cause an issue in an extreme rainfall event. A shingled channel on geo textile membrane is proposed in this area and this is considered acceptable.

4.24 In respect of planting of the banks, as an interim solution (until such time as the reserved matters for the housing scheme and the subsequent agreement of the landscaping of the access to this is agreed) meadow grass is proposed to be planted along the banks and this is to be maintained by the management company currently managing the landscaping around the medical centre. The existing concreted sand bags used in the west face of the western back are to be replaced with a concrete plantable retaining wall structure and planted with grass seed. This is an acceptable solution.
4.25 In respect of the concerns raised by the resident regarding financial compensation for monies spent on part of the new fence, this is a matter between the applicant and neighbour. However Officers have asked the applicant to specifically review this matter and to liaise directly with the neighbour in this respect.

4.26 In respect of the turning head and the re-alignment of the road, these would have no adverse impact on the amenities of 14 Stoke Road.

4.27 As existing a 1.8m fence runs along the side boundary of this property.

4.28 In respect of the road levels, as amended, following requests from the resident at 40 Clearview Drive, a 2.2m fence is proposed to be installed. This includes a 600m concrete gravel board so as to prevent any surface water coming off the bank into Clearview Drive at this point. The impacts of the increased road levels are considered acceptable in this respect.

4.29 In respect of the turning head and the re-alignment of the road, these would have no adverse impact on the amenities of 40 Clearview Drive.

Highway impact

4.30 The amendment to the road alignment and the retention of the turning head are considered to result in no highway safety impact and accord with policies IMP8 and DM3.12.

4.31 The road levels were approved by Norfolk County Council Highways as part of the technical highway approval for the road prior to its construction.

Other considerations

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

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 The applications to be determined are limited to the changed road alignment and the retention of the turning head only. The road levels were approved by a discharge of condition application and as such the level of the road as erected is in accordance with the approved details, as such there are limitations as to what the Council can require the applicant to address in relation to this privacy issues that have arisen regarding this matter. Notwithstanding this, officers have worked with the applicant and immediate neighbours to try to find a reasonable solution to all parties regarding the impact on privacy from the road levels. Whilst consensus has not been reached with all parties, given that there are limitations as to what can be required from the developer in this instance, Officers consider that the proposals as amended are acceptable in this respect.

5.2 In regards to the impact of the amendments sought by the applications, namely the road alignment and turning head, the impacts of these are considered acceptable.

5.3 On balance therefore and having regard to the extent to which these applications can address the privacy issues, Officers consider the applications to be acceptable and to accord with the development plan.
5.4 Application 2015/0974 (Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/1706/F - Revised layout of the access road) is considered to accord with the Development Plan and approval is therefore recommended.

5.5 Application 2015/1023 (Turning head at the end of the health centre access road) is considered to accord with the Development Plan and approval is therefore recommended.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applicant Name: New Boundaries Group
Site Address: Beggars Roost 89 Norwich Road Barnham Broom Norfolk NR9 4BU
Proposal: Conversion of vacant existing residential property to provide four self-contained studio flats.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with amendments
3. Replacement hedge
4. Provision of parking and turning area

Planning Policies
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM3.5 Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life

Planning History
2.1 2003/0347 Proposed single storey double garage Approved
2.2 2000/0403 Alterations to house and garage to form granny flat Approved
2.3 1996/1209 Erection of garage and extension Approved

Consultations
3.1 Parish Council Comments on revised plans
Previous comments still stand and would still like to see the plans reduced to three studio flats
Comments on original plans

Refuse
- the existing site is already overdeveloped. The conversion of this one extended dwelling into five self-contained studio flats will create an unacceptable load onto the services within the village. The current sewage system is at capacity and there are regular flooding issues and sewage odours in the vicinity
- the property line is incorrect
- access to the site is on a blind bend and the increased number of vehicular movements provides a road safety danger which must be addressed
- it is believed that a condition of the original planning application for the double garage was a high hedge which is being proposed to be reduced
- there are also concerns over the suitability of a village to provide the facilities needed for five studio flats with limited parking
- - the Parish Council would however support an amended application with a reduction to three studio flats

3.2 District Member To Committee
- Following the original planning meeting at Barnham Broom and discussions with the residents, parish council and the applicants I formed the opinion that the original application was not suitable for the property due scale and highway concerns. I am still of the same opinion.
- The scale of development appears too large for the space available and there are ongoing questions over the boundary of the property.
- As reported by Highways there are concerns over access to and from the property, the amount of parking available and how disabled access provision will reduce this further. There appears to be insufficient manoeuvring space within the business premises and I would suggest that vehicles will struggle to enter and leave in forward gear. The idea that staff will use Hethersett as a hub and shuttle between in practice is unlikely to happen
- The proposed conversion with even only four flats represents complete overdevelopment and is completely out of character with the rest of the village
- Originally I considered the site might be suitable for three flats, I am now of the opinion that it is not suitable at all for this type of development

3.3 NCC Highways Comments on revised plans
- the revised proposal is now considered to be at a level we can accept
- a suitable condition will need to be imposed such that the front hedge should be restricted to a maximum height of one metre
- Comments on original plans
- visibility is very poor in the easterly direction. The whole hedge would need to be lowered to 600mm in height for this to be addressed
• as a commercial premises and with the location being close to a bend it is considered essential that the majority of vehicles using the site can turn within the premises and enter the highway in forward gear. The layout as proposed does not permit this possibility
• the applicants are requested to submit more information about the number of vehicles that will use the site on a daily basis as the parking provision is very cramped

3.4 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)  No comments to make

3.5 Representations  2 letters of objection to revised proposal
• concerns have still not been addressed
• site will still contain a minimum of 10 people at any one time, along with the traffic movements of having a business of this size and nature operating from this premises, it is totally out of keeping with the village environment in which it will exist
• the boundary of the site remains incorrectly shown
• plan to remove the existing conifer hedge is in contravention of a previous approval as the proposed replacement would not adequately screen the property as the current hedge does

9 letters of objection received to original proposal
• five units not suitable
• site will be overdeveloped with not enough room for the proposed number of vehicles the site plan indicates so vehicles will be parked on the road
• incorrect boundary shown
• a business venture in a quiet residential area
• the property is situated on a blind bend and with increased traffic entering and leaving the property there could be potential for road traffic accidents
• footpath outside the property is regularly used by children and their parents going to and from the nearby village school and older children walking to pick up points for the school bus to Wymondham
• visibility will not be significantly improved even with the pruning of the existing hedge due to the garage
• it is not in keeping within a village community
• no amenities other than childrens play area and minimal bus service
• village has already met its LDF requirement for additional housing which includes some affordable housing
• suggest Anglian Water need to confirm the additional occupancy of the property would not be detrimental to the sewage and drainage system
• the individual studio flats could be used in the future for purposes other than that proposed, for example for service uses suffering addiction or emotional, social and behavioural needs which could then affect the safety of children living in the area
• given the hard work by local parishioners to raise funds to complete the children's play ground, it would be a waste and shame for children not to use it given the type of use intended as the property is in close proximity to that.
• previous owners were required to plant a large hedge on the road frontage when building the garage to the front of the property
Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the conversion of an existing residential property in Barnham Broom into four studio self-contained flats for tenants who require supported living. The conversion also includes a communal area, as well as a staff room and managers office. The site will be staffed 24 hours a day to provide support and to also enable the development of life skills. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as they remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.2 The site is within the development boundary for Barnham Broom. Whilst some comments have questioned the appropriateness of the location for such accommodation, the settlement is classified as a service village within the Joint Core Strategy and therefore under Policy 15 this use is acceptable within the development boundaries for the village as any other form of residential accommodation would be.

4.3 As originally submitted, the proposal was for conversion of the existing buildings to five units. This included the conversion of a detached garage to the front of the site into one of the five units. A number of concerns were raised with this proposal, including from the highway authority who were concerned about the level of parking provided for the number of units available along with inadequate visibility on the access due to a hedge that had been planted to screen the garage building. The applicant was advised that this number of units on the site was unlikely to be acceptable. The applicant has therefore revised the scheme so that the detached garage to the front of the site is proposed to be removed, along with the hedge on the front boundary, thereby reducing the number of units on the site to four and increasing the level of parking provision.

4.4 The revised proposal is considered acceptable by Norfolk County Council's highways officer as it provides additional parking and acceptable visibility with the removal of the hedge. They have required conditions relating to the height of any replacement hedge and to the provision and retention of the parking and turning area. Some comments have been made that the hedge was required to be planted when the garage to the front of the site was erected. However, as the garage is now to be removed and given that the leylandii hedge has limited visual value and obstructs visibility on the access, there is no objection to its removal subject to suitable replacement planting.

4.5 Concerns have also been raised about the intensity of the use of the site. The property is a detached dwelling. It has a relatively small curtilage but nonetheless does not have particularly close relationship with its neighbouring properties. On either side of the curtilage there are access tracks to land to the rear. The access to the site is shared with the western of those two access tracks and also the neighbour to the west. Use of this access would potentially be intensified by staff accessing the site. However given the relationship with immediately adjoining properties and given that the property could within its existing permitted use be occupied by up to six people each with their own vehicle it is considered that the impact on the amenities on residential amenity will not be unacceptable. Similarly, given the existing permitted use of the site, it is not considered that the proposed use would have an impact of the sewage capacity and it is understood that the applicant has confirmed this with Anglian Water.

4.6 Comments have also been raised about the extent of the red line which includes the two access tracks mentioned above. This has been raised with the applicant and clarification requested. However, the issue of ownership of the two tracks does not impact on the acceptability in planning terms of the proposal.

4.7 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
Conclusion

5.1 The proposed conversion is acceptable as it provides adequate parking and would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and is within the development boundaries of Barnham Broom, thereby in accordance with Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy, policies IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, and Policies DM3.12, DM3.13 and DM3.14 of the Development Management Policies document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533801 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2015/1036/F  
**Parish**: WRENINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr William Lockwood  
Site Address: Land West Of All Saints Church Church Road Wreningham Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 1 No. (Code5) dwelling using innovative Solar based technology and wildlife enhancing landscape proposal.

Recommendation: Refusal

1. Development in the countryside contrary to policy ENV 8 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF
2. Harm to setting of Grade I listed church
3. Insufficient information to assess archaeological impact

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  
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 2: Landscaping  
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. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
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  
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and setting of Listed Buildings:

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

2. Planning History

2.1 1995/1522 Change of use from agricultural land to burial ground Approved 15.02.96

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council The proposal is not supported by the Parish Council:

- The Parish Plan has evidenced that parishioners value the various open spaces within the village and that there are sufficient large buildings
- The application plot is not within the development boundary
- Concern about circumventing planning rules via paragraph 55
- The visual appearance was considered attractive to some but others considered that it would dominate/overwhelm the church and not be in keeping.
- Concern about potential for future buildings to the front of the plot
- Concern at loss of open space next to Church
- Regular flooding could have implications for proposal
- Technical aspects of the proposal including green measures were welcomed
- Planting plan was welcomed
- Concern about ribbon development along Church Road.

3.2 District Member Request that application be reported to committee in order to truly evaluate the merit of the application, one should take into account the proposals innovative design, the economic & environmental benefits associated with the technology behind the solar store, the beneficial impact such a high quality scheme will have on the longevity of existing landscape, ecology, biodiversity and security.

3.3 SNC Environmental Services (Protection) No objections.

3.4 NCC Ecologist This application is supported by an ecological assessment and Great Crested Newt (GCN) Survey (Norfolk Wildlife Services, April 2014). This report is fit for purpose. The land appears to mainly consist of a disused grazing meadow with limited ecological value.

However GCN were found to be present in 2 of the 7 ponds surveyed, one of which was adjacent to the site. The proposed mitigation outlined from section 5.3 in the ecology report, along with the proposed Landscape Plan (ref 2015:004) should be sufficient to ensure that a licence is obtained and that the ecology of the site is not affected by the development.
3.5 NCC Highways

No objection. The only comment of note, is that there is an existing ditch in the south west corner of the site which takes highway water from Hethel Road. The ditch will therefore need to be maintained in an open state in perpetuity.

3.6 SNC Conservation And Design

Original proposal: In terms of the tests of paragraph 55 of the NPPF, I do not consider that the proposal enhances the existing setting or is sufficiently sensitive to the character of the area. The existing field allows for uninterrupted views (in terms of buildings) of the church across open countryside on three sides a situation that is likely to have existed since the medieval foundation of the church. Although the landscaping measures may be considered 'enhancement' in another context, I do not consider overall that they can be considered enhancement in this location particularly in the context of the setting of the church.

The actual buildings are well designed, although I am not convinced by the use of flint in reference to the church as they are two different building types, with different levels of 'status' in a historic context barns within the local area are of brick and/or timber weatherboarded construction and the design should reference these. Also, although the design is of a good standard if looked at in isolation, in this context it will actually draw attention away from the church tower and therefore harm the setting.

Comments on amendments (3 August): I do not consider that changes in planting mitigate the harmful impact of the development of the site on the setting of the church, and the importance this space as undeveloped gap in a what was historically a dispersed village. The views, and the experience of seeing the church within open countryside (a surviving undeveloped gap in what was a scattered and dispersed village) would just as much be harmfully impacted upon by additional screening landscaping as they would by a large scale new contemporary dwelling.

3.7 Historic England

Original proposal: The proposed dwelling is large in scale and would be overly dominant. In addition to this its design would be incongruous with the surrounding character, it would therefore cause harm to the setting of the grade I listed All Saints Church. We do not consider this harm to be justified or outweighed in line with paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

Comments on amended proposal (30 July): With regard to the location we remain concerned by the change of land use within such close proximity to the church and consider this would cause harm to the setting of grade I listed All Saints Church. Although there may be barns within the setting of the church which are of a similar scale to the proposal, these sit back within the street scene and are not visually prominent. The application site's location alongside the churchyard on Church Road would mean that its large scale would visually compete with the church and would cause harm to its setting and significance. We therefore continue to recommend that unless your authority considers the harm to be outweighed by public benefit you should refuse the application.
Comments on further amendments (28 August): The amendments seek to address the visual impact the scheme would have on the setting of grade I listed All Saints Church, and the scale and location within the street scene. The proposals are not convincing as a traditional threshing barn. The application has not addressed our concerns we therefore continue to recommend that unless your authority considers the harm to be outweighed by public benefit you should refuse the application.

3.8 SNC Flood Defence Officer

No objections. The Environment Agency's fluvial and tidal flood risk maps indicate that the site lies within flood zone 1 with a low risk of flooding from rivers or the sea. The Environment Agency's surface water flood risk map does indicate the site as having a high to medium risk of flooding from surface water. The location of the highest risk area (up to the 1 in 30 year storm event) affects the proposed access and egress from the site.

We would request that a suitable Flood Risk Assessment be carried out with a broad approach of assessing, avoiding, managing and mitigating flood risk being followed.

3.9 NCC Historic Environment Service

The proposed development site is located in the historic core of the settlement of Wreningham, close to the medieval church of All Saints, a location in which Saxon and medieval settlement is often found. In view of this we request that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken and the results submitted prior to determination of the planning application in order to establish the significance of any heritage assets present. In this case evaluation should take the form of trial trenching of the development area.

3.10 Representations

6 letters of support:

- House would be outstanding design of real architectural merit
- Energy efficient design
- Proposed orchard would enhance ecology and be of public benefit
- Proposal would support sustainable energy industry

1 letter of objection:

- The nature of the plot in question is unique and adds to the setting of the church
- Proposal would detract from the rural character of the area
- Impact on local wildlife including birds of prey and great crested newts

4 Assessment

Site and proposal

4.1 The site is a field outside of the development boundary for Wreningham (both within the current adopted local plan and emerging Site Allocations and Policies document), and is adjacent to the grade I listed All Saints Church, which is to the east. To the west and south west are houses on Hethel Road and Church Road, to the north and south is agricultural land.

4.2 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a four bedroom detached dwelling that would be constructed to Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. The applicant has sought to design a proposal to meet the criterial under paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which concerns an outstanding or innovative design
within the countryside. The house would be set back towards the rear of the field and have an appearance similar to that of a barn. Also proposed is a further detached building which would contain a double garage, shower room, lobby and trim pool. The outer end of each wing features a glazed open gable end containing a smaller “utility pod” projection. The inner end of each wing being connected to the central glazed courtyard.

4.3 The majority of the South facing roof would be covered with an “all black” in roof PV and solar thermal panel array – this will read as part of the finished roof surface. The south facing aspect of the central covered courtyard roof would be solar control glazing. A technology consisting of an underground energy bank or “Earth Energy Bank (EEB)” would be used, which would collect energy from the pv panels, and store spare solar heat energy from the summer months in the ground for use in the winter using a heat pump.

Principle of development

4.4 The site is within the countryside and is within the rural policy area of the district, where the Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. The proposal is therefore assessed under policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, which only allows development in exceptional circumstances, which the proposal does not meet. However the applicant has requested the proposal is considered as a truly innovative scheme, in the context of the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Consideration of the exceptional quality / innovative nature of the design

4.5 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.

4.6 The design has been examined under each of these criteria by the Council’s Senior Design and Conservation Officer, and his feedback has informed the following paragraphs.

Outstanding or innovative, helping to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas

4.7 The design and access statement justified this section of the proposal through using innovative solar based energy in a different way to other schemes. It is difficult to know whether this is the case or not, however achieving the high degree of sustainability in a different way to other schemes is certainly a supportive feature of the scheme and could benefit other schemes. It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of the technologies that would be incorporated, accords with this requirement.

Reflect the highest standards of architecture:

4.8 The building is an interesting design based on an agricultural threshing barn. The use of flint in reference to the church is an unusual reference to make considering the very high status of the church and the relatively low status of functional threshing barns. Flint is not a feature of existing barns in the immediate area (i.e. the recently converted threshing barn at Elm Tree Farm, the red brick barn at adjacent Church Farm, and the earlier listed barn at Poplars farm, which is weather-boarded and rendered.). The burnt cedar would create a more appropriate effect, and zinc would replicate later metal roofing found on barns. The introduction of Corten metal panelling to the gable end would make the architecture more distinctive without overpowering the rest of the building – and is in my opinion also a good reference to the metal sheeted agricultural buildings, and perhaps the general rusting old machinery often found around barn complexes.
In terms of functionality and architectural expression, the building appears well designed and well ordered, creating a coherent architectural unit. The refined and simple approach to massing produces a form that replicates the simplicity of threshing barns, but with a modern contemporary twist in terms of materials. The design of the garage compliments rather than detracts from the building. Apart from the use of flint the building would be considered a high standard of building in architectural terms.

Significantly enhance its immediate setting:

The proposal includes various measures to improve the landscaping and bio-diversity of the site. The altered landscape will to some extent lend the site more of a domestic managed landscape appearance (albeit a very natural one) than open agricultural grazing land. The impact on setting also includes the design and construction of the building, and its impact on the character of the area, including the setting of a grade I listed building. At present the church can be seen in the context of the existing field – a situation that has probably remained unchanged for hundreds of years. With the church being such an important feature within the immediate setting, and therefore key to assessing impact, the changes to the landscape and the new building cannot be considered to significantly enhance the immediate setting.

Sensitive to the characteristics of the area:

Although the design and landscaping attempts to be sensitive to the character of the area, the fundamental issue is whether it is sensitive to the setting of the grade I listed church. The change to the existing landscape and construction of a striking new building would result in harm to the grade I asset. Although additional landscaping has been proposed, the views, and the experience of seeing the church within open countryside (a surviving undeveloped gap in what was a scattered and dispersed village) would be harmed just as much by additional screening landscaping as they would by a large scale new contemporary dwelling. The proposal therefore fails to comply with this criterion.

Impact on the setting of the Church

The response from Historic England notes that All Saints Church is constructed in flint with a red pantile roof. It features an unbuttressed square tower which is early medieval with the top half rebuilt in the 19th century. It describes how medieval churches have traditionally dominated their surroundings and that the undeveloped nature of the application field has acted as a buffer between the expanding village and church. Historic England are concerned that the development of the site would increase the density of development next to the church, diminishing the church’s sense of displacement from the village, harming the historical significance of its location away from the main settlement. The response further considers that the proposal design would be overly dominant and incongruous with the surrounding development. The Applicant has sought to address this by lowering the height of the house and increasing the landscaping around the building, but this has not overcome the objection by the Historic England Inspector to the principle of development.

The harm is categorised as less than substantial, in which case under paragraph 134 of the NPPF, it must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst there would be some limited benefit in terms of developing an energy-efficient building, and providing a family dwelling, it is considered that this does not outweigh the harm to the setting of the grade 1 listed building, including open views across the site towards the church. The proposal also conflicts with policy IMP 15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, with regard to the harm that would be caused to the listed building.
Archaeological Impact

4.14 In consultation with Norfolk Historic Environment Service, recent archaeological investigations to the east of the site have uncovered a large Roman oven complex, a Roman pit and a post-medieval pit. To the west, evidence of possible medieval roadside settlement has been revealed on the Church Street frontage. Large numbers of historic metal objects have also been found in the vicinity of the site. The Historic Environment Service has therefore requested that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken in the form of trial trenching and results submitted prior to determination of the planning application.

4.15 The applicant has not carried out such an evaluation and faces a problem in that a license would be required from Natural England, due to the presence of newts in the area. It is understood that such a license is unlikely to be gained unless planning permission has been secured. There is a lack of information to be able to assess the archaeological significance of the site, therefore the proposal does not comply with paragraph 128 of the NPPF.

Flood risk

4.16 The site lies within flood zone 1 with a low risk of flooding in terms of the Environment Agency’s fluvial and tidal flood risk areas. However the Environment Agency’s surface water flood risk map does indicate part of the site as having a high to medium risk of flooding from surface water. It is considered that this matter could be dealt with by a condition, to ensure that an approach of assessing, avoiding, managing and mitigating flood risk is followed.

Other matters

4.17 It is considered the proposal would be acceptable in terms of amenity impacts on neighbouring residential properties, given the large size of the site and distances involved. In addition no objection is raised by the County Highway Authority regarding the access and impact on the highway network. However these matters do not outweigh the main reasons for refusal.

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.

This application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal represents a high standard of design which would deliver a new family home and contain innovative energy efficiency technologies. However it would fail two key tests of paragraph 55, in that it would neither significantly enhance its immediate setting, nor be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. In addition Historic England has raised an objection to the harm that would be caused to the setting of the listed church, which would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. Finally insufficient information has been supplied to be able to assess the archaeological significance of the site. For these reasons, the application is recommended for refusal.
6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 The proposal would represent a new dwelling in the open countryside and fails to meet the criteria under paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, in that it would fail to significantly enhance its immediate setting and by causing harm to the listed church would not be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. It would also conflict with policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

6.2 The proposal would cause harm to the setting of the Grade I listed church, due to its size and prominence and the fact that the buildings and landscaping proposed would lead to the loss of the open views currently available across the field towards the church. The harm would be less than substantial and the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm, in terms of the test required by paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal conflicts with policy 15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011, amendments adopted 2014).

6.3 Insufficient information has been provided to be able to assess the archaeological significance of the site, contrary to the requirements of paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:**
Robert Webb 01508 533681
rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. Appl. No : 2015/1266/F  
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mrs Jane Levers  
Site Address : Ashgate House Ketteringham Lane Hethersett Norfolk  
Proposal : Retention of existing mobile home and change of use of land from paddock to residential use

Recommendation : Refusal

1. Outside of development boundaries and contrary to JCS Policies 2 and 17 and Policy ENV8

Authorise appropriate enforcement action to remove mobile home and cease use.

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and transportation  
Policy 17: Smaller rural communities and the countryside

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

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
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

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/1614  
Erection of a new 4 bedroom house meeting the criteria of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (land to south of application site)  
Not yet determined
3. Consultations

3.1 Hethersett Parish Council
Refuse
- Pending further information as to what the change of use would entail

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
Details of access and parking required if consent is granted
- Statistical data from TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer Services) shows that a residential dwelling is likely to generate 6 vehicular movements per weekday. Whilst the development in this instance is a caravan, there is no reason to assume that the traffic likely to be generated by this development would not be similar to this figure
- The site is removed from services and transport connections that are available in Hethersett. The closest bus stops are on Norwich Road at a distance of 900 metres, although if pedestrians attempted to reach local services and bus connections by foot they would have no option but to walk along sections of narrow unilit carriageway
- The location of this site is borderline location in transport sustainability terms. The occupants will be largely dependent on the private car. Even so, the site would not generate significant movements and therefore the scheme would not have a significant impact on the interests of sustainability

3.4 Representations
5 letters of objection
- this is an agricultural location outside of development boundaries
- the site was originally granted permission on the basis of an agricultural tie, if the requirement for the tie no longer exists then should we not be looking at the validitiy of all the residential properties on the site and not just one caravan?
- Ketteringham Lane is a narrow single track road with passing places that has become a rat run for motorists visiting the waste disposal tip at Station Road which will only get worse with the 60% increase in properties in Hethersett over the next few years
- the applicant's access to this road is known by local drivers to be an accident black spot
- to the north of the site is part of Ketteringham Lane that floods regularly as the drainage infrastructure is inadequate, increasing the number of residential properties will make matters worse
- new entrance is invisible until you are directly in front of it. It also seems to have very poor visibility for any vehicles exiting the site and is potentially dangerous for road users
- detrimental effect on Ketteringham
- there are no close facilities so the question of sustainability must be raised
- inter-visibility must be a concern as the mobile home is very visible in the road and offer less privacy than a standard development
4. Assessment

Proposal

4.1 The application is for the retention of a mobile home and change of use of surrounding land used as a paddock to domestic garden space to be used in association with the mobile home. There is a dwelling immediately to the north of the application site known as Ashgate House which is currently in the same ownership, however this application proposes the creation of a separate residential property in planning terms. The mobile home is already in situ and therefore the application is retrospective. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as they remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.2 The site is located to the south of the settlement of Hethersett on Ketteringham Lane in a location well outside of any development boundaries. The settlement of Ketteringham is closer to the site but the site feels well removed from this settlement by the severing effect of the A11 dual carriageway and the Norwich to Ely railway line. As a consequence the site’s location is rural in character with agricultural fields surrounding the site.

Principle of development

4.3 The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply in accordance with paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and therefore land supply policies cannot be considered up-to-date. The application therefore needs to be assessed against the planning balance in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, and assess any adverse impacts resulting from the development and weigh these against the benefits of permitting development.

Economic role

4.4 The NPPF highlights the economic role as “contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.”

4.5 The site is not located in a location that has been identified as being suitable for new development of this nature. The mobile home is in place and therefore there are no economic benefits from any further construction works although in the longer term local spending by the occupants would create benefits to the local economy and contributing to the vitality of local services. There is therefore a modest level of economic benefit.

Social role

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

4.7 As confirmed above, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and therefore there is a clear social benefit in delivering an additional residential site in this area. However, this site does not relate well to any existing built-up area and therefore would have more limited value due to its isolated location.
Environmental role

4.8 The NPPF confirms that the environmental role as “contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment: and, as part of this, helping to improve bio-diversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”

4.9 As mentioned above, the site is located within an agricultural landscape and outside of the site is relatively open in nature. A core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is reflected in Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that conservation and enhancement of the landscape, not only designated landscapes, contributes to upholding this principle. Whilst the site itself has well established boundaries, development of the site through the granting of consent for the retention of the mobile home and the associated change of use of the paddock would erode the rural character of the local landscape and consequent sense of place, thereby conflicting with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV8 and DM1.3.

4.10 Another core principle of the NPPF is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling. Similarly, the transport strategy in JCS Policy 6 is aimed at promoting healthy travel choices and minimising the need to use the private car.

4.11 A range of services and transport connections are available within the settlement of Hethersett. However, to walk to them residents would have no option to walk along sections of narrow unlit carriageway and as a consequence it is likely that occupants of the site would be reliant to a large extent on the private car for accessing services. It should be noted though that use of the site as a mobile home would not generate significant movements and therefore given the relative proximity of Hethersett it would be difficult to show significant harm on this issue alone.

4.12 No specific harm has been identified from the development in relation to heritage assets, flood risk or ecological impacts.

4.13 While I accept the development of one plot could be considered to make a positive contribution to the shortfall of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area, the adverse impact of the creation of a new residential dwelling in this location with associated curtilage with the subsequent erosion of the rural character of the area outweighs the modest economic and social benefits of developing the site. The development therefore fails to meet the definition of sustainable development, as defined within the NPPF.

Other matters

4.14 As the mobile home is already on the site, enforcement action will need to be authorised to secure its removal. Clearly a reasonable period of time will be needed in order for the applicant to arrange for the mobile home to be removed and to secure alternative accommodation and therefore a period of 6 months is proposed for the mobile home to be removed from the site.

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

5.1 The proposal would result in the erosion of the rural landscape in a location removed from either the settlements of Hethersett or Ketteringham contrary to JCS Policy 2, Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. As a consequence it is considered that in combination these factors outweigh the benefits of development with the scheme therefore conflicting with Paragraphs 8 and 14 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533801 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2015/1427/F  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT  
Applicants Name: Mr John Barrett  
Site Address: Land north of Priory Road Hethersett Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of single new dwelling  
Recommendation: Refusal

1. Harm to character of site and likely loss of trees in conflict with NPPF 11; JCS policy 2; SNLP policy ENV19; emerging policies DM 1.4 and DM 4.9.

Subject to expiry of site notice consultation period

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 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
ENV 19: Tree Preservation Orders  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
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  
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies

1.7 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 2005/2594 Proposed dwelling Refused 30/1/06

2.2 1989/1080 Erection of one dwelling Refused and Appeal dismissed 16/5/90

2.3 1983/1758 Erection of one dwelling Refused 27/7/83

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Should be refused
   • Not in keeping with street scene
   • Overdevelopment of available land
   • Impact on trees with TPOs

3.2 District Member To Committee in view of contentious nature of case and need to hear local concerns in full

3.3 NCC Highways No objection subject to conditions – set back walls 2m from carriageway

3.4 SNC Environmental Services (Protection) Some concern at proximity to Public House

3.5 NCC Ecologist No comments received

3.6 SNC Flood Defence Officer No objection. Advisory comments

3.7 SNC Conservation Officer Good design and does not impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings. Recommends height of boundary wall is reduced.

3.8 SNC Landscape Officer Permission should not be granted. Concerns regarding impact of development on TPO trees and future pressure for tree removal in view of site limitations – location of services and outbuildings problematic Amended plans do not address all concerns.
3.9 Representations

Objections from 6 addresses
- No need in light of other developments
- Keep natural entrance to Priory Road and replace trees taken out
- Woodland used by variety of wildlife
- Limited parking on road and safety risk to pedestrians including children
- Loss of buffer between housing and Public House noise
- Spoil outlook onto trees
- Ecological Report was undertaken after tree felling and brush clearance
- Dangerous access with limited visibility made worse by parking
- Overlooking from west facing windows
- Note previous refusals so should still be refused
- Siting of building on edge of footpath increases its intrusion
- Pressure for future occupiers to prune trees for more light in future

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site falls within the Development Limit for Hethersett as defined in the current and emerging Local Plan. Hethersett also falls within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. In these circumstances paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable residential proposals unless there is significant and demonstrable harm which outweighs the benefits of the development. To assess the sustainability of the proposal it is necessary to consider the economic, social and environmental impacts of the development. This will also reveal any harm which needs to be weighed against the benefits.

Economic Impact

4.2 The construction of a single dwelling will bring some benefit in the construction phase, providing employment and economic benefit to suppliers. The occupiers would also add to spending in the local economy although, given the large scale of growth already provided for in Hethersett, such benefits are marginal. There is also some concern that there could be conflict between the proposed residential use and the immediately adjacent Public House which actively uses its outdoor space that borders the plot. The potential for noise complaint against the business could to some extent counter the economic benefit.

Social Impact

4.3 The new dwelling would clearly provide a home for its occupiers although, as with the economic benefits, the existing size and future growth elsewhere in this village means that the benefit is more marginal than it would be in a small settlement.

Environmental Impact

4.4 Environmental impacts are potentially various, but the main issues to be considered are design; ecology/landscape; setting of nearby listed buildings; and parking/highway safety.

Design

4.5 The proposed design of the dwelling is acknowledged to be of a high quality and it seeks to address the constraints of the site while producing an attractive building. The design is supported by the Conservation Officer although it is suggested that the high boundary wall along the frontage would create a harsh feature in the approach to Priory Road and it should be lower with hedge planting instead.
Ecology/Landscape

4.6 The site contains substantial mature trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. The site originally formed part of a continuous tree belt that has been severed by the entrance to Priory Road. The trees each side of the entrance still create a distinctive woodland character to the approach to the development beyond and are a significant feature helping to define the edge of the built-up area as well as having their own intrinsic value.

4.7 The trees and their root protection zones severely limit the space within the site that can accommodate building or other works without causing direct damage to the trees. The original design of the dwelling has been amended by reducing its footprint to make more space for associated soakaway and drainage works. The 4 bedroom dwelling is to be sited hard against the highway boundary but would still not leave enough space for garaging, but a parking area is to be formed using a 'no dig' method to avoid root damage. Even so, the Landscape Officer has some concern that the necessary levelling and surfacing works in this area may cause some damage. No other outbuildings can be conveniently accommodated without encroaching into the root protection zones.

4.8 The garden area of the dwelling would be dominated by the surrounding mature trees and the Landscape Officer considers it likely that this close relationship would pose at least a perceived safety threat to the occupiers of the plot. The main rear aspect of the dwelling is to the north and the trees would have an overbearing impact on the garden area. In such circumstances it is likely that there would be considerable pressure to remove further trees in the future which would be difficult to resist if residential development were approved.

4.9 Although local people have commented on the wildlife associated with the site there is no evidence to prove harm to protected species. However, the loss of further trees would represent harm to the habitat value of the site and visual harm to the character of the area. In this respect the development would not represent sustainable development.

Impact on Heritage Assets

4.10 There are two listed buildings in the vicinity, the Priory and the Kings Head Public House. The Conservation Officer is satisfied however, that the proposed development would not cause material harm to the setting of these buildings.

Parking/Highway Safety

4.11 Local people have commented on the potential conflict between the proposed development and the on-street parking that takes place in this area. Highway safety concerns have been expressed particularly for pedestrians, including children. However, the Highway Authority has expressed no objection provided the front wall is set back 2m from the carriageway. Adequate parking space is also shown within the plot on the proposed plans. Although the new access would marginally reduce available on-street parking space, I do not consider that an objection on highway safety grounds could be sustained.

4.12 This development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (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.
5. Conclusion

5.1 Although the design of the building is acknowledged to be of high quality and there would be limited economic and social benefits from the development, the adverse impact it would cause directly to the character of the site and in the future through likely tree removal, would constitute significant harm. This harm would be contrary to the requirement to protect the natural environment as contained in NPPF section 11; Joint Core Strategy policy 1; SNLP policy ENV19; and emerging local plan policies DM1.4 and DM4.9. This significant harm would outweigh the benefits of the development and the application should consequently be refused.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett 01508 533794 ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2015/1458/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name: Mr Paul Rochford  
Site Address: Land North Of Suton Street Suton Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of a new 5 bedroomed dwelling with double garage.  

Recommendation: Refusal

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  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 6: Access and transportation

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. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

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

DEFERRED
1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Recent Planning History

2.1 2014/0459 Erection of a new code level 6 dwelling. Approved (adjacent site).

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council
Refuse
• Lack of sensitivity to local area

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
• To ensure that it meets all four criterion of Para 55 of NPPF

3.3 SNC Senior
Conservation and
Design officer
Refuse
• The design of the dwelling in this location does not meet the high test of NPPF 55 which would make an exceptional case and allowed against policy ENV8 and the protection of the open countryside

3.4 SNC Flood Defence
Officer
No objections subject to conditions

3.5 SNC Environmental
Services (Protection)
No objections subject to conditions

3.6 NCC Highways
No objections subject to conditions

3.7 Representations
4 letter of objection to the original submission
• Entrance to site directly opposite the gate to our front door
• Suton Street is a narrow country lane and the siting of the entrance is potentially dangerous to motorist, cyclist and lorries
• Style of house not in keeping with the rest of the street and from the drawings represents a very large railway carriage and not an attractive one
• Building is ugly and does not fit the character of this small community of houses
• Next door is a newly built horse area which will attract more traffic when it opens
• No planning permission being given for additional dwellings in Suton
• New build without sufficient investment in the community and the infrastructure as a whole
• An opportunistic application to over develop agricultural land by simply hiding behind the 'Eco' tag
• Does nothing to enhance its immediate vicinity or the surrounding one either
• Village has no amenities

9 letter of support (which includes letters from the landowner) to the original submission
• Refreshing to see sustainable eco development in our Parish
• Future generations are dependent on this generation building homes that are self-supporting in design
Hope SNDC supports and puts Wymondham and surrounding areas on the map for developing well designed houses that are sustainable and sensitive to the environment

Exciting house and would be a welcomed addition

People who criticise the design have no vision

It is to be commended architecturally

Hats off to the architect

Cannot keep building in Towns but Countryside should be innovative and this one is that

Love the design of this house which looks like a rounded roofed barn and it really this in with farm land surroundings

To the amended plans

3 letter of objection

A steel and glass monstrosity that is just not in keeping with anything else in the village and shows a complete lack of sensitivity to the local area

Other planning permissions refused that have been more traditional and in keeping

Wymondham Town council have opposed the planning application

Already have one so called Eco building nearby let alone the prospect of a second being built even closer

Both this application and the 2014/0459 are on land owned by the same person

Situated in the open countryside where National and local policies seek to restrict new dwellings

- sites are not in fill area
- Greenfield and contrary to ENV8 and Planning Policy Statement 1-7
- Whether Eco home or not they will cause harm to the rural character of the area

3 letters of support (including the landowner)

Amended position further adds to the 'agricultural feel'

- Compliments the surrounding landscape
- Suton Street is made up of a mish mash of different types of houses and there is nothing here that can be considered of a certain style or period
- An exception and 'Grand Design' that is worthy of being built in South Norfolk and something the Council should complement and be proud to approve
- It is within the boundaries of the village and certainly falls into a sustainable and innovative category

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a 5 bedrooomed house with double garage at land north of Suton Street, Suton. The site lies on an existing field/open grassland, to the southwest is an existing bungalow and to the northeast a 'para 55' house has planning permission (2014/0459), this house is located in the northwest corner of the neighbouring field and is designed with straw bales to complement its more open agricultural setting.

4.2 The site lies within the D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place making Guide as being composed of 'large expanse of flat landform with little variation over long distances with strong open horizons' with 'vernacular character partly eroded by modern estate type development'.
4.3 Within this area, Suton is a dispersed settlement with no identifiable 'core'. The surrounding area consists of agricultural land, with a mixture of small clusters of historic labourer's cottages, detached farmhouses on the south east side of Suton Lane and some more modern development to the west along Suton Lane. The modern dwellings are predominately small scale bungalows or set back some distance from the road behind established landscaping, so are relatively small scale and discreet in views.

In this part of the settlement narrow lanes with thick hedgerows and tree planting, together with agricultural activity, creates a very rural feel.

4.4 The main issues in this case are; the principle of development in this location and design, highway safety, residential amenity and drainage

Principle of development and design

4.5 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.

4.6 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. Suton is situated within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, its housing supply related policies are considered to no longer be up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 also confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the application represents sustainable development.

Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 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 but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.7 The following is an assessment of whether the proposed dwelling can be considered to represent sustainable development.

4.8 The NPPF three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental, looks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's need and support its health, social and cultural well-being and protecting our natural, built and historic environment.

4.9 The proposal is for a single dwelling which would make a modest contribution to the economy of the area through employment at the construction stage and subsequent spending from the occupiers.

4.10 Due to the isolated location of the site the social benefits of the provision of one dwelling in this location do not outweigh the significant harm to the open countryside of the undeveloped nature of this location.

4.11 The site is not located within a development boundary nor is it close to one and is remote from local services and transport connections. It is considered the development of this site would erode the character of the area which is characterised by agricultural land, with a mixture of small clusters of buildings.
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4.12 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered the harm of providing one dwelling in this location which would encroach into the open countryside contrary to the provisions of ENV8, would significantly outweigh the limited benefits in social and economic terms. As such, when considered as a whole, the scheme does not represent sustainable development.

4.13 Having established that the scheme does not represent a sustainable form of development in the context of the NPPF, it is necessary to have regard to paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking. This states that:

“where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
• Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
• Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.”

4.14 If this site were to be developed the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and would not protect and enhance the locality and therefore result in significant and demonstrable harm to the open nature of this area. While I accept the development of one plot could be considered to make a positive contribution to the shortfall of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area, the erosion of the open countryside in this instance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of developing the site and is in conflict with para 14 of the NPPF and ENV8 of the SNLP 2003.

4.15 An exception to the site being in a sustainable location 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 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

4.16 The application has been submitted as a ‘para 55’ development and it has therefore 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, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural area

The design has an interesting reference to a Dutch barn like architecture with a curved barrel roof. This simple shape can be extended with a 'concertina' effect to allow for future adaptability. This is an interesting concept and will mean the building can change with family life whilst retaining much of the same appearance, just increasing the length. The building will also create a simple structural envelope which would create flexible and adaptable spaces internally. Overall it is considered that this is a simple, 'clean' architectural design, which can be considered to introduce ideas of modular construction and adaptability. Such an approach could contribute to raising the standard of design. The application can be considered to meet this criterion.

b) Reflect the highest standards in architecture

The building is a contemporary form with simple and coherent structure. With conditions to ensure that detailing is good, the design should achieve a high standard and this criterion can therefore be considered as being met.
c) Significantly enhance its immediate setting

The area lies within D1: Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland, as defined in the South Norfolk Place making Guide. Suton and its environment is a flat area of farmland. Existing cottages and red brick farmhouses have simple vernacular forms unlike for example the large farmhouses with decorative gables found in other parts of the district.

In assessing the degree of enhancement, the development will be in part of an existing field with established hedgerows. There will be little impact on the neighbouring residential development to the southwest due to extensive mature landscaping of some height; however concerns were raised at the relationship in terms of the impact on the setting of Avalon farmhouse which lies directly opposite the site entrance.

The agent has responded to the concerns raised by moving the dwelling and its access away from the lane. Notwithstanding the amended siting I still have concerns regarding how this building will be considered to significantly enhance the immediate setting of where it is located and how sensitive it is to the local character of the area. By moving the building away from the road and positioning it in a larger field, with a shared access but no apparent visible relationship to any other buildings, the proposed dwelling now appears isolated in a field with no connection to the landscape or built character around it. There is no reasoning why the building is proposed for this location rather than anywhere else in the local open countryside. Therefore it is considered that the building will not enhance the immediate setting as developing this site changes the character of a field that contributes to the character of the open countryside and therefore is not acceptable.

d) Sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area

This is a very large contemporary modern building and is distinctively different in terms of form and materials from any historic dwellings in the area. It is noted that in the Alburgh para 55 appeal (2011/0451) a similar contemporary dwelling designed with a barrel roof was commented on by the Inspector in that case as follows: "Due to its position, scale and contemporary design the proposed building would have an urbanising effect."

The building has not been designed specifically for this landscape context and therefore could be sited elsewhere. Although set back from the road, the building will be viewed as a very large and incongruous structure when viewed in context with the surrounding area and therefore is not acceptable.

Highway safety

4.17 The proposal is accessed off Suton Street via the existing access that serves The Lodge. Whilst local residents have raised concerns regarding the highway safety of Suton Street, the application has been assessed by the Highway Officer has raised no objections. As such it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Residential amenity

4.18 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 dwellings 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

4.19 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

4.20 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.

4.21 If approved, this application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The site is situated within the village of Suton which does not have the benefit of a development boundary nor is it close to one and is remote from local services and transport connections. For this reason the site is considered to be remote from existing settlement boundaries and not in a sustainable location. In view of the above, whilst the proposal would have limited benefits as set out in paragraphs 7, 8 and 14 of the NPPF, these are outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the character of the area and its unsustainable location, contrary to saved policy ENV8 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), policy 6 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011, amended in 2014), emerging policies 1.1 and 1.3 of the Development Management Policies Document (Submission document November 2013).

5.2 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 proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to 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.

5.3 The site is open agricultural land, which characterises this area together with narrow lanes, with a mixture of small clusters of historic labourer’s cottages, detached farmhouses on the south east side of Suton Lane and some more modern development to the west along Suton Lane. The proposed design, together with its siting and size of the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the open nature of the agricultural land and would be significantly harmful to its immediate setting and would also be demonstrably harmful to the defining characteristics of this part of South Norfolk. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccourtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk

DEFERRED
DEFERRED
11. **Appl. No**: 2015/1810/RVC  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH  
**Applicants Name**: Mr B Kemp  
**Site Address**: Villa Farm  Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ  
**Proposal**: Variation of conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 9 (Landscaping), 10 (Earth Bunding) and 22 (Access, Parking and Vehicle Turning) of planning permission 2009/0910/F.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
1. In accordance with approved plans  
2. No occupation of piggery until 40% of the proposed employment floorspace is available for employment use  
3. No more than one dwelling shall be occupied on the site and once the piggery is occupied as a dwelling Villa Farm House shall no longer be occupied as such.  
4. No more than 60% (747 sq m) of the total floor space shall be occupied for B1(a) and B1(b) purposes.  
5. Removal of pd rights on piggery conversion  
6. Landscaping Management Plan and implementation  
7. Retention of existing trees  
8. No external storage of goods or materials  
9. External lighting  
10. Retention of staff parking and turning for that specific use.

12. **Appl. No**: 2015/1811/F  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH  
**Applicants Name**: Mr B Kemp  
**Site Address**: Villa Farm  Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ  
**Proposal**: Retention of the change of use of land to a car sales display area, associated staff and customer parking area and vehicle turning area, access, retention of and re-profile of existing earth bunds and amended Landscaping Scheme.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
1. Full permission  
2. In accordance with approved plans  
3. Staff parking and turning areas not to be used for car sales.  
4. Landscaping Management Plan and implementation  
5. External lighting

13. **Appl. No**: 2015/1812/F  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH  
**Applicants Name**: Mr B Kemp  
**Site Address**: Villa Farm  Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ  
**Proposal**: Retention of use of land for agricultural storage purpose (ie sugar beet, cereals, straw and agricultural Fertilisers); retention and re-profiling of existing earth bunds and amended landscape scheme.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
1. Full permission  
2. In accordance with approved plans  
3. Landscaping management plan and implementation.
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 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 5 : The Economy
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
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 6: Southern Bypass protection zone
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.1 Employment and business development
DM3.9 Design Principles

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document

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 2014/0368 Proposed change of use of barn to car repairs and MOT testing station  Approved

2.2 2014/2650 Variation of condition 6 of planning permission 2014/0368 to include car sales within the permitted uses.  Withdrawn

2.3 2012/1043 Change of use to a concrete hardstanding and grassed area to allow storage for potential occupiers of the already approved employment units.  Refused

2.4 2012/0229 Concrete hard standing to allow external storage for potential occupiers of adjacent approved employment units  Refused

2.5 2009/0910 Change of use of piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to B1 (a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements.  Refused

2.6 2009/0283 Change of use of piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to B1 and B8 uses, with associated access improvements.  Withdrawn

2.7 1997/0700 Erection of two agricultural cattle & storage buildings  Refused

2.8 1997/0157 Construction of new vehicular access from B1108  Refused

Appeal History

2.9 2009/0910 Development Appeal - Change of use of piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to B1 (a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements.  Appeal Allowed

3. Consultations

3.1 Bawburgh Parish Council  No objection to application 2015/1810 and 2015/1812 (Retention of use of land for agricultural storage purposes and retention of existing earth bunds and amended landscape scheme) but objects to application 2015/1811 (Car sales display area) on the grounds that it would add to traffic movements on the busy B1108 road which has a history of accidents.

3.2 District Member  To committee - in view of the considerable public interest and the long history of non-compliance.
• No explanation of why open meadow area is reduced by 50%.
• Concerns sugar-beet storage area will be used for storage of vehicles
• No indication of vehicle movements associated with agricultural storage
• No justification for huge mounds of earth.

3.3 NCC Highways

No objection. It is considered that the proposed land use will not have a material impact on traffic levels in the area. The site has an existing and acceptable access to the adopted highway.

Second hand car sales is a relatively benign use in traffic terms and as such it is considered that the the car sales aspect of the application is likely to result in a low traffic generation. The majority of vehicular movements from customers are likely to take place outside of the peak traffic hours. This is confirmed by The Agent who has indicted that the number of customers visiting the site is low with 5 – 10 customers visiting the site per week to view cars for sale

As such the impact of the car sales is likely to be minimal. There will be very limited material increase in traffic in the peak hours for traffic on the B1108. It is therefore not considered that a highway objection could be sustained to the development that is being proposed.

3.4 SNC Landscape Officer

The revised planting and mounding details are more in line with the concept that was previously established. The 2 metre mounding is higher than would be my preference, but if it were to be complemented by an extended run of hedging, it could be acceptable.

Suggestions made regarding the possibility of extending hedgerow planting along the southern boundary and providing a landscape management plan prior to approval which could be conditioned. Otherwise this would need to be requested via condition.

3.5 SNC Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection. Hours of operation may need to be clarified.

3.6 Little Melton Parish Council

Object strongly to use of the site for car sales:
• concerns about increased traffic associated with car sales
• visual impact of site on Landscape protection zone
• unsustainable location
• proposals not in accordance with original approved scheme which was allowed by the Planning Inspector.

3.7 Representations

19 letters of objection.
• Not suitable in open countryside near a landscape protection zone
• Increased traffic on a dangerous road
• The earth banks and industrialisation of the site are contrary to its rural setting
• Dangerous entrance/exit onto Watton Road
• Reduction of the open meadowland within site
• Bunds not required to screen farming activity
4 Assessment

Background

4.1 In August 2010 permission was granted on appeal for the change of use of a piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to offices (B1), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) uses with associated car parking, landscaping and access improvements. A further permission was granted in June 2014 for the change of use of a barn to car repairs and a MOT testing station.

4.2 In October 2014 the Council was made aware that car sales were taking place from the site without planning permission. The applicant was informed that the development required planning consent and an application was received in December 2014 to vary conditions of the car repair/MOT use to include car sales. Following a site visit and assessment of the application it was established that there were further breaches of planning control, because the access route and landscaping required under permission ref. 2009/0910 had not been implemented and a number of bunds had been constructed that did not have permission.

4.3 It was established that further applications were required to fully regularise activities on site and to achieve a suitable landscape scheme. As a result application 2014/2650 was withdrawn and, following pre-application discussions, the three applications that are the subject of this report were submitted.

Proposals

4.4 The applications seek retrospective permission for part of the site to be used for car sales (2015/1811); retrospective permission for a revised site layout for the original scheme that was approved on appeal, which allows for different internal access and parking arrangements (2015/1810); and permission for a revised landscaping scheme, including a landscaped area for agricultural storage purposes (2015/1812).

Principle of development

4.5 The original permission was allowed on appeal in 2010. Since that time the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012) came into force and so has the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS, 2011 amendments adopted 2014). Both of these documents give a stronger emphasis to the need to support proposals for economic development, including in rural areas, than existed at the time of the appeal decision. In addition policy DM 2.1 of the emerging Development Management Policies document states that development proposals which provide for the adaptation and expansion of existing businesses will be supported providing there is no significant adverse impact on the local and natural environment, character of the countryside, or neighbouring occupiers.

4.6 Therefore the principle of what is now an established commercial site for the use of car sales is in accordance with planning policy. It is important however to assess whether the proposals are acceptable in terms of their impacts.

Visual impact

4.7 The car sales operation is screened from public view by a number of earth bunds, and set back within the site away from the main road. However the bunds along the site frontage do not benefit from planning permission and are in themselves unsightly, as they have not been properly graded or seeded. The applicant was informed of this and invited to submit a new landscaping scheme, which has been developed in discussion with Officers. The revised scheme would include bunds of a more acceptable form, and would include the planting of hedgerows, which would help soften the impact of the development and be far
more acceptable in visual terms. The outcome would be a commercial site which features a large degree of ‘soft’ and ‘green’ landscaping, which would be sympathetic to its rural position.

4.8 With regards to the objectors concerns about the impact on the small ‘meadow’ area within the site (which is reduced in size as a result of the proposal), this area would not be visible from the wider area following the implementation of the landscaping scheme. The reduction of this area is considered to have little impact and would not be a reason to withhold planning permission.

4.9 In terms of the impact on the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, the proposals would have a limited impact on this. Essentially the applications consist of relatively minor revisions to previously approved scheme for the redevelopment of a farm, and the incorporation of car sales which would be screened from public view. There is no material conflict with policy ENV 6 of the Local Plan. Overall, the proposals accord with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and guidance within the NPPF in terms of visual impact.

Highways impact

4.10 Concerns have been raised by local residents that the site is accessed from the Watton Road, where there is fast moving traffic. There are concerns that the proposal to use the site for car sales would lead to increased vehicle movements which would be unsustainable and potentially cause highway safety issues. Until recently a section of bunding restricted visibility from the entrance to the east, and this has led to further objections. This section of bunding has however now been lowered, ensuring satisfactory visibility exists.

4.11 The car sales area accommodates 30 cars and is already operating. In terms of vehicle movements, the applicant has stated that Mr Kemp undertakes car sales by advertising primarily on the internet but also in the local newspapers. Some customers do visit the site to inspect the vehicles whilst a large proportion buy vehicles unseen. Many of the vehicles are shipped worldwide or delivered to other parts of the UK having been purchased via the internet unseen. Mr Kemp sells approx. 10 – 15 vehicles locally per month with approximately 5 – 10 customers visiting the site per week to view cars for sale.

4.12 Mr Kemp trades Monday to Friday during normal business hours of 8am to 5pm and Saturday to 1pm. Most customers telephone before visiting the site. The numbers of customers visiting the site varies from day to day, there are some days when no customers visit and other days when 3 people will visit, most customers visit during the day or Saturday mornings outside peak traffic hours.

4.13 With regard to the traffic movements associated with the agricultural storage. It is stressed that all agricultural storage is associated with Thickthorn Farm’s agricultural operations. There are many weeks when there is no traffic generated. The sugar beet harvesting will commence during the second week of October and there will be approximately 10 tractors and trailers bringing sugar beet for storage in the compound. The sugar beet will be stored on the site until permits are obtained during December when 3-4 lorries per day will take sugar beet from the site to Cantley for processing. At other times of the year straw, fertilisers and other agricultural products are stored on the site.

4.14 This information has been assessed by the County Highway Officer, who has commented that car sales is actually a relatively benign use in terms of vehicle movements. He is satisfied that there would be relatively low levels of traffic and that the majority of movements would be outside of peak traffic hours. The Highway Officer is therefore satisfied that there would be no undue impact from increased vehicle movements on the B1108 (Watton Road), and is also satisfied with the parking and layout proposed, commenting that it is logical and acceptable. No highway objection is raised to the proposal, and there is no conflict with local plan policy IMP 8.
Other matters

4.15 Concern has been raised that the agricultural storage area could be used for car sales, yet this would require planning permission and any such use without permission would be at risk of enforcement action. There are also concerns at the retrospective nature of some of the proposals, yet the applications must be assessed on their merits. The scheme as proposed is considered to comply with relevant national and local planning policies. If the applicant fails to implement the approved landscaping scheme he would be at risk of enforcement action.

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

4.17 The applications are not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because no additional floor space is proposed.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The applications seek to regularise the use of part of the site for car sales, regularise an amended layout from that which was originally approved, and provide a satisfactory landscaping scheme to address the visual harm that has been caused by some of the landscape works carried out to date. In all aspects the proposals are found to be acceptable and in accordance with planning policy. Although it is recognised that the site is locally contentious due to its planning history and the retrospective nature of parts of the development, there is considered to be no justifiable grounds to refuse planning consent.

6. Recommendations:

6.1 Appl. No: 2015/1810/RVC - Variation of conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 9 (Landscaping), 10 (Earth Bunding) and 22 (Access, Parking and Vehicle Turning) of planning permission 2009/0910/F:

Recommend approval subject to conditions.

6.2 Appl. No : 2015/1811/F - Retention of the change of use of land to a car sales display area, associated staff and customer parking area and vehicle turning area, access, retention of and re-profile of existing earth bunds and amended Landscaping Scheme.

Recommend approval subject to conditions.

6.3 Appl. No: 2015/1812/F - Retention of use of land for agricultural storage purpose (ie sugar beet, cereals, straw and agricultural Fertilisers); retention and re-profiling of existing earth bunds and amended landscape scheme:

Recommend approval subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533681 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applicants Name : Mr Stephen White  
Site Address : 32 Main Road Swardeston Norfolk NR14 8DF  
Proposal : Retention of climbing frame in back garden & proposed bike storage to front of house  
Recommendation : Refusal of retention of climbing frame in back garden  

1. Adverse effect on neighbours privacy and amenities  
2. In accordance with approved plan  

1. Planning Policies  
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU19: Extensions to existing dwelling  
1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.  

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

2. Planning History  
2.1 2010/0030 Single and two storey rear extensions, attached garage to side and erection of front porch  

3. Consultations  
3.1 Parish Council Object  
Proposals obtrusive climbing frame in the back garden is positioned and constructed in such a way as to seriously invade the privacy of the neighbouring property  

3.2 District Member Can be delegated
3.3 Representations
1 letter of no comment
3 letters of objection
- Climbing frame intrusive
- Strongly disagree to where it is sited
- Would not like to see any building at front of address
- Climbing frame too tall overlooking all surrounding gardens and houses
- Anyone on the frame is able to look into surrounding gardens destroying privacy and into dwellings

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks permission for the retention of a climbing frame in the back garden and the erection of a proposed bike store to the front of the applicant’s house. The application site is within the front and rear curtilage of the applicant’s dwelling. A close boarded wooden fence defines the rear boundary with open fields located to the south of the site. The site is located within the development limits for Swainsthorpe.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of a good design and do not adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling or the street scene to a material degree, or have an adverse impact on the privacy or amenities of the neighbouring properties. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent/part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The play equipment has been erected within the rear garden of the applicant’s dwelling. The garden tapers from the main dwelling to the rear fence and this equipment has been sited to the rear of the curtilage. Due to its height, proximity to the boundary and inclusion of a raised platform planning permission is required.

4.4 The play equipment is a structure with an overall height of 3.3 metres and is visible above the boundary fence. The equipment includes a raised platform which has caused concern regarding overlooking and a loss of privacy/amenities due to the platform height of 1.5 metres. The distance to the boundary is 1.2 metres.

4.5 Concerns have been raised as summarised above, regarding the potential overlooking and loss of privacy and amenities when the equipment is being used. The situation is made more sensitive due to the narrow width of the gardens. I have viewed the equipment from both the applicant’s and the neighbour’s rear gardens. From the adjoining neighbour the structure is highly noticeable above the existing boundary fence and could appear dominant to the neighbouring occupiers when within their rear garden. The structure is of a high quality and has been sited at the bottom of the garden which lessens its impact in the area close to the dwellings, but its proximity to the site boundary makes it more prominent from the adjoining property.

4.6 Due to the height of the structure and the inclusion of a raised platform, concerns have also been raised as to the possibility of overlooking when the structure is in use resulting in a loss of privacy and amenities to the neighbouring property. On balance I consider that, if an application had been made before the equipment was erected, we would have sought to negotiate a siting and design which reduced the impact on the adjoining property. In these circumstances I consider the application to retain the play equipment in its present position and form should be refused and the applicant be invited to discuss possible changes to the siting and design of the equipment and to submit a revised application accordingly.
4.7 In relation to the erection of a storage shed to the front of the site, concern has also been raised that this may look untidy or prevent a view. However, after assessing the site I consider the front gardens are large enough that an outbuilding as detailed (only 2m square), shielded by a natural boundary, will not result in a significant negative impact on either the street scene or the neighbour’s amenities.

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

4.9 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion and recommendations

5.1 The proposed bike storage to the front of the applicant’s dwelling would not significantly adversely affect the amenity of nearby residents and therefore should be approved with appropriate conditions.

5.2 The play equipment would not have been supported in its current form and location, so retrospective permission should be refused and the applicant invited to discuss an alternative scheme.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chrissy Briggs 01508 533832 cbriggs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
15. **Appl. No**: 2015/1976/H  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND  

**Applicants Name**: Wilkinson Builders Reepham  
**Site Address**: 40 The Street Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JT  
**Proposal**: Elevational treatment to incorporate render with brickwork features & oak cladding to gables of existing bungalow. Amendment to garage previously approved to include extension to provide store to rear.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Matching Materials

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

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

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan  
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies  
DM3.5 Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements

2. **Planning History**

2.1 FH\11122\ Erection of Bungalow  
Approved

2.2 2013/0790 Removal of condition 1 of planning permission FH\11122\ - removal of the agricultural occupancy  
Approved

2.3 2013/0839 Proposed double garage  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
No comments to make

3.2 District Member  
Can be delegated.

3.3 SNC Flood Defence Officer  
No objection.

3.4 Representations  
No letters of representations received.
4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a detached bungalow and curtilage which is accessed off a track on The Street in Poringland and seeks to replace the elevation materials and amend the proposed garage previously approved. The application site is between the existing residential properties and the housing site being developed by Norfolk Homes. There is an existing bungalow to the east (No 38) and permission has been granted for two new bungalows to the west, a new dwelling to the south east and the conversion of the barn to the south west to two dwellings. There are two storey dwellings running along The Street.

4.2 The site falls within the development boundary for the village of Poringland and is identified as a Key Service Centre under the Joint Core Strategy.

4.3 The application is being reported to committee because a Director of the applicants, Wilkinson Builders (Reepham) Ltd, is related to an employee of South Norfolk Council.

4.4 The application is for a pitched roof detached double garage with additional storage room and alterations to the elevation materials of the bungalow.

4.5 This particular part of Poringland has a very mixed style of development and it is considered that the changes to elevation materials incorporating render with brickwork features and oak cladding to gables represents a good quality design, which takes into account the mixed character of the immediate area.

4.6 The proposed garage has a simple design which will match the materials of the bungalow and contributes positively to appearance of the surrounding area. Planning permission was granted previously for a detached double garage which did not include the rear storage room and featured two separate garage doors to the front. The proposed double garage features a single up and over door, a storage room, and is single storey with no windows. The land levels where the garage is proposed to be sited have been lowered. The property boundary includes hedges to the rear and a 1.8 metre high fence between No. 40 and No. 38 to the east, which provides adequate screening. I consider this proposal will not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the neighbours.

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

4.8 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – less than 100 sq m of new floor space.

5. Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the proposed development accords with the principles of the adopted and emerging policies as set out above, and as such the application is recommended for approval subject to the above conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Peter Freer 01508 533848 pfreer@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : PORINGLAND
Applicants Name : Wilkinson Builders (Reepham) Ltd
Site Address : 36 The Street Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JT
Proposal : Proposed fence on road frontage
Recommendation : Authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with amended plans

Subject to the expiry of the re-consultation period

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

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

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. Full weight cannot be
given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in late October 2015. In line with paragraph
216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) significant weight can be applied to the
emerging policies as the Inspector’s report has been received on 28th September 2015 which
found the plan sound.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/0577 Discharge of conditions 5 - ground levels, 6 -
external materials, 13 - boundary treatments
of permission 2012/0674/F
Approved

2.2 2012/0674 Replacement of existing prefab dwelling by
detached house and garage
Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council To be reported if appropriate

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways No objections

3.4 Representations None to date

4 Assessment

4.1 The property is a newly constructed dwelling, situated on a residential road within the
development limits of Poringland. The proposal seeks consent for a 1 metre high fence on
the front boundary of the site.
4.2 The proposal was originally for a 600mm high brick wall, however, due to the proposed wall being sited within the Root Protection Area of an existing Oak tree in the south east corner of the site, a wall would not be acceptable. The fence post holes will be hand dug and appropriate protective measures carried out to prevent damage to the tree roots.

4.3 The application is being reported to committee because a Director of the applicants, Wilkinson Builders (Reepham) Ltd, is related to an employee of South Norfolk Council.

4.4 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.5 The proposed fence runs part of the way along the front boundary with the footpath and curves in around the Oak tree. Front boundary treatment on both sides of the road consists of a mix of walls, fencing and hedging. I consider that the fence will not result in detriment to the visual amenities and character of the area.

4.6 The NCC: Highways Officer has no objections. Due to the siting and height of the proposed fence, I do not consider highway safety will be endangered or the free flow of traffic on the highway will be prejudiced.

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

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the proposal does not involve any floor area.

5. 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 Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Rachel Flaxman 01508 533985 rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 05 September 2015 to 01 October 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/0168</td>
<td>Diss Salisbury House  84 Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG</td>
<td>Mr Barry Smith</td>
<td>Division of garden space, to erect a new 4 bedroom dwelling and retention of existing garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0787</td>
<td>Poringland Subdivision of Garden of 21 Clearview Drive Norwich Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>Ms S Kenward</td>
<td>Proposed 3 bedroom chalet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0937</td>
<td>Wymondham 14 Marion Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0ND</td>
<td>Mr R Harding &amp; Ms Julia Alexander</td>
<td>Single storey front extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1543</td>
<td>Tibenham Old Chapel House The Street Tibenham Norfolk NR16 1AP</td>
<td>Mr D Gee</td>
<td>Fell Ash tree and replace with Rowen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 05 September 2015 to 01 October 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/1851</td>
<td>Wymondham Land Behind 1 Cantley Villas Station Road Spooner Row Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr N Binks</td>
<td>Sub-division of site, demolition of outbuildings, erection of 7 dwellings, garages and ancillary works.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2162</td>
<td>Costessey 2 Olive Road Costessey Norwich NR5 0AT</td>
<td>Side extension with room in the roof, alterations to existing roof and internal re-ordering.</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
<td></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>Refusal</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Dale Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
