Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives
- Mr J Mooney (Chairman)
- Mrs L Neal (Vice-Chairman)

Liberal Democrats
- Dr M Gray
- Mrs Y Bendle
- Mrs F Ellis
- Mr C Gould
- Dr C Kemp
- Mr G Minshull
- Mr B Stone
- Mrs 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 11 November 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

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 8, and arrive at 1:30pm if you intend to speak on items 9 to 14.

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

03/11/2015
SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

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.
AGENDA

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 22)
   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>2015/1810/RVC</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1811/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/1812/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm Watton Road Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LQ</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/1058/DC</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land North of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/1766/D</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North of the A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/1280/D</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North of the A11 Phase 1 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/1649/D</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North of the A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/1131/F</td>
<td>BARFORD</td>
<td>Land at Sayers Farm Watton Road Barford Norfolk</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/1614/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land West of Ketteringham Lane Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/1754/F</td>
<td>BEDINGHAM</td>
<td>Lodge Farm School Road Bedingham Norfolk NR35 2DB</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/1835/F</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Little Ellingham Airfield New Road Hingham Norfolk</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/1967/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>1 Church Close Poringland Norfolk NR14 7LB</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/2145/RVC</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
<td>Crown Bungalow Lower Street Gissing Norfolk</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015/2244/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Items 9 - 14 will not be heard before 1.30pm
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

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

7. **Enforcement Reports**

(attached – page 145)

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

(attached – page 151)

9. **Quarterly Enforcement Report**

(attached – page 153)

10. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 2 December 2015
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advert</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Proposal by Government Department</td>
</tr>
<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNDP</td>
<td>Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAAP</td>
<td>Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D.</td>
<td>Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAP</td>
<td>Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 shareholding
- land or leases they own or hold
- contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
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 14 October 2015 at 10.00 am.

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

Apologies: Councillors Y Bendle, F Ellis and C Gould

Substitute Members: Councillors J Hornby (for Y Bendle), N Legg (for F Ellis) and L Dale (for C Gould)

(Cllrs G Minshull and L Dale left the meeting after application 10. Cllr L Neal left after application 13)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors) and the Senior Planning Officers (C Trett, C Raine, J Hobbs and C Curtis).

(30 members of the public were also in attendance)

226. 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>2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1678/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1266/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant and Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1427/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant and Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
227. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 16 September were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

228. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/0075/F</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Ms A Jordan – Chair East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R George – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr S Caruthers – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1422/D</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Mr R McVicars – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1678/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Mr D Goodman – Chair Bawburgh Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr E Perrin – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr G Wheatley – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0974/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Ms L Tattersall – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1023/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Ms L Tattersall – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1027/F</td>
<td>BARNHAM BROOM</td>
<td>Ms C Baines – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.

(The meeting closed at 4:35pm)

Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Applications referred back to Committee

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

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

   Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL (contrary to officer recommendation)

   Refused

   Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to remove all residential caravans and associated items which have been brought onto the site within 6 months.

Updates

Further letters of objection from local residents maintaining objections mostly already summarised in agenda report, but additionally

- Ketteringham Lane too dangerous to walk so bus stop on Norwich Road is not accessible.
- Hethersett does not have full range of services so need to access Wymondham 7km away.
- Site is back land not infill
- Site is greenfield not brownfield

Reasons for overturning officer recommendation

- Harm to character and appearance of area
- Harm to neighbour amenities
- Harm outweighs limited benefits
- Insufficient foul drainage information

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

   Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE
Approved 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.

Updates

Comments from Design Officer (summarised):
- Building for Life Assessment demonstrated all green scorings. The one area that should stay amber is no. 11 (Public and Private Spaces) as the buffer to the south will not be well overlooked
- There needs to be some commitment to managing the various spaces over a period of time.
- Final submitted plans are fine, affordable units now have cedar boarding on plots 11 to 14 and cedar doors on plots 11 to 18 to tie design cues to market housing.
- Detail of the dormer window details should be conditioned as they will be quite visible elements in the roofline

Comments from the Landscape Officer (summarised):
Final plans are fine now, the woodland buffer strip is a single entity to be managed as such and trees now have strimmer guards.

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

Decision : Members voted 10 – 1 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

1. Temporary time limit of 25 years
2. Decommissioning plans to be submitted
3. In accordance with plans
4. Visibility splay protection
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 review
16. Retention trees and hedges on site
Development Management Committee 14 October 2015

17. Tree protection to be agreed
18. External lighting to be agreed
19. CCTV to be agreed
20. Wheel washing (verbally updated at meeting)

Subject to outstanding highways and archaeology matters being resolved.

Updates

Comments from Norwich City Council – No objections or comments to make

Comments from NCC Highways on amended plans/details (summarised):
- The revised Construction traffic management plan includes for some traffic management of the delivery vehicles.
- Accept that with the low average level of construction traffic movements of about 5 per day and that the applicants are willing to complete a wear and tear agreement, that there is not a need for the provision of additional informal passing places.
- The vision splay details from the new entrance are acceptable as is the construction signing.
- There are no objections to the Construction Traffic Plan
- There is some disagreement regarding the appropriate surfacing of the new entrance and as such these details need to be agreed either before permission is granted or by condition together with the details for the maintenance access, updated details of wheel washing and road sweeping.
- Overall no objection to the amended details subject to securing details of the above point by condition.

Environmental Services
- No objections to submitted noise report subject to boundary noise level condition and condition restricting hours of deliveries to the site and machinery operation on the site.

Historic Environment Services
- Further report submitted and content that condition for surface-mounted panels and cable ducts required for north east section of the site to avoid ground disturbance.

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

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Re-imposition of all conditions on 2011/1706
2. Fencing to be erected
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

Updates

Neighbour response
- Additional correspondence from 14 Stoke Road – concern about landscaping being implemented as weeds are destroying the fence already installed and surface water
draining under fence into garden. Also comment on approved oak tree planting not appropriate when the existing oak tree has caused problems relating to fence height.

Officer response
- The matter of financial compensation is covered in the committee report (4.25), and not a matter that can be considered as a material planning consideration. Surface water matter is covered in paragraph 4.23 of report. Existing approved landscaping of the new oak tree is not a matter that is being considered in this application.

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

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved 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

Updates

Neighbour response
- Additional correspondence from 14 Stoke Road – concern about landscaping being implemented as weeds are destroying the fence already installed and surface water draining under fence into garden. Also comment on approved oak tree planting not appropriate when the existing oak tree has caused problems relating to fence height.

Officer response
- The matter of financial compensation is covered in the committee report (4.25), and not a matter that can be considered as a material planning consideration. Surface water matter is covered in paragraph 4.23 of report. Existing approved landscaping of the new oak tree is not a matter that is being considered in this application.

6 Appl. No : 2015/1027/F  
Parish : BARNHAM BROOM

Applicants 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 studio self-contained flats.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with amendments
3. Replacement hedge
4. Provision of parking and turning area
Development Management Committee 14 October 2015

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.

Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL

Refused

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

Updates

Officer
- The applicant has asked for it to be clarified that letters of support have been received from the following:
  o Carbon Zero, the inventor and supplier of EEB (Earth Energy Bank)
  o The PHD Project Leader from DeMontfort University whom developed the EEB
  o East Anglia Apples and Orchard project

- The applicant has also requested that the following benefits of the proposal be made clear:
  o the building would be carbon negative (will produce more energy than it uses)
  o will be the first of its kind in East Anglia to use EEB
  o The scheme would also provide a community orchard

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

Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL

Refused

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

Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to remove mobile home and cease use within 6 months.

Updates

Objection from Ketteringham Residents Group
- Outside development boundary
- Not in keeping with character of the area
- Single unit does not significantly contribute to housing supply
- Not sustainable or high quality
Development Management Committee 14 October 2015

E-mail from applicant to Members
- Should be presumption in favour in view of lack of 5 year land supply and assessed in light of para 14 of NPPF.
- Note location is not considered to be unsustainable in terms of transport and access to services.
- Access is already in existence.
- Caravan is not visible from outside site
- Note economic benefit supports reason to approve
- There is clear social benefit
- Close to other caravan site in Ketteringham which is similar and officers support
- Would not be reliant on car. Use bike.
- Suitable adaptation and re-use of the existing plot of land.

9 Appl. No : 2015/1427/H
Parish : HETHERSETT
Applicants Name : Mr John Barrett
Site Address : Land north of Priory Road Hethersett Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of single new dwelling
Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL

Refused

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

Updates
- Parish Council maintain their objection despite amendments.
- Objection letter from resident re-iterating objections plus concern at disruption from construction phase
- Letter from agent with revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirming development can proceed without unacceptable harm to trees.
- Note from landscape Officer maintaining objection due to likely future pressure to remove trees from residents.

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 bed roomed dwelling with double garage.
Decision : This item was DEFERRED to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee at applicant’s request

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
Development Management Committee  14 October 2015
Bunding and 22 (Access, Parking and Vehicle Turning) of planning permission 2009/0910/F.

Decision : Members voted 5 – 4 for **DEFERRAL**
Deferred

Reasons for Deferral
To enable Members to consider the previous appeal decision in greater detail.

Updates
Further objections from local residents already summarised in report

---

**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.

Decision : Members voted 5 – 4 for **DEFERRAL**
Deferred

Reasons for Deferral
To enable Members to consider the previous appeal decision in greater detail.

Updates
Further objections from local residents already summarised in report

---

**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 (e.g. sugar beet, cereals, straw and agricultural Fertilisers); retention and re-profiling of existing earth bunds and amended landscape scheme

Decision : Members voted 5 – 4 for **DEFERRAL**
Deferred
To enable Members to consider the previous appeal decision in greater detail.

Updates

Further objections from local residents already summarised in report

14  Appl. No  :  2015/1889/H
Parish  :  SWARDESTON
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
Decision  :  Members voted 5 – 4 (the Chairman exercised his casting vote) for REFUSAL of the application to retain climbing frame in back garden and for APPROVAL of the erection of a bike storage in front of the house

Refused - retention of climbing frame in back garden

1. Adverse effect on neighbours privacy and amenities

Approved with conditions - bike storage to front of house

1. Standard outline time limit
2. In accordance with approved plan

Updates

1 letter of support:
- Children have the right to play within the boundaries of their own garden for their safety and parents peace of mind

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.
Decision  :  Members voted 8 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Matching materials

16  Appl. No  :  2015/1977/H
Parish  :  PORINGLAND
Applicants Name : Wilkinson Builders (Reepham) Ltd
Site Address : 36 The Street Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JT
Proposal : Proposed fence on road frontage

Decision : Members voted 8 – 0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

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

Subject to the expiry of the re-consultation period
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **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.

2. **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
   6. Hours of use restricted to between the hours of 08:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturday. The use shall not take place on Sundays or public holidays.
3. **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 (eg 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  
4. Agricultural produce storage only.

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 Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 Ensuring development management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk.  
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development  
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM2.1 Employment and business development  
DM3.9 Design Principles  
DM3.11 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  
DM4.7 Landscape setting of Norwich  
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design

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 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

21 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 The applications were reported to Development Management Committee on 14 October and were deferred to enable Members to further consider the Inspector’s original appeal decision for planning application reference 2009/0910. A copy of this report is therefore
included at appendix 2 to this report. Paragraph 26 refers to the landscape impact of the original proposal, with details which included bunding on the southern and eastern boundaries later agreed by condition.

4.2 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.

4.3 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.

4.4 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

4.5 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

4.6 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 arguably 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 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.

4.7 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

4.8 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
planning 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.

4.9 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.

4.10 In terms of the impact on the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, the proposals would have a relatively limited impact once the landscaping proposed has been fully implemented. The applications consist of relatively minor revisions to a previously approved scheme for the redevelopment of a farm, and the incorporation of car sales which would be screened from public view. Although there would be landscaped bunds, these would be screened by hedgerows once the landscaping has matured. There is no material conflict with policy DM4.6 of the Development Management Policies. Overall, the proposals accord with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and guidance within the NPPF in terms of visual impact.

Highways impact

4.11 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.

4.12 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.

4.13 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.

4.14 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.

4.15 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 policies DM 3.11, DM 3.12 and DM 3.13.

Other matters

4.16 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.

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

4.18 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 (eg 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 533801 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2010

by John Murray LLB, Dip.Plan.Env, DMS, Solicitor
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/09/2115934
Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh, Norwich, NR9 3LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Gable Developments Ltd against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2009/0910/F, dated 8 June 2009, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2009.
- The development proposed is described as the change of use of former piggery building to one dwelling; change of use of former agricultural buildings to B1(a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) and (b) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.

Procedural matters

1. As originally submitted, the application proposed a 60% limit on B1(a) floor space only. However, prior to determination of the application, this was amended, so that B1(b) uses would also be included within that 60% limit.

2. As well as the conversion of former agricultural buildings, the proposal involves the conversion of the dwelling known as Villa Farm House to business use. The description of the development should therefore include reference to “...change of use of former agricultural buildings and existing dwelling...” However, the description need not refer to the limit on B1(a) and (b) floor space, as this can be covered by a condition.

Main issues

3. There are 3 main issues, namely:
   - the effect of the proposal on the safety and free flow of traffic;
   - whether the proposed business uses are acceptable having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development; and
   - whether the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside.

Reasons

The safety and the free flow of traffic

4. The proposed B1 and B8 units would be accessed from the B1108 via the existing bell-mouthed, kerbed and metalled farm access. The B1108 is a main distributor route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy and its principal purpose is
to provide essential cross country links. In particular, it is a direct link from Watton in south-west Norfolk to Norwich.

5. In the vicinity of the appeal site, this road is subject to a 60mph speed limit but, using an automated traffic counter (ATC), the appellant established that the 85th percentile speed in both directions is between 50 and 54mph. For these speeds, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) indicates that visibility of 162.4m in either direction should be achieved, measured from a point 2.4m back from the carriageway edge. The appellant’s evidence is that this is achievable in both directions, within land under its control, and the Highway Authority (HA) suggests a condition requiring visibility splays of 160m x 2.4m. Based on the evidence and my own inspection, I am satisfied that visibility at the access point is sufficient.

6. The concern of the Council and the HA is based on the intensification of the use of the access and resulting interference to the safe and free flow of traffic on the B1108, including the possibility of parking on the highway. Based on the ATC data, the appellant estimates the annual average daily traffic flows (AADTF) along the B1108 at 4,503. By reference to the latest version of the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) database, it contends that the number of two-way trips into the site during the morning peak would be 21 and 16 during the evening peak and that the AADTF along the site access would be 88. Based on a “parking accumulation exercise”, the appellant also says a maximum of 29 cars would be parked on the site at any time. The proposal includes 42 parking spaces in line with the HA parking standards, which are the same as those in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Note 13 (Transport).

7. However, the HA points out that the 3 comparison sites selected from TRICS by the appellant are not truly comparable in terms of bus and other non-car mode accessibility. The appeal site is located in the open countryside, with no footways or cycleways in the vicinity and an extremely limited bus service, the nearest bus stop being in excess of 1.4km away in the village of Little Melton and more than 2km away on the B1108 itself. Given the speed of traffic on this main distributor route, walking and cycling would be unattractive. By contrast the sites used by the appellant in the TRICS analysis are all located on a business park, or in a commercial zone. They all have good footway/cycleway links and good public transport connections with a minimum bus service level of 4 buses an hour and a maximum of 15 buses an hour. All the sites have a bus stop within 400m and one even has a train station within 1km, providing a service of 2 trains per hour.

8. For these reasons, I am not convinced that the TRICS information can be relied upon to indicate the number of vehicle movements and parking demand likely to be generated by this proposal. Indeed, the appellant acknowledges in its final comments that there are no suitable sites included in the TRICS database.

9. In principle, whilst an end user is not known, I consider it more realistic to base the assessment on the potential number of employees, having regard to employee/floor space ratios. The HA says that for B1 development in this location, one can expect between 1 employee per 15sqm and 1 employee per 20sqm. Although the basis of this expectation is not clear, in the Transport Assessment as originally submitted with the application, the office sites identified had employee floor space ratios as high as 1 per 9sqm. On this
basis, the development would accommodate between 62 and 83 employees, depending on the split between B1(a), (b) and (c), or between 108 and 116 employees, if the higher ratio is used. Accordingly, given the 42 car parking spaces provided, the HA suggests that between 20 and 41 employees would not be able to access the site by car, even if the lower ratio is adopted, and this could lead to parking in undesignated areas, or even on the highway.

10. However, the HA's analysis ignores the fact that, following amendment of the application, B1(a) and (b) uses would be restricted to 60% of the floor space. It also assumes that everyone employed would come by car, with no car sharing. Notwithstanding the limited availability or attractiveness of alternative means of travel to this site, this seems unduly pessimistic.

11. Furthermore, based on studies undertaken throughout the country, the appellant contends in its comments on the Council's evidence that appropriate employee/floor space ratios are: 1:21 for B1, except for B1(c), for which the ratio is between 1:34 and 1:40; and between 1:47 and 1:50 for B8. Given that no more than 60% of the floor space would be occupied by B1(a) and (b) uses and assuming the remaining 40% would be split evenly between B8 and B1(c) uses, the appellant says that a total of 47 to 48 employees would be accommodated by the development. Both the appellant and the HA say that, based on statistical travel to work information, 84.3% of employees would normally be expected to travel by car, which would equate to 40 drivers per day. I acknowledge the HA's concern that, given the lack of alternatives, a higher percentage might come by car and of course there may be other visitors to the site. However, against this, it is unlikely that all employees would all be on site all of the time, given the possibility of off-site meetings, holidays, sickness and so on, and a requirement for a travel plan could encourage sustainable transport choices, including car sharing.

12. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that 42 car parking spaces would be adequate and, even if occasionally they were not, this would be more likely to lead to parking on undesignated areas within the site, rather than actually on the B1108. Furthermore, given that the AADTF along the B1108 is 5,403 vehicles and right turn movements will already take place at the junctions with Stocks Hill and Green Lane nearby, I consider that the relatively minor increase in traffic movements proposed through the main access point into the site would not cause any significant interference with traffic on the B1108.

13. For the reasons given, I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would not harm highway safety or interfere with the free flow of traffic to a material degree. In this regard, it would comply with saved Policies IMP 8 and TRA 13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (LP), adopted March 2003 and there is no indication that the other criteria in Policy TRA 13 would not also be satisfied.

**Whether the proposed business uses constitute sustainable development**

14. PPG13 indicates that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly

---

1 Crawley Borough Council – Parking Standards and Transport Contributions; ARUP, 2006 – Draft RSS for the North West EP; Employment Technical Seminar Employment Land Methodology; and West Sussex County Council
2 WSCC Transport Contributions (example).
3 The HA refers to DfT guidance indicating 1.2 persons per vehicle.
under 2km. However, whilst the site is within 2km of the villages of Bawburgh and Little Melton, it is in the open countryside and there is no footway provision or street lighting within the vicinity, where vehicular traffic is relatively heavy and fast. Even assuming significant numbers of employees would come from those villages, it is unlikely that they would consider walking to work an attractive option. Cycling is more likely, even from further settlements such as Bowthorpe, West Earlham and Cringleford but, given the nature of traffic on the B1108 and the absence of dedicated cycleways, it may still be an unattractive option for many. Indeed, the appellant recognises that only a small proportion of employees would be likely to walk or cycle to the site.

15. There are no bus stops within 1.4km of the site. Whilst the appellant says that it is in negotiations with a bus operator to agree an “on-demand” stop within easy walking distance, there is nothing to indicate that this will be achieved. The evidence suggests that the majority of employees would be likely to get to and from the site by private car, notwithstanding the fact that the appellant has drafted a travel plan to encourage sustainable transport choices. In this regard, whilst the Council cited Policy T1 of the East of England Plan, which no longer forms part of the development plan and carries no weight, the proposal conflicts with saved LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4, which seek to encourage access on foot, bicycle and by public transport.

16. Census data indicates that Little Melton has a total population of 620 people, with 375 of these being economically active. Bawburgh has a population of 340, with 213 economically active. The proportion of residents who travel to work by car is 73% for Little Melton and 71% for Bawburgh. Average trip lengths to work are 15.05km for Little Melton and 14.97km for Bawburgh, suggesting that the majority probably travel to work either in Norwich city centre or other employment areas on the edge of the city.

17. Given the size of these settlements, it is unlikely that a large proportion of those employed at the proposed development would come from Little Melton or Bawburgh. However, in addition to settlements such as Bowthorpe on the edge of Norwich, there are others to the west, such as Barford and Hingham, from where people probably commute into Norwich. Whilst I am not convinced that there is significant scope to access the proposed development by non-car modes, it is likely that the employment opportunities it would provide could reduce commuting distances for local people, whilst re-using existing buildings. This reduction in distances travelled by private car is arguably consistent with the thrust of Policy 4 of the Local Transport Plan for Norfolk 2006 – 2011, which states that new development should be located so as to minimise the need to travel and reduce reliance on the private car.

18. Furthermore, notwithstanding contrary views expressed by the Little Melton and Bawburgh Parish Councils, the commercial property market report prepared by Roche Chartered Surveyors indicates that there is a demand for employment space in converted farm buildings in locations such as this. In particular, such sites suit businesses which have a necessity for county wide travel and therefore look to locate close to a major highway network whilst avoiding city centre congestion and costs. The appeal site is located close to the B1108 junction with the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass.

3 The Secretary of State revoked Regional Strategies on 6 July 2010.
19. Saved LP Policy EMP 3 indicates when the adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes will be permitted outside development limits and village boundaries. The structural report submitted with the application indicates that the buildings are structurally sound and capable of re-use without significant rebuilding. The scheme for the conversion of the brick buildings would substantially use existing openings, retaining the buildings' form and character and the steel framed buildings would be clad in sympathetic materials. There is no indication that the conversion of these redundant buildings would cause demonstrable harm to the viability of the farm and I have concluded that the road access is of a sufficient standard to serve the development without causing demonstrable harm to the safe and free flow of traffic. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the proposals would lead to the dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice the vitality of local towns and villages. The scheme therefore complies with saved LP Policy EMP 3.

20. Policy EMP 3 is specifically concerned with proposals such as this and I therefore consider it to be the dominant policy in relation to this main issue. Accordingly, notwithstanding the conflict with saved LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4 referred to above, I consider that the scheme complies with the development plan as a whole on this issue. In my view, it is also consistent with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth), which generally encourages the re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic purposes and recognises that a site may be an acceptable location for development, even though it may not be readily accessible by public transport.

21. For the reasons given, I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed business uses are acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development.

**Whether the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable**

22. The Council is concerned that, given the functional appearance of the piggery building, it does not make a positive contribution to the character of the area and therefore considers that, having regard to paragraph 17 of PPS7, the creation of a new dwelling does not outweigh the disadvantages of creating a new dwelling in an unsustainable location. However, in December 2009, that paragraph of PPS7 was cancelled by PPS4 and, in any event, it did not say that conversion should only be allowed if the building was of historic or architectural importance or interest, or otherwise contributed to local character; that was merely one criterion to take into account.

23. In terms of the development plan, the adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes is addressed by saved LP Policy HOU 10. Having regard to the criteria laid down by that policy, I am satisfied from the structural report submitted with the application and from my own inspection that the structure of the piggery building is both permanent and substantial. I accept that the building is of functional appearance, with little architectural merit. However, whilst there would be no significant changes to its overall form, the building would be repaired, rendered and generally tidied up. Given the ability to control the use of materials by condition, I consider that the fabric and character of the building would be enhanced. The scope for landscaping and the removal of permitted development rights would also prevent the
scheme having an overly domestic appearance in public views. I am satisfied that the building is no longer suitable for continued agricultural use and indeed such use, or even alternative business use, could be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupants of the nearby dwelling know as Villa San Lorenzo.

24. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that the conversion to a dwelling would comply with LP Policy HQU 10. In addition to converting the piggery to a dwelling, the proposal involves conversion of the existing dwelling on the site (Villa Farm House) to a business. Whilst I have seen no evidence to indicate that the conversion of the piggery is absolutely necessary to facilitate the conversion of Villa Farm House, the appellant indicates that it would enable the Villa Farm complex to be converted to employment uses and conditions could ensure that the proposal does not result in an additional dwelling on the site. Furthermore, a suggested condition requiring a minimum of 40% of the proposed employment floor space to be available before the former piggery is occupied would safeguard the provision of that employment space and the attendant benefits to the rural economy.

25. For the reasons given, I conclude on the last main issue that the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside.

**Other matters**

26. The site lies within the "Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone" as identified on the LP Proposals Map. The Little Melton and Bawburgh Parish Councils suggest that this development could be contrary to saved LP Policy ENV 6, which seeks to protect the landscape quality and openness of that zone and to prevent the bypass becoming the outer development boundary of the city. However, given the scope for landscaping, the fact that the scheme would utilise existing buildings and accesses and car parking would be sensitively located within the site, I do not share that concern.

27. The occupier of Villa San Lorenzo says that she owns a major part of the access to the piggery and is concerned that traffic associated with the business units might also use it. A planning condition can ensure that the access does not serve the commercial development and ownership of and rights over the access are not planning matters; if there is no right to use that access, the grant of planning permission will not change that.

**Conditions**

28. I will impose the usual condition regarding commencement of development. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I shall also require that, otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

29. Suggested conditions requiring approval of external materials, window details, landscaping, earthworks, tree protection measures, the control of external storage and lighting and the removal of permitted development rights are all reasonable and necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I impose them, subject to minor amendments to ensure precision in accordance with Circular 11/95.
30. Conditions requiring 40% of the employment floor space to be available prior to occupation of the former piggery and ensuring that no more than one dwelling is occupied on the site are reasonable and necessary in the interests of ensuring sustainable development and the delivery of benefits to the local economy. To limit the number of people likely to be employed on the site in the interest of highway safety and the free flow of traffic, I will restrict Class B1(a) and (b) uses to 60% of the total floor space.

31. To avoid risk to public health and the environment, I shall require the implementation of an approved scheme to deal with contamination. In order to prevent harm to biodiversity, I will require ecology mitigation measures to be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Bat Survey Report submitted with the application.

32. To safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of the former piggery and of Villa San Lorenzo, I shall require the submission of a scheme to ensure that the access track between Villa Farm and the former piggery is only used by farm traffic. Whilst this was not addressed in the Council or HA’s lists of suggested conditions, the appellant indicated in its grounds of appeal that the existing central access points would be stopped up once the commercial buildings have been converted. Given the nature of those accesses and the need to avoid closely grouped, multiple accesses onto the B1108, I consider this necessary in the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. For the same reasons, the HA’s suggested conditions concerning the construction of the accesses, provision of visibility splays and gates, on-site parking, servicing and turning areas, and the provision and use of wheel cleaning facilities during the construction period are all reasonable and necessary.

33. In the interests of sustainability, and having regard to the thrust of LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4 and advice in PPG 13, I will require the implementation of an approved travel plan. Whilst I note the appellant’s evidence that its draft travel plan contemplates off-site improvements to link bus services and the proposed provision of a bus stop “subject to operators’ agreement”, it is not clear whether this is achievable. On balance, I have found the scheme acceptable in the light of current bus service provision and, on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that conditions requiring a bus stop and connecting footways are reasonable or necessary.

**Overall conclusion**

34. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issues and to all other matters raised, I am satisfied that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

**Decision**

35. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the change of use of the former piggery building to one dwelling; change of use of the former agricultural buildings and the existing dwelling to B1(a), (b), (c) and B8 uses, together with car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements at Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh, Norwich, NR9 3LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2009/0910/F, dated 8 June 2009, subject to the following conditions:
1) The development hereby permitted must be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

2) Subject to conditions 6, 7 and 9, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4731 101F; 4732 105E; 4732 108D; 4732 121; 4732 109; 4732 100A; 4732 107C; 4732 111C; 4732 02; 4732 05; 4732 04A; 4732 03B; 4732 102A; drawing No 10 (Proposed Access Arrangements (Feb 09)); drawing No 11 (Villa Sen Lorenzo Residential Access Arrangements (Feb 09)); Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Plan, dated 30/04/09; and Landscape Layout Plan, dated 21/05/09.

3) The former piggery shall not be occupied until such time as a minimum of 40% of the proposed employment floor space is available for employment use.

4) 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.

5) No more than 60% (747 sq m) of the total floor space shall be occupied for B1(a) and B1(b) purposes.

6) No works or development shall take place on each building until details, including samples where required, of the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This condition shall apply notwithstanding condition 2 above and any indication as to these matters that have been given in the application or on the approved plans. The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved details.

7) Notwithstanding condition 2 above and details shown on the approved plans, no works or development shall take place on each building until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority: detailed drawings of the proposed windows at a scale of no less than 1:20 and timber profiles of a scale no less than 1:5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

8) With regard to the dwelling hereby permitted through the conversion of the former piggery, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order)(with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alterations of the dwelling; no additions or alterations to the roofs; no provision of porches; nor the provision within the curtilage of the dwelling of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, or chimneys, flues or soil and vent pipes or any other works as defined by Classes A, B C, D, E and G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order shall be erected or brought onto the land unless an appropriate planning application is first submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

9) Notwithstanding condition 2 above and the details shown on the Landscape Layout Plan, dated 21/05/09, no development shall take place until further details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:
a) means of enclosure;
b) hard surfacing materials;
Soft landscaping works shall include:
c) planting plans;
d) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
e) schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; and
f) an implementation programme.

If within a period of FIVE years from the date of planting, any tree or plant or any tree or plant planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or is destroyed or dies, or becomes in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

10) No development shall take place on the commercial units until details of earthworks and a timetable for implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

11) No works or development shall take place on the commercial units until all existing trees have been protected by the erection of a one metre high chestnut pale fence to be positioned beneath the extremities of the crown spread, or in the case of fastigate trees in a position to be agreed with the local planning authority. All such fencing shall be retained and maintained in good condition for the duration of the construction period. During the construction period:
   (a) the storage of vehicles, fuel, materials, site huts or other buildings or ancillary equipment will not take place within the fenced areas.
   (b) the existing ground levels within the fenced areas will not be raised or lowered;
   (c) no services shall be laid within the fenced areas; and
   (d) no trees shall be lopped, topped or felled without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

12) No trees or hedges shall be cut down, uprooted destroyed, lopped or topped, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the previous written approval of the local planning authority. Any trees or hedges removed without consent shall be replaced during the next planting season November/March with trees of such size and species as agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
13) No external storage of goods or materials shall at any time take place outside the commercial buildings on the application site, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

14) No external lighting shall be erected unless full details of its design, location, orientation and level of luminance (in Lux) provided have first been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Such lighting shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the purposes of security and site safety and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation.

15) No development shall take place until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This scheme shall include an investigation and assessment to identify the extent of contamination and the measures to be taken to avoid risk to the public/environment when the site is developed. No development shall take place on the site until the measures in the scheme as approved have been implemented and completed.

16) Ecology mitigation shall be undertaken in accordance with the Mitigation and Recommendations as set out in Section 6.3 of the Bat Survey Report dated February 2009 and undertaken by Aspect Ecology and shall be retained as such thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

17) Before any works or development commences on the commercial units a scheme to restrict the use of the access track between Villa Farm and the Piggery to farm traffic only shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, prior to any of the units being first brought into use the approved scheme shall be implemented in full and shall be retained as such thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

18) Before any works or development commences on the commercial units a scheme for the stopping up of the two central access points, marked “ACCESS RETAINED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE ONLY” on drawing No 10, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation following cessation of the use of Villa Farm House as a dwelling and shall be implemented as approved. The accesses shall not be used thereafter.

19) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access at the eastern end of the site shall be constructed in accordance with the Norfolk County Council industrial access construction specification, and additionally to accord with details to be approved in writing by the local planning authority, for the first 15 metres into the site, as measured back from the near edge of the adjacent carriageway.

20) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted any access gate or gates, shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 15 metres from the near edge of the adjoining highway carriageway. Any sideswails/fences/hedges adjacent to the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from each of the (outside) gateposts to the front boundary of the site.
21) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 160 metres shall be provided to each side of the accesses at the eastern and western ends of the site, shown in grey on drawing Nos 10 and 11 respectively, where they meet the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

22) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, on-site car and cycle parking, servicing and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

23) The accesses at the eastern and western ends of the site, shown in grey on drawing Nos 10 and 11 respectively, shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a detailed scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

24) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Interim Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, such plan to accord with the Norfolk County Council document “Guidance Notes for the Submission of Travel Plans” or be produced using the Workplace Travel Plan Generator Tool, www.worktravelplan.net.

25) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied prior to implementation of the Interim Travel Plan approved under condition 24 above. During the first year of occupation a Full Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, such plan to include a timetable and targets. The approved Full Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development used for B1(a), B1(b), B1(c) or B8 uses is occupied, subject to any modifications approved by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, as part of an annual review.

26) No works shall commence on site until the details of wheel cleaning facilities for construction vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development hereby permitted will use the approved wheel cleaning facilities.

J A Murray
INSPECTOR
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

4. **Appl. No**: 2015/1058/DC  
   **Parish**: HETHERSETT

   Applicants Name: Miss Laura Townes  
   Site Address: Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road  
   Hethersett Norfolk  

   Proposal: Discharge of condition 4 following planning permission 2011/1804/O – a site-wide masterplan and design code for each phase of development.

   Recommendation: Agree that the site-wide Masterplan and Design Code be approved pursuant to condition 4 of planning permission 2011/1804

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
   DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
   DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
   DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
   DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
   DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
   DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
   DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
   DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
   DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
   DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/1918: Discharge of conditions 12 - Ecological Management Plan, 26 - Floor levels/boundary treatments & 27 - Lighting details of planning application 2011/1804 and part discharge of condition 20 - Hard/soft landscaping works under consideration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2015/1681</td>
<td>Reserved matters for appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the first phase of development for 129 dwellings in relation to outline permission 2011/1804 under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2015/1594</td>
<td>Residential development of 95no dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure. under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2015/1589</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition 27 of planning permission 2011/1804 - Street Lighting under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2015/1587</td>
<td>Discharge of condition 12 - Ecological Management Plan from 2011/1804/O under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2015/1577</td>
<td>Discharge of condition 20 - Reserved matters phased landscaping scheme from 2011/1804/O under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2015/1059</td>
<td>Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2014/0863</td>
<td>Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Deletion of condition 32b footway/cycleway Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2014/0860</td>
<td>Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O- Alterations to condition 32 and 33. To delete condition 32 and substitute with 32a in regard to commencement of Phase 2 and 32b commencement of Phase 5, deletion of condition 33 and substitute 33a and 33b, 33a in regard to first occupation of Phase 2 and 33b first occupation of Phase 5 Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2011/1804</td>
<td>Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 &amp; B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11 Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2011/1489</td>
<td>Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park &amp; Ride Scoping Opinion issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Consultations

3.1 SNC Landscape Officer

Final consultation response: support

- All matters previously raised have now been addressed and the Code updated.

Summary of previous consultation responses:
- Design code is not user-friendly or as clear as it could be.
- Local photos would benefit from annotation and updated images.
- Junction with Colney Lane should be included as a ‘distinctive new space at key nodes’.
- The Local Centre and Village Heart imply similar objectives – clarify character of each.
- Question whether the Community Woodland is in the best location as proposed.
- Trees and other planting could be used to form ‘gateways’.
- It need to be established where the services will be installed in relation to road/verge arrangements and tree planting.
- Remove example of garage court parking and reference approach for parking bicycles.
- There is no allocation of different public realm materials or what boundary treatments relate to specific character areas.
- The key grouping diagram implies a very uniform building line which is not in the spirit of the rural edge.
- The proposed boundaries treatments need to be suitable for the uses as suggested.
- No description is provided of the existing landscape characteristics.
- It would be useful to set some minimum standards for the position of features such as benches, bins etc.
- Minimum clearances for existing trees should be set so they can mature.
- Need to understand the difference between informal and formal paths. Gravel paths are unlikely to be acceptable.
- It would be good to establish the notion of a circular walk within the community wood.
- There is scope to improve the proposed planting palette to make it more indicative of the existing species mix and expand with regards to trees and hedges.
- It might help to list species against each open space area.
- Welcome the remarks about the use of structural soils and linking tree pits.
- Would like to see the inclusion of more fruit trees.

3.2 Design Officer

Final consultation response: support

- All matters previously raised have now been addressed and the Code updated.

Summary of previous consultation responses:
- The Code should reference the key place-making and design principles in accordance with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.
- The parameters plans should include a description of what each plan is trying to achieve.
• The land-use plan should be updated to reflect the S106 definitions as agreed.
• General structuring elements should be included, such as block principles, street types, parking, density, building heights, key spaces etc.
• Boundary treatments should be shown in a tabulated format for front, side and rear boundaries as well as public realm.
• Images of doors and windows etc. should relate to historic presidents, rather than prescribing a modern palette of features.
• Materials should be described for each character area and a palette of colours/ textures identified.
• Where general principles have been identified these should be moved to the ‘developing the masterplan’ section.
• The 3D massing study and development framework would be better separated from the design principles section.
• The ‘detailing the place’ section which has been merged with the ‘design principles’ is now slightly confusing and should be reviewed.
• If more information is to be provided about the detailed elements of the development then these should feature in a separate section and not be duplicated in the character areas section.
• The character area locations should be less defined to allow a degree of flexibility and transition between the different areas.
• The character areas should refer to the key spaces identified in the landscape section and explain how buildings will define each of these spaces.
• Additional housing typologies should be added to show examples of massing.
• More information should be added on set-back distances, building lines and the general alignment of buildings for each character area.
• References to car parking courts should be removed and information added that describes the car parking solutions in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.
• The Code should not prescribe a particular strategy for dealing with renewable energy and sustainable construction, but instead refer to way of achieving the renewable energy requirements.
• Precedent images of volume house types should be removed and replaced with images of local precedents and indicative street scenes.
• The ‘local centre’ character area struggles to define what this area is trying to achieve and should be updated to provide further clarity.
• The ‘village heart’ character area suggests that it at the heart of the development, similar to the local centre.
• Various other comments provided relating to discrepancies and inconstancies that need correcting.
4 Introduction

4.1 The purpose of the report is to provide an overview of the masterplan and design code submitted to comply with condition 4 pursuant of planning consent 2011/1804, which requires a site-wide masterplan and design code to be submitted and approved prior to or concurrently with the first of the Reserved Matters applications for the built up area of the site on Land North of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road, Hethersett.

4.2 The report will explain the purpose of the masterplan and design code and its relevance to the assessment of all subsequent phases of the Hethersett North development, as well as providing an understanding of the merits of its submission as a tool for ensuring a high quality development.

4.3 Members should note that Officers have been working with the architects and developers prior to and after the submission of this document to ensure that it complies with condition 4 of the planning consent. As a result the document has been significantly amended, adjusted and tested at every stage of its development to set out the guiding principles and mandatory requirements for development based on the guiding principles of the outline consent.

Site description

4.4 The site relates to an area of agricultural land occupying approximately 86.3 ha allocated for up to 1196 houses, associated infrastructure, landscaping, open space, recreation, mixed uses and a primary school. Members should note that the principle of development was established as part of the outline planning consent ref 2011/1804.

Proposal

4.5 The application relates to the approval of the site-wide masterplan and design code submission element that was required through condition 4 of the outline consent for 1196 dwellings on Land North of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road, Hethersett ref 2011/1804. The precise wording of the condition is as follows:

Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first of the reserved matters applications for the site, a site-wide Masterplan and Design Code for each phase of development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The Masterplan shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and parameters established in the outline application and shall include the following:

a) The character, mix of uses and density established through parameter plans at the outline stage to include block principles and the structure of public spaces;

b) The street hierarchy, including the principles of adopting highway infrastructure, and typical street cross sections;

c) The conceptual design and approach to the treatment of the public realm (including public art, materials, signage, utilities and other street furniture), the Neighbourhood Centres, landscape infrastructure, and proposed primary access points;

d) Details of the approach to vehicular and cycle parking across the entire site and parking for people with disabilities and for each building type, including the distribution of resident/visitor parking and cycle parking;

e) The approach to the character and treatment of the structural planting to the development areas;
f) *The approach to the treatment of any hedge, footpath, tree or woodland features;*

g) *The conceptual design and approach to the lighting strategy and how this will be applied to different areas of the development with different lighting needs, so as to maximise energy efficiency, minimise light pollution and avoid street clutter;*

h) *Details of waste and recycling provision for all building types;*

i) *Measures to demonstrate how opportunities to maximise resource efficiency and climate change adaptation in the design of the development will be achieved through external, passive means, such as landscaping, orientation, massing, and external building features;*

j) *Details of measures to minimise opportunities for crime;*

k) *Details of Design Code review procedure and of circumstances where a review shall be implemented.*

Furthermore, prior to the approval of reserved matters within each phase of development, a Design Code specific for that phase shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Design Code shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and parameters established in the outline application and shall include the following:

a) *Details of key groups of buildings and other key landmark buildings including information about height, scale, form, level of enclosure, building materials and design features.*

**Purpose of the Masterplan and Design Code**

4.6 The masterplan and design code sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters and rules to ensure a high quality development at North Hethersett. It does not fix every detail, but is intended to allow designers a degree of creative flexibility as long as design quality is retained. Scope also remains for discussion with the Local Authority on detailed design matters which will be subject to subsequent reserved matters applications accompanied by a design code specific to that phase of development.

4.7 The masterplan and design code is intended to be used by developers, their agents, South Norfolk Council and by consultees to help establish whether a scheme has met the design quality required and whether it will achieve an integrated development with a strong sense of place and identity.

**Assessment**

4.8 The main assessment is whether the masterplan and design code submission satisfies the requirements of condition 4 of the outline consent ref 2011/1804.

4.9 The submitted masterplan and design code is also required to meet the objectives of the Design and Access Statement and S106 Agreement which was approved under the outline consent and which sets out the overall structure of the development and a number of principles that informed the formation of an approved illustrative masterplan.
4.10 The masterplan builds on previous detail submitted through a number of parameter plans illustrated in the Design Code that set out the general land uses, phasing, density, building heights, open space network and access principles. The masterplan is considered acceptable in this respect.

4.11 In terms of the design code, this provides a framework in which detailed reserved matters designs for each parcel can be taken forward, ensuring flexibility for each parcel to be distinctive and recognisable whilst achieving a coherent overall identity across the site as a whole.

4.12 Following comprehensive feedback and input from South Norfolk Council during the application process, the design code has been updated to reflect comments and suggestions. This has mainly involved changes that assist in improving the content, structure and robustness of the code. Of note are changes made to explain how the design principles of the code have been structured around the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide (PMG) and how the PMG will continue to be used by Members and planning officers to assess proposals for any new development.

4.13 In terms of the content of the document, the code as amended is structured in a logical and easy to follow way that builds on the local character and sets out the strategic and more detailed elements of the site, which contains useful drawings (plans, sections, axonometric sketches), tables and detailed explanation.

4.14 The document builds evidence to demonstrate how the various elements of the code will define a number of character areas as well as how the design code will be applied across the whole of the proposals.

Character Areas

4.15 This section sets out the division of the site into a number of character areas and is fundamental to the design approach. It explains how the development will be divided into character areas and provides an overview of each of them. Sections 6.0 of the code sets out the detailed requirements of the development for building form, materials, boundary treatments, public realm and parking solutions. The section also contains information on the general distribution of affordable housing across the site.

4.16 The character areas include information on the guiding characteristics of each area to help establish character across the whole of the development and ensure a high quality development at North Hethersett. The characteristics of each character area are described as:

4.17 Rural Edge – This character area runs along the northern boundary of the site along the main route and also forms a buffer with the adjacent agricultural field. The character area is predominately rural, with small distinct groups of development positioned around informal areas of open space. Private drives serve individual plots enabling houses to face outwards with looser built form towards the outer edges of the development giving views over the buffer and open space.

4.18 The Meadows – This character area forms the western gateway to the development and is bounded by existing open space and some ponds. The character is rural, to reflect its position at the entrance to the site and is defined by traditional houses as well as distinct boundary treatments and landscaping. High quality landmark buildings will form the entrance to this character area, enhanced by open space, existing ponds to the north and further landscaping.
Local Centre – This character area is located adjacent to the existing and proposed school sites and provides the location for a new mixed use building or community building with a civic element. The proposed character area is intended to introduce a contemporary design to the housing and future uses with strong connectivity through the development.

Village Greens – This character area is located towards the centre of the site and is bounded by the school site and new areas of landscaping with views over the proposed open space and green corridors. The character is mostly modern in design, featuring a number of key buildings along both the northern and southern routes through the site, supplemented by landscaping.

Countryside Edge – This character area forms the entry point into the development from the east and is located to the south of existing residential development. The character area is traditional in design, incorporating materials and architectural details generally found in the local area. Outward facing development fronts onto new and existing areas of landscaping along the southern landscape buffer and proposed sports pitches and community woodland to the east.

Developing the Masterplan

This section of the code shows how the masterplan has been developed from the parameter plans to inform the masterplan framework which applies across the whole of the site. The development of the masterplan has been informed by the codes covered by the following sections:

- Scene setting route (position of building lines and the treatment of spaces between buildings and the street).
- Distinctive spaces (gateways, spaces and key nodes that add interest along the movement network).
- High quality frontages (landmark buildings, key views and active frontages).
- Significant vistas (key views and groups of buildings that act as landmarks or marker buildings).
- Street hierarchy (structure and hierarchy of streets within the development).

The masterplan framework establishes the design principles for the key elements of the development to ensure the appropriate character and quality is delivered across the site, for example distinctive spaces along the scene setting route use groups of buildings and landscaping to draw the eye into the development to define new spaces.

Design Code Compliance

Before submitting reserved matters applications developers will be required to complete a design code compliance statement to show that they have applied the codes to their detailed designs, or provided a higher standard of design. Applicants will also be expected to demonstrate how their proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design principles as well as explaining their approach to achieving this by carrying out a Building for Life 12 evaluation.

As stated above, the design code is a technical document which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development at North Hethersett. It does not fix every detail, but is intended to allow designers a degree of creative flexibility as long as design quality is retained.

All reserved matters applications for development within the code area shall be required to comply with the guiding principles and design parameters of the masterplan and design code unless it can be demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that individual site circumstances justify a minor departure from it.
5.  **Conclusion**

5.1 Following the changes to the masterplan and design code, officers are now satisfied with the document. The format and content of the design code is considered to be comprehensive, legible and user friendly as a stand-alone document. It covers all the requirements set out in condition 4 of planning permission 2011/1804. Officers are satisfied that the masterplan and design code will provide clear design guidance to developers and their agents and will secure a high quality integrated development with a strong sense of place and identity for North Hethersett.

5.2 It is therefore considered that the submitted masterplan and design code is acceptable and will ensure that all subsequent phases of development will achieve a consistently high standard of development that reflects and relates well to each other meeting the original aspirations for the development at North Hethersett.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  
Chris Watts 01508 533765  
cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2015/1766/D  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Jordan Last  
Site Address: Land North Of The A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/0505/O for road layout

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
1. In accordance with approved plans  
2. Tree species, locations and pit details required  
3. Highways – technical highway design to be approved  
4. Highways – roads to binder course prior to occupation

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
- Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
- Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
- Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
- Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
- Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
- DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
- DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
- DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
- DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
- DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
- DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
- DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
- DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
- DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
- DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design  
- DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
- Wymondham Area Action Plan  
- WYM 3: Land at South Wymondham  
- WYM 10: General Green Infrastructure requirements for new developments in the south of Wymondham  
- WYM 13: New Recreation provision in Wymondham
1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0505 Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting

2.2 2015/1115 Discharge of condition 5 of planning application 2011/0505/O - Design code

2.3 2015/1725 Discharge of conditions 4 - Phasing Scheme, 7 - Green Infrastructure Management Plan, 10 - Foul Water Strategy and 11 - Surface Water Strategy of permission 2011/0505/O.

2.4 2015/1280 Phase 1 development for 10 dwellings including site Infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure following outline planning permission 2011/0505.

2.5 2015/1649 Residential development of 129 dwellings with details for Appearance, Landscape, Layout and Scale.

2.6 2015/1760 Proposed development for 90 new dwellings including parking, garages, road infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure.

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council No objection

3.2 District Member To be considered by Development Management Committee - Given the scale of this application and the impacts it would have on the local area,

3.3 NCC Highways No objection

Comments on final amended plans:
- The amended plans address my earlier comments.
- Reiterate (but not relevant to this application) the fact that the visibility splays required at the access to the proposed community facility are likely to rely on using a large area of frontage and that this area will need to be kept clear and unobstructed.
- With regards to conditions I am aware condition 17 of the outline consent requires details of the following to be submitted and approved:
i. Roads, footways, cycleways, foul and on-site water drainage
ii. Visibility splays
iii. Access arrangements
iv. Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard
v. Bus Stops and shelters

- The Highway Authority are satisfied the layout of these points i-iv have been addressed under the submitted drawings and would have no objection to these parts of the condition being discharged subject to the following estate road conditions and informative being appended to both reserved matters permissions: detailed plans of roads, footways, cycleways, foul and surface water drainage to be submitted; road, footways and cycleways to be constructed to binder course surfacing level prior to first occupation; note re streetlighting
- Conditions 21, 22 & 23 of the outline consent remain relevant.

Comments on amended plans
Further details and amendments are still required:
Further consideration of how the site layout links with the re-designed off-site highway works will be given on receipt of revised plans. In the meantime I would offer the following comments:
Details of pedestrian links on Silfield Road and the road layout need further consideration; details of alignment of roads and vehicle speed management; All side roads will be subject to 20mph zones and will require TROs. These will be secured as part of the S38 agreements; radii of junctions need clarification; sightlines need clarification.

Original comments:
New estate roads should be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Norfolk Residential Design Guide. I
Further information and amendments are required in respect of:
whether the number, scale and location of junctions onto the spine road are appropriate; how the site links with the revised off-site works layout; consideration of speed limits and road alignments: radii of junctions; visibility splays; details of junction of shared surface roads and the main roads; provision and extent of verges; query bus stops/shelters.

3.4 SNC Landscape Officer
No objection

Original comments:
We need to ensure that adequate provision is made for the street tree planting that is outlined in the design code and indicated on the submitted drawings. My view is that it would be reasonable to expect to know now exactly what will be planted (and how) within the verges that are included with this scheme. We must be clear about the responsibility for the long-term management for the trees (and if they are to be part of the adopted highway, then NCC need to agree the details too). We also need to ensure that the specification for the roads and foot/cycle paths as presented will not preclude any options for further street tree
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planting in the immediate margin adjacent to them. It may be that root barriers need to be incorporated with the construction at strategic points along the route.

Comments on amended plans:

The locations of highway trees are now provided, and those shown are acceptable. There is, however, a short section of verge at Road 4 (the new access to the Bays Field character area) that might take some planting too and this should be sought. We will need to have confirmation that the adopting authority (NCC) also agrees with the proposed siting, and also whether there are any particular specification/engineering requirements. Notwithstanding the submitted tree pit detail (and options approved on sites elsewhere), it would be preferable to see if the overall rooting volume for the new trees can be maximised by extending them under the pavement. The better the conditions, the more successful and healthy the trees will ultimately be. It is likely that the trees within the parking bays on Road 2 will require a specific design solution as the pits are shown directly in and under the carriageway construction. We need to be absolutely sure that the street tree planting will be able to be implemented without being compromised by other factors (such as building foundations). It is therefore imperative that the full details of the species for each of the locations, and the pits, are agreed prior to the commencement of construction (of either of roads or plots). Ideally I would like to have the additional information / revised scheme prior to a decision being made on the application.

3.5  NCC Ecologist  No objection

Comments on amended information:
- Consider the responses to be adequate in terms of the issues raised and have no comments to make further to those already submitted. As such we are happy to approve the discharge of condition 7 for case (ref 2015/1725) and to approve the Reserved Matters for cases (ref 2015/1766 and ref 2015/1649.

Original comments:
Are of the opinion that the commitments made in the documents submitted (Green infrastructure management plans) provide sufficient confidence for South Norfolk Council to understand the implications on ecology and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site. As such we can recommend the approval of Reserved Matters in terms of ecology for cases 2015/1649 and 2015/1725, and also discharge of condition 7 for case 2015/1280.

3.6  Natural England  No comments to make.

3.7  Norfolk Wildlife Trust  No comments received

3.8  Historic Environment Service  No objection – a condition is already imposed on the outline in respect of archaeology

3.9  NCC Lead Local Flood Authority  No comments received
3.10 Internal Drainage Board
Advise that the developer will need to seek consent from them to discharge surface water into their network.

3.11 Highways England
No objection.

3.12 Wymondham Heritage Society
No comments received.

3.13 Norfolk Fire Service
No comments received.

3.14 Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group
Comments on amended information:
- The Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) seems to answer most of the questions but could the developer confirm that there will be silt/pollution traps to ensure the quality of the water entering the Tiffey?
- The report refers to the Foul Water (FW) sewer crossing two tree-lined boundaries and reducing manholes, but this action does not relate to the FW drain. The comment should refer to the Surface Water (SW) drain.
- We would suggest that The Ecology Consultancy make contact with The Lizard Charity to discuss the mitigation measures and any pipe that crosses their land.
- The pumping station should be cited on the developers land and not in the landscape buffer.
- Please advise how ongoing maintenance of private spaces that is required to maintain the effectiveness of the SUDS scheme will be enforced.
- The group would like to thank the developer for this information which gives more clarity about the green infrastructure contribution as set out in the S106 agreement.

Original comments:
- Pleased to see that a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) has been submitted which covers the mitigation of the adverse impacts of the development and its construction on the ecology of the area, the protection of species and habitat, green infrastructure connections and the management of greenspace areas.
- Would like to see further information on mitigation measures in connection with the formation of surface water and foul water drains in close proximity to the Lizard and Wades Pit County Wildlife Sites and the forming of the new surface water drain across the Lizard County Wildlife site towards the River Tiffey.
- Would also like to see more about the implementation, management and on-going maintenance of the green infrastructure which will be provided as part of the development. The group is concerned about the reliance on future maintenance and/or replacement of hard landscaping by private individuals to contribute to the maintenance of a site-wide SUDS scheme.
- The group would be particularly interested to understand more about the green infrastructure contribution set out in the S106 agreement and how this money will be collected and spent.

3.15 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No comments to make.
3.16 Historic England  
No comments to make. The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of the Council's Conservation advice.

3.17 Norfolk Fire Service  
No comments received

3.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
No concerns.

3.19 The Lizard Charity  
Object

Summary of detailed comments received:
- The below ground facility at the junction of The Lizard and Station Road emits odours on a regular basis which is not acceptable, and gives us no faith in the assurances made. Please advise that will absolutely not be the case with the new pumping station proposed as part of this development.
- Please also advise the location of the 4m high vent pipe, which we expect to be on the developers side of the pump station, furthest from The Lizard County Wildlife Site.
- Technically we expect the pumping station can go anywhere, however, if the pump station is located within the buffer, then it will erode the effective width of that buffer. Anything that reduces the effective width is not acceptable.
- We would need to see sight of a revised surface water plan before commenting further on the likely root protection zones and number of manholes.
- Do not accept that a note to the Drainage Strategy drawing that refers to this sewer alignment to be agreed on site prior to construction. Alternative routes to the River Tiffey should be explored.
- If a Section 98 Sewer Requisition is used for the sewer this needs to be confirmed. Again, there are alternative routes.
- With regard to Bats, there will need to be a full environmental survey undertaken, with a full EIS prepared in respect of this sewer specifically.
- When alternative routes do exist, it is not in the interests of the public and users of The Lizard to permit any commercial developer-led project to impact adversely on The Lizard Pastures.

Original comments:
- The Charity has no comment to make on the design or layout of the proposed development.
- Implied by the applications is the routing of the Foul Water (FW) and Surface Water (SW) drainage beyond the site and towards The Lizard Pastures.
- The FW sewer is indicated running towards a new pumping station immediately to the south of the Lizard Pastures and the SW drain running across the Lizard.
- The routes are subject to a separate discharge of conditions application and we do not consider that the applications should be separate as one is dependent on the other.

Consequently we object to this application on the basis that it relies on a separate application being approved, that is not yet approved, and to which we have made separate objections.
3.20 Wymondham Heritage Society

No comments received

3.21 Representations

9 letters of objection received on the following grounds (summarised):

- Consortium Road application Boundary sheet 1 of 3 shows road 1 access to the new estate having right of way to the new estate over Silfield Road. For example if we were to drive south on Silfield Road towards Ashwellthorpe we would have to turn right at the junction of road 1 towards the A11 flyover. This junction would appear to be on a blind bend and would be dangerous for all road users. This could be solved by inserting a roundabout or giving right of way to traffic leaving Wymondham Ashwellthorpe bound.

- The existing carriageway alignment on Silfield Road and its priority should remain as is with no amendment.

- The amount of traffic that would be coming down Silfield road with no measures for traffic calming mentioned in any developers plans. Such measures as priority build-outs, speed tables, road humps, 20 mph speed limit. In our personal view priority build outs would be best suited this would force traffic to slow down and cause less noise as speed bumps and be more effective. We would advise a traffic survey be conducted on Silfield road to establish the current amount of traffic and how it would impact on residents and safety. We would suggest the survey is carried out after the Silfield Road bridge is re-opened. Conducting such survey would determine the road layout for such development as a large amount of traffic already passes through Silfield serving the neighbouring villages.

- We are supportive of a proposed development in the neighbouring area as long as it is done with the consideration of the existing residents in terms of quality of life and safety.

- Serious objection the town does not have the infrastructure for further expansion

- At present the health and education facilities can barely cope

- If we allow more development the town will lose what little character remains

- Traffic impact

- Existing issues of speeding

- More development needs more infrastructure such as shops and schools

- Schools are overcrowded

- Concern if railway bridge improvements don’t work

- Under the bridge flooded this week (04.09.2015)

- Traffic under bridge is already a problem

- The A11 should be joined to Silfield Road

- The layout will cause traffic bottlenecks to the Ashwellthorpe end of Silfield Road as well as at the railway bridge

- No thought given to anyone who wants to travel along Silfield Road in either direction

- The use of the railway bridge underpass as the single point of access to the town is creating a single point of failure.

- The road layout will lead to an over-dense development

- The development has been forced through by SNC against the town council, local opinion and benefit.

- SNC should be supporting brownfield/infill development and local residents instead of high density inappropriate greenfield development which only benefits developers.
Development Management Committee 11 November 2015

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is a reserved matters application for the primary and secondary road layout for the parcel of land to the east of Silfield Road.

4.2 The site relates to an area of agricultural land at South Wymondham to the east of Silfield Road, which forms part of land that has outline consent for 500 dwellings granted on the 6 February 2014 (ref 2011/0505). This application now seeks approval of reserved matters, which include the road layout of the main spine road through the site.

4.3 The roads to be approved as part of this application are the primary and secondary road layout through the site. The roads that connect from this primary and secondary route in to each parcel will be approved under the reserved matters for each housing parcel.

4.4 The application is accompanied by an arboricultural report, tree constraints plan, Green Infrastructure Management Plan and surface water drainage strategy.

4.5 Following the grant of outline consent, a Design Code and parameter plans for the whole site was approved, which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development at Park Farm, Wymondham.

4.6 A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the site and this secured a number of obligations, including contributions for education, libraries, securing the quantum of play and recreation space and the future management and maintenance of those spaces, affordable housing at 15%, off-site highway works and a travel plan contribution.

4.7 The main issues for consideration under this application are the:
   - principle of development;
   - highways issues;
   - layout;
   - trees and landscaping;
   - residential amenity;
   - drainage;
   - ecology and green infrastructure.

Principle of development

4.8 The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/0505. The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3, WYM10 and WYM13. The site also has regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of up to 500 dwellings. As such the principle is established for residential development. It is therefore only the details reserved at that outline that are now for consideration.

4.9 This particular reserved matters application relates to the road layout only. The Masterplan submitted with the outline application indicated the proposed site accesses from Silfield Road and this reserved matter application follows those principles. A detailed assessment of the acceptability of the road layout is set out in the highways section below.

Highways issues

4.10 Policy DM3.11 states that development will not be permitted if it endangers highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.
4.11 The principle of the development being served off Silfield Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement.

4.12 The details of the access points to Silfield Road and the internal estate road layout is now for consideration.

4.13 The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site.

4.14 In line with details indicated at the outline stage, Silfield Road (at the south of the development) would be re-aligned to create the new southern access into the site. The access further north on Silfield Road would be taken from the existing road alignment. Access from the western side of Silfield Road as detailed in the masterplan would be located to the south of 94 Silfield Road.

4.15 The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority which required amendments and further information to address technical highway specifications. The Highway Authority has confirmed that the plans as amended address their comments and they raise no objection subject to conditions being imposed in respect of requiring technical design details to be agreed with the highway authority and construction of the roads to binder course level prior to first occupation of the dwellings.

4.16 Concern has been raised by local residents in respect of the re-aligned Silfield Road however this strategy was set out at the outline stage and the Highway Authority has confirmed no objection to this matter.

4.17 The proposed access and road layout is therefore considered to comply with policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Layout

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

4.19 The detailed design of the site has been informed by the approved Design Code and parameters plans. The design code provides a framework in which this reserved matters application has been taken forward, ensuring a distinctive and recognisable development whilst achieving a coherent overall identity across the site as a whole.

4.20 The general layout of the site, which has been informed by the Design Code and follows the principles set in the strategic masterplan set at the outline stage is considered acceptable.

4.21 The layout of the main primary and secondary roads through the site allows for sufficient parcels of development to be served off them to deliver the quantum and quality of housing, open space and green infrastructure etc. and to be delivered at the reserved matters stage and it is considered therefore that the proposal accords with the approved design code and development plan.

Trees/Landscaping

4.22 The access and road layout do not require any substantial tree removal and there is no objection from the Landscape Officer therefore in this respect.
4.23 In respect of new tree planting along the highway verge, new tree planting is proposed and the overall strategy is supported by the Council’s Landscape Officer subject to further trees in road section 4 being shown, full details of species and pitch details for the trees, and confirmation from the Highway Authority that the tree locations/species and details can be accommodated without any highway objection. Therefore subject to further details in this respect either prior to determination or by the imposition of a pre-commencement condition, the landscaping is considered acceptable and to accord with the approved design code and the development plan.

Residential amenity

4.24 Development Management policies DM3.13 and DM3.14 seek to protect the residential amenities of new and existing residents, whilst the wider policy framework emphasises the importance of good design in planning to ensure successful developments.

4.25 The principle of the development, access points, and number of dwellings is established through the outline consent and the impacts on general residential amenity in this respect had already been considered. The layout of the road as proposed would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of existing properties.

Drainage

4.26 Objections have been raised by Norfolk County Council Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the drainage strategy proposed for the discharge of surface water drainage condition application 2015/1725 and other housing reserved matters application currently under consideration (2015/1280, 2015/1649, 2015/1760). In respect of the road layout, it is not considered that the layout of the road affects the ability of the developers to deliver the overall drainage strategy on the site which includes ponds, swales and a piped system. No development can commence until the surface water drainage strategy is approved under that discharge of condition application so there are no risks to the Local Planning Authority or flood risk to local residents in granting consent for the road layout prior to the surface water drainage condition being discharged.

Ecology and Green Infrastructure

Existing features such as trees along the site boundary are to be retained as part of the development and further landscaping proposed. This coupled with the use of open spaces and green corridors around the site to create linked linear parks and enhancement features such as the creation of grassland habitats and use of native species with proposed planting of shrubs and trees would help create a green infrastructure network and habitat which should result in a net enhancement to biodiversity.

4.27 As required by the outline consent a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) sits alongside this application and has been submitted as a separate discharge of condition application ref 2015/1725, which is currently under consideration at the time of writing this report. The GIMP outlines the proposals for Green Infrastructure and broad measures across the development areas, which include measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the ecology of the area; protection of species and associated habitat; identification of the green infrastructure and provision for the management of greenspace areas.

4.28 The Committee will note that the Green Infrastructure Group have made comments in respect to the GIMP seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of conditions application ref 2015/1725. The comments regard surface water and foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and the maintenance of the Green Infrastructure as well as technical matters relating to the position of the pumping station outside of the site boundary. At the time of writing the report further
information has been provided by the Ecology Consultancy and discussions with the green infrastructure group and The Lizard Charity are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of conditions application. These matters are to be agreed by condition and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site boundary.

4.30 The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the Green Infrastructure Management Plan as submitted, and the commitments made in the plan provide sufficient information to understand the implications on ecology and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site.

4.31 Natural England has also confirmed no object to this development. The outline planning consent also requires that a Construction Environmental Management Plan for protecting ecologically sensitive areas is submitted by condition.

4.32 Therefore subject to the Green Infrastructure Management Plan to be agreed by condition, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims the Wymondham Area Action Plan WYM10, general Green Infrastructure requirements for development in South Wymondham, NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

4.33 The outline application to which this reserved matters relates was Schedule 2 development under the EIA regulations and was therefore accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

4.34 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion has been undertaken through the course of the application. Consideration has been given as to whether this reserved matters application as proposed would have any adverse impact on the environment. Having taken into account the selection criteria in schedule 3 to the 2011 Regulations, it is considered that the development as proposed is not considered to give rise to any adverse impact on the environment.

4.35 Furthermore all potential impacts of the development as a whole were considered by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application. The main characteristics of the potential impact of the development for consideration are the physical scale of the development, increased traffic, noise, emissions to air and water. These impacts were fully considered with the submitted Environmental Statement for the outline application. There is no evidence to suggest that the delivery of this reserved matter application on this particular phase of the approved outline would increase the impact of the development on the environment over and above that already identified by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline. This reserved matters as proposed is not therefore considered to give rise to significant impacts and the reserved matters application itself is not EIA development and nor does it merit any amendments to the original Environmental Statement.

Financial considerations

4.36 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 outline permission was granted prior to CIL being adopted by the Council.
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2011/0505. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout, and is consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

5.2 It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission continue to be applicable and will be required to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s which the Local Planning Authority has full control over.

5.3 On the basis of the above it is recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions.

5.4 It is considered that the road layout is appropriate and that the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS, Wymondham Area Action Plan and South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln, 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2015/1280/D
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

   **Applicants Name**: Mr John Dale
   **Site Address**: Land North Of The A11  Phase 1 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk
   **Proposal**: Phase 1 development for 10 dwellings including site Infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure following outline planning permission 2011/0505.

   **Recommendation**: Authorise Director for Growth and Localism to approve with Conditions.

   1. In accordance with submitted drawings

      Subject to further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be agreed to adequately deal with surface water.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   Policy 7: Supporting Communities
   Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
   Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
   Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   Development Management Policies
   DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   DM1.3 The sustainable location of new development
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM3.1 Meeting housing requirements and needs
   DM3.8 Design principles
   DM3.11 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.12 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.13 Amenity, noise, quality of life
   DM3.14 Pollution, health and safety
   DM3.15 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
   DM4.1 Renewable energy
   DM4.2 Sustainable drainage and water management
   DM4.3 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
   DM4.8 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
   DM4.9 Incorporating landscape into design
   DM4.10 Heritage Assets
1.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan
WYM3 Land at South Wymondham
WYM10 General Green Infrastructure requirements for new developments in South Wymondham
WYM13 New recreation provision in South Wymondham

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

Statutory duties relating to 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 2011/0505 Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting
Approved

2.2 2015/1115 Discharge of condition 5 of planning application 2011/0505/O - Design code
Approved

2.3 2015/1725 Discharge of conditions 4 - Phasing Scheme, 7 - Green Infrastructure Management Plan, 10 - Foul Water Strategy and 11 - Surface Water Strategy of permission 2011/0505/O.
under consideration

2.4 2015/1766 Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/0505/O for road layout
under consideration

2.5 2015/1649 Reserved Matters development for 129 dwellings including site Infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure following outline planning permission 2011/0505.
under consideration

2.6 2015/1760 Proposed development for 90 new dwellings including parking, garages, road infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure.
under consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council
No comments received

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.3 | Anglian Water Services Ltd           | No objection | - There are no Anglian Water surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore has no comments in respect to surface water.  
- Mitigation has been identified for foul water however the improvement works have not yet been carried out, therefore Anglian Water can only recommend the part discharge of condition 10 (foul water). |
| 3.4 | SNC Design Officer                   | No objection | Comments on amended plans (based on the Design Code):  
- Layout and house types have been updated in response to design comments and are considered acceptable. |
|     | Original comments (based on the Design Code):  
- Suggest that dwellings facing Silfield Road and the community green are brick, to reflect the predominate character of this part of S. Wymondham at the entrance to the site.  
- Plots 5 – 7 would be better if they were positioned so that they followed the alignment of the road.  
- House types P508 should all be of the same materials. |
| 3.5 | SNC Community Services - Protection  | No objection |  
- Recommends conditions for a Construction Environmental Management Plan and that guidance as detail in the Contamination Report paragraph 32.2/33 page 21 appendix 2 should be implemented. |
| 3.6 | NCC Highways                         | No objection | Comments on amended plans:  
- Confirm that the layout shown on drawing 14-2294-RM-02 C is acceptable, subject to conditions. |
|     | Original comments:  
- The access to plots 1 - 3 should be via a shared private drive accessed direct from Silfield Road midway along the site frontage. This would remove the proposed access, which is currently too close to the adjacent junction |
| 3.7 | SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager | No objection |  
- As the required number of affordable homes are to be provided elsewhere within Phase 1. |
| 3.8 | NHS England                          | No comments received. | |
| 3.9 | GP Surgery                           | No comments received. | |
| 3.10| NCC Lead Local Flood Authority       | Object   | Comments on amended information:  
- Unable to respond within requested timescales.  
- Recommends that the principles of the drainage strategy, as well as the management of surface water during the construction of the development phases are finalised in advance of deciding on the Reserved Matters applications. |
Lack of information relating to the prevention of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework para 103 and 109.

3.11 NCC Planning Obligations Co Ordinator
No objection and offers no comments.

3.12 SNC Landscape Officer
No objection

Comments on amended plans:
- Amendments acceptable.

Original comments:
- Suggest that the frontage hedge be continued along the whole frontage to the boundary with 97 Silfield Road
- Omit the oak from the hedging; we have sufficient trees within the frontage and it would be better to substitute with holy for additional evergreen interest.

3.13 Historic England
The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

3.14 Environment Agency
No objection
- We have reviewed the foul water strategy, including details of phasing, and it is considered that the strategy is appropriate for the discharge of the foul water condition.
- The site lies in flood zone 1 and has no other constraints, therefore the only issue to be considered from a flood risk point of view is surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority is now the lead for all surface water matters.

3.15 Highways England
No objection and offers no comments.

3.16 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
No objection
- The site provides good in-curtilage parking and defensible space for all 10 dwellings.
- Vulnerable areas, such as side and rear gardens, need defensive barriers - ideally the minimum of a 1800mm fence should be erected between all houses as close to the front elevation as possible.

3.17 Historic Environment Service
No objection
- Comments are on the outline application (2011/0505) and archaeological works are secured through conditions of the outline consent.

3.18 SNC Conservation Officer
No objection
- There are no listed buildings located within the application site and the site is not within a Conservation Area.

3.19 Natural England
No comment
- The application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscape.
- Advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological advice when determining environmental impacts of development.
3.20 UK Power Networks
No comments received

3.21 Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group
Comments on amended information:
- The Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) seems to answer most of the questions but could the developer confirm that there will be silt/pollution traps to ensure the quality of the water entering the Tiffey.
- The report refers to the Foul Water (FW) sewer crossing two tree-lined boundaries and reducing manholes, but this action does not relate to the FW drain. The comment should refer to the Surface Water (SW) drain.
- We would suggest that The Ecology Consultancy make contact with The Lizard Charity to discuss the mitigation measures and any pipe that crosses their land.
- The pumping station should be cited on the developers land and not in the landscape buffer.
- Please advise how ongoing maintenance of private spaces that is required to maintain the effectiveness of the SUDS scheme will be enforced.
- The group would like to thank the developer for this information which gives more clarity about the green infrastructure contribution as set out in the S106 agreement.

Original comments:
- Pleased to see that a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) has been submitted which covers the mitigation of the adverse impacts of the development and its construction on the ecology of the area, the protection of species and habitat, green infrastructure connections and the management of greenspace areas.
- Would like to see further information on mitigation measures in connection with the formation of surface water and foul water drains in close proximity to the Lizard and Wades Pit County Wildlife Sites and the forming of the new surface water drain across the Lizard County Wildlife site towards the River Tiffey.
- Would also like to see more about the implementation, management and on-going maintenance of the green infrastructure which will be provided as part of the development.

The group is concerned about the reliance on future maintenance and/or replacement of hard landscaping by private individuals to contribute to the maintenance of a site-wide SUDS scheme.
- The group would be particularly interested to understand more about the green infrastructure contribution set out in the S106 agreement and how this money will be collected and spent.

3.22 The Lizard Charity
Object

Summary of detailed comments received:
- The below ground facility at the junction of The Lizard and Station Road emits odours on a regular basis which is not acceptable, and gives us no faith in the assurances made.

Please advise that will absolutely not be the case with the new pumping station proposed as part of this development.
Please also advise the location of the 4m high vent pipe, which we expect to be on the developers side of the pump station, furthest from The Lizard County Wildlife Site.

Technically we expect the pumping station can go anywhere, however, if the pump station is located within the buffer, then it will erode the effective width of that buffer. Anything that reduces the effective width is not acceptable.

We would need to see sight of a revised surface water plan before commenting further on the likely root protection zones and number of manholes.

Do not accept that a note to the Drainage Strategy drawing that refers to this sewer alignment to be agreed on site prior to construction. Alternative routes to the River Tiffey should be explored.

If a Section 98 Sewer Requisition is used for the sewer this needs to be confirmed. Again, there are alternative routes.

With regard to Bats, there will need to be a full environmental survey undertaken, with a full EIS prepared in respect of this sewer specifically.

When alternative routes do exist, it is not in the interests of the public and users of The Lizard to permit any commercial developer-led project to impact adversely on The Lizard Pastures.

Original comments:

The Charity has no comment to make on the design or layout of the proposed development.

Implied by the applications is the routing of the Foul Water (FW) and Surface Water (SW) drainage beyond the site and towards The Lizard Pastures.

The FW sewer is indicated running towards a new pumping station immediately to the south of the Lizard Pastures and the SW drain running across the Lizard.

The routes are subject to a separate discharge of conditions application and we do not consider that the applications should be separate as one is dependent on the other.

Consequently we object to this application on the basis that it relies on a separate application being approved, that is not yet approved, and to which we have made separate objections.

3.23 NCC Ecologist | No objection

Agree that an Environmental Protected Species licence is not necessary.

The commitments made in both provide sufficient confidence for South Norfolk Council to understand the implications on ecology and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site.

We have noted the responses from The Ecology Consultancy and Bovis Homes regarding the points raised by the Lizard Charity and Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group.

We deem the responses to be adequate in terms of the issues raised and have no comments to make further to those already submitted.

As such we can recommend the approval of Reserved Matters in terms of ecology.
3.24 Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board

No objection

- Envisage an attenuated site using SUDs, however the route of any normal or exceedance discharge must be provided to confirm whether or not discharges will flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system.
- Should water flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system then further more detailed conditions will need to be met to let this occur.

3.25 Anglian Water

No objection

- There are no surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore we have no comments in respect to surface water.
- Mitigation has been identified for foul water.

3.26 Representations

13 letters of objection on the following grounds:

- Access road from Silfield Road substandard and prone to flooding at bridge with surface water and sewage causing possible pollution of nearby River Tiffey which has water voles present on Tolls Meadow.
- Development will erode the green outlook from my property. Recommends that the site is open space such as football pitch or cricket pitch.
- Proposed road opposite no’s 76 and 78 is unacceptable and will create disturbance from heavy lorries in the future.
- Headlights of vehicles exiting the site will be pointing toward existing residents on Silfield Rd.
- If road has to be built, then can it be opposite Green Lane junction.
- The first driveway on the adjoining road is too near to the junction onto Silfield Road.
- This whole scheme, together with others planned, seem unreasonable, unnecessary and adds nothing to the environment of Wymondham.
- Increased traffic along Silfield Road, the railway bridge and connecting roads to the A11 will be unable to cope.
- The development needs to be accessed on to the A11 from Silfield Road and the railway bridge. A slip road is required.
- Doctor’s surgeries, schools and other facilities will be unable to cope with the extra homes.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is a reserved matters application for 10 dwellings. The site relates to an area of agricultural land at South Wymondham to the east of Silfield Road, which forms part of land that has outline consent for 500 dwellings granted on the 6 February 2014 (ref 2011/0505). This application now seeks approval of reserved matters, which include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and access for 10 dwellings.

4.2 Following the grant of outline consent, a Design Code and parameter plans for the whole site was approved, which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development at Park Farm, Wymondham.

4.3 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 3, 4 and 5 bed accommodation. These would include a combination of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. No affordable housing is proposed on this site as this will be provided elsewhere in accordance with the approved S106 Agreement.
4.4 The site comprises of a vehicular access point off Silfield Road that serves four dwellings from a private shared drive and a further access that forms the entrance to the development and links to the primary Spine route running through the centre of the site. The principle internal road layout forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, which is under consideration at the time of writing this report.

4.5 A network of open spaces and linear green corridors are proposed that have been agreed as part of the outline consent and approved Design Code and parameter plans. The open spaces comprise of recreation and play spaces located to the south of the site along Silfield Road and a linear park to the east of the site. Members should note that the detailed design of these open spaces and green corridors will be subject to a separate Reserved Matters application and do not form part of this application. The landscaping proposals included with the site boundary for this site are considered in more detail below.

4.6 A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the overall site and this secured a number of obligations, including contributions for education, libraries, securing the quantum of play and recreation space and the future management and maintenance of those spaces, affordable housing, off-site highway works and a travel plan contribution.

4.7 The main issues for consideration of this application are the:

- principle of development;
- access and highways issues;
- open space;
- landscaping;
- layout, appearance and scale;
- ecology;
- drainage;
- residential amenity;
- affordable housing; and
- sustainable construction.

Principle of development

4.8 The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/0505. The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3, WYM10 and WYM13. The site also has regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of up to 500 dwellings. As such the principle is established for residential development and the number of dwellings now proposed for this phase of development for 10 dwellings is acceptable. It is therefore only the details reserved at that outline that are now for consideration, which as mentioned above include access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Access and Highways issues

4.9 The principle of the development being served off Silfield Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement.

4.10 The road layout currently forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, which is under consideration at the time of writing this report. The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site.
4.11 This reserved matters application seeks to agree the precise details of highways within this phases of residential development and do not form part of the principle road layout.

4.12 The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority which required the access to plots 1 - 3 to be provided via a shared private drive accessed direct from Silfield Road midway along the site frontage. The Highways Authority has confirmed that the amended scheme is now acceptable.

4.13 In respect of parking provision, policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site, totalling 29 parking spaces. Garage sizes are 7m x 3m which are sized to ensure sufficient storage space in addition to parking that comply with the Parking Standards for Norfolk Guide (2007).

4.14 Car parking is all on plot and ensures that the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking. Dwellings are linked by garages and linked canopies/ car ports that help to support street scenes and create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.

4.15 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Open space

4.16 The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3 and WYM13. The amount of open space required was set out in the S106 which formed part of the outline planning application and was further developed in the Design Code and parameters plans.

4.17 The open space framework for the overall development creates a network of open spaces and linear green corridors which are designed to be multi-functional and respond to a number of specific design principles as set out in the Design Code. The open spaces that relate to this phase of development comprise of recreation and play spaces located to the south of the site along Silfield Road, known as Peaceacre Park, and the linear park to the east, known as Green Oak Linear Park. Whilst the detailed design of these open spaces and green corridors are subject to a separate Reserved Matters application, they continue to inform the design proposals for this application.

4.18 The location of the Peaceacre Park to the south of the site along Silfield Road allows for strong physical and visual linkages between the existing community along Silfield Road and the proposed development, which creates a well-integrated and shared community space. The park itself comprises sports play provision with a football pitch, cricket pitch and Local Equipped Area of Play as well as new tree, shrub and meadow planting. Buildings front on to this space, which helps to enclose the open space and create attractive views across the park.

4.19 In terms of the Green Oak Linear Park, this boarders the site to the east and sweeps from the edge of the Peaceacre Park to the norther boundary of Park Farm. The park itself comprises two attenuation ponds, a local Equipped Area of Play and informal play opportunities, which respond positively to the edge of the site.
4.20 The proposed open spaces and linear parks associated with this reserved matters application demonstrate that the character of the development will be enhanced by the landscape proposals and provides sufficient detail to ensure that the proposals are acceptable, subject to further details that will be secured by a separate reserved matters application.

4.21 The future management and maintenance of the open space, play areas and green corridors is to be agreed through the S106 which was completed as part of the outline consent.

4.22 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policy WYM13 of the Wymondham Action Plan and Policy DM3.15 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11.

Landscaping

4.23 With regards to the landscaping included within the site boundary for this site, the landscape officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and the scheme has subsequently been amended to ensure that the proposed layout is compatible with the requirement set by the Design Code.

4.24 The interface between this phase of the development and Peaceacre open space has subsequently been amended and the boundary treatments updated to provide better long-term management. Details of street trees within verges have also been reviewed and updated to ensure that sufficient margin has been allowed for these trees to grow without conflict with dwellings or highways, as well as additional planting provided along some boundaries where private drives abut open spaces.

4.25 As set out in the Design Code, the design principals for this area are swathes of grasses with hints of colour and variety of texture with herbaceous plants to compliment the planting palette within Peaceacre Park. Hedgerows show a transition from Peaceacre Park to private gardens. The dwellings fronting on to Peaceacre Park are planted with Privet hedges, with swathes of shrubs, ornamental grasses, herbaceous perennials and lawns. A new native hedgerow with hedgerow trees is proposed along the western boundary with Silfield Road, along with a grass verge and swathes of bulbs.

4.26 The Landscape Officer has confirmed that the amendments and revised scheme is acceptable and does not wish to raise an objection to the proposals. Overall in respect of the landscape impact and landscaping, the approach to the landscaping is considered acceptable. The landscape planting, open spaces and careful consideration of building heights, scale, grouping and massing ensures that the proposal would have no adverse landscape impact to the wider area and would be appropriately screened to its immediate context. It is therefore considered that the proposal would accord with the aims of Policy DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11. Precise planting schedules, management and maintenance details will need to be secured by condition.

Ecology and Green Infrastructure

4.27 Existing features such as trees along the site boundary are to be retained as part of the development and further landscaping proposed. This coupled with the use of open spaces and green corridors around the site to create linked linear parks and enhancement features such as the creation of grassland habitats and use of native species with proposed planting of shrubs and trees would help create a green infrastructure network and habitat which should result in a net enhancement to biodiversity.
As required by the outline consent a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) sits alongside this application and has been submitted as a separate discharge of condition application ref 2015/1725, which is currently under consideration at the time of writing this report. The GIMP outlines the proposals for Green Infrastructure and broad measures across the development areas, which include measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the ecology of the area; protection of species and associated habitat; identification of the green infrastructure and provision for the management of greenspace areas.

The Committee will note that the Green Infrastructure Group have made comments in respect to the GIMP seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of conditions application ref 2015/1725. The comments regard surface water and foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and the maintenance of the Green Infrastructure as well as technical matters relating to the position of the pumping station outside of the site boundary. At the time of writing the report further information has been provided by the Ecology Consultancy and discussions with the green infrastructure group and The Lizard Charity are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of conditions application. These matters are to be agreed by condition and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site boundary.

The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the Green Infrastructure Management Plan as submitted, and the commitments made in the plan provide sufficient information to understand the implications on ecology and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site.

Natural England has also confirmed no object to this development since adequate mitigation, biodiversity enhancement measures and green infrastructure has been included in the GIMP. The outline planning consent also requires that a Construction Environmental Management Plan for protecting ecologically sensitive areas is submitted by condition.

Therefore subject to the Green Infrastructure Management Plan to be agreed by condition, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims the Wymondham Area Action Plan WYM10, general Green Infrastructure requirements for development in South Wymondham, NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

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

The detailed design of the site has been informed by the approved Design Code and parameters plans. The design code provides a framework in which this reserved matters application has been taken forward, ensuring a distinctive and recognisable development whilst achieving a coherent overall identity across the site as a whole.

The general layout of the site, which has been informed by the Design Code and subject to discussions with Officers following the application being submitted, is considered acceptable.

This proposal aims to deliver a high quality range of dwellings that reflects the local vernacular using quality materials and appropriate elevational detailing informed by a local character assessment and the approved Design Code. The character area comprises of traditional elevational treatments, facing materials and detailing. Buildings front onto the...
open space and are predominately detached with some semi-detached building forms. Buildings are linked by garages and car ports set back from the front elevations that help to create an informal sense of place not to enclose open space. The combination of these elements ensures that the identity of this character is positively reinforced, which assist in creating variety and interest through the development.

4.37 An assessment of the individual house types has been undertaken and the plans amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties. The position of house types and building lines has also been reviewed, which has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces, which is considered acceptable.

4.38 With regard to density, the development proposals achieve an average density of approximately 30dph which accords with the Design Code and parameters plans ensuring the efficient use of land. Density is generally low, when considering open space is not included within this calculation, and reflects existing densities along this part of Silfield Road which helps to provide prominent detached building forms that overlook the open space to the south and east.

4.39 The height and massing of the proposed development defines key spaces and focal points. Built form is 2 storeys, to reflect the existing built form and to minimise the impact of new development. The proposed building heights are in accordance with the agreed Design Code and parameters plans, which aim to create distinctive spaces, while also respecting the edges and sensitive uses of the development.

4.40 Car parking is all on plot and ensures that the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking. Dwellings are linked by garages and linked canopies/ car ports that help to support street scenes and create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.

4.41 With regard to bin storage, each dwelling has a garage with side access as well as a dedicated bin storage area within its rear garden for both convenience to the householder and to avoid any visual detriment to the external street scene. Travel distances between bin storage areas and the designated collection points have been carefully planned within Norfolk County Council guidelines. Generally, all external private gardens have been carefully planned in terms of their size and shape to ensure adequate external storage can easily be accommodated. Provision for cycle storage is provided in garages and rear gardens.

4.42 A design code compliance statement has been submitted, which shows how the design code has been applied to the detailed designs of the site. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design principles.

4.43 Overall, the scheme, as amended, results in a development with its own distinctive character with a strong green network that relates positively to its surroundings and Wymondham. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.8 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.
Secured by design

4.44 The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and considers that the site provides good in-curtilage parking which is preferred by both Secured By Design and crime prevention specialists. The scheme as amended also shows how vulnerable areas, such as side and rear gardens will be enclosed by a minimum of 1800mm fences between houses. The proposals are therefore considered acceptable in this respect and are in accordance with 'Secured By Design' principles.

Residential amenity

4.45 The design and position of the properties along the boundaries of the site have been designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or adverse impacts in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties on Silfield Road and as such is considered acceptable.

4.46 In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Furthermore, the relationships between the proposed dwellings are sufficient that future owners will each have adequate levels of amenity in terms of outlook, privacy and light and have suitable sized and private amenity spaces.

4.47 The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

Drainage - Surface water

4.48 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was considered and approved at the outline stage, which confirmed that the site falls within Flood Zone 1 category (low risk) and is not at risk from flooding. This application is supported by a surface water strategy that builds on the recommendations of the FRA to provide details of the drainage proposed, based on the latest site layout. The strategy sets out the methods for implementing a Sustainable urban Drainage System (SuDS) using attenuation techniques, which includes a combination of attenuation lagoons, swales, permeable paving and rainwater harvesting to drain the surface water from the site.

4.49 Anglian Water have confirmed that there are no surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore have no comments in respect to surface water for this reserved matters application.

4.50 The Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board have requested that the route of any normal or exceedance discharge must be provided to confirm whether or not discharges will flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system. Should water flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system then further more detailed conditions will need to be met to let this occur. These matters are to be agreed by condition on the outline consent and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site.

4.51 A separate application has been submitted to discharge Condition 11 of the outline planning application, which requires a surface water strategy to be submitted to include details of the future adoption and maintenance of surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Lizard Charity has raised concerns about the runoff rates, volume of runoff generated from the development, location of off-site surface water routes and the management of surface water during the construction phase.
Whilst these details form part of condition 11, the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to this reserved matters application on the grounds of insufficient information relating to the prevention of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 103 and 109. The applicant subsequently provided supplementary information that relates to changes to the proposed surface water strategy and location of drainage ponds outside of the site. At the time of writing this report the Lead Local Flood Authority have been unable to provide additional comments in relation to the supplementary information within the timescales requested and recommends that the principles of the drainage strategy, as well as the management of surface water during the construction of the development phases are finalised in advance of deciding on the Reserved Matters applications.

On this basis it is recommended that authority be delegated to the Director for Growth and Localism to approve the application subject to further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water, and subject to no further substantive issues being raised in this respect.

Foul water

The principle of the development in relation to the foul water capacity was considered at the outline stage. The proposed strategy provides a foul water network that meets the requirements for adoption by Anglian Water. Both the Environment Agency and Anglian Water has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed foul water strategy, including details of phasing.

The Committee should note that the Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group have also made comments in respect to foul water seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of condition 10 of the outline consent. The comments relate to foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and The Lizard Pastures as well as matters relating to the location of off-site pipes, the pumping station and sewer requisition.

At the time of writing the report discussions with the The Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of condition 10. Therefore subject to compliance with this condition the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable.

Affordable Housing

No affordable housing is proposed on this site as this will be provided elsewhere in accordance with the approved S106 Agreement. The Councils Affordable Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that this is acceptable. It should be noted that the affordable housing contributions for the site were secured via the S106 agreement linked to the outline planning permission for the site.

In accordance with the Design Code the wider affordable housing outside of this phase has been distributed around the site in small groups that are not distinguishable from other housing types in terms of design quality. Their position within the overall development, elevational treatments and detailing are considered to be acceptable in terms of the character created.

The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan in this respect.
Sustainable construction and renewable energy

4.60 Condition 13 of the outline application requires that the application shall demonstrate that at least 10% of the expected energy requirements shall be provided by renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques in accordance with part 10 of the NPPF and policies 1 and 3 of the JCS. Information has been submitted with this application that demonstrates how the scheme will exceed 10% of the schemes energy requirements from photovoltaic panels and consequent savings of Carbon Dioxide. Therefore subject to the energy efficiency measures being implemented in accordance with the information provided, the submission element of Condition 13 of planning permission 2011/0505 is considered acceptable to meet the requirements of part 10 of the NPPF, policies 1 and 3 of the JCS and Policy DM4.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Screening Opinion

4.61 The outline application to which this reserved matters relates was Schedule 2 development under the EIA regulations and was therefore accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

4.62 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion has been undertaken through the course of the application. Consideration has been given as to whether this reserved matters application as proposed would have any adverse impact on the environment. Having taken into account the selection criteria in schedule 3 to the 2011 Regulations, it is considered that the development as proposed is not considered to give rise to any adverse impact on the environment.

4.63 Furthermore all potential impacts of the development as a whole were considered by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application. The main characteristics of the potential impact of the development for consideration are the physical scale of the development, increased traffic, noise, emissions to air and water. These impacts were fully considered with the submitted Environmental Statement for the outline application. There is no evidence to suggest that the delivery of this reserved matters on this particular phase of the approved outline would increase the impact of the development on the environment over and above that already identified by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline. This reserved matters as proposed is not therefore considered to give rise to significant impacts and the reserved matters application itself is not EIA development and nor does it merit any amendments to the original Environmental Statement.

Financial considerations

4.64 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.

Other matters

4.65 It is noted that Norfolk Historic Environmental Services have requested an archaeological condition to be applied. However, it is noted that there is already a condition in place as part of the approved outline consent ref 2011/0505, which will need to be discharged as part of this application. It would therefore be unreasonable to put in place a further condition.

4.66 The Conservation Buildings Officer has confirmed that there are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. The Listed Buildings that are closest to the site is Coll’s Farm House (Grade II). This is some distance from the application site and it is considered that the proposed development would not
have any adverse impact on these heritage assets and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.67 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.”

4.68 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as outline permission was granted prior to CIL being adopted by the Council.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2011/0505. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout, and is consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

5.2 It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission continue to be applicable and will require to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s which the Local Planning Authority has full control over.

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 further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water.

5.4 Subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding matters in respect to the proposed surface water drainage, it is considered that the landscape, layout, appearance and scale and other relevant issues are appropriate and that the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS, Wymondham Area Action Plan and South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2015/1649/D  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Mr Jordan Last  
**Site Address**: Land North Of The A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk

**Proposal**: Residential development of 129 dwellings with details for Appearance, Landscape, Layout and Scale.

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director for Growth and Localism to approve with Conditions.

1. In accordance with submitted drawings  
2. Details of acoustic fencing to be agreed  

Subject to further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be agreed to adequately deal with surface water.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 Meeting housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8 Design principles  
DM3.11 Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14 Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.15 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space  
DM4.1 Renewable energy  
DM4.3 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
DM4.2 Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.8 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.10 Heritage Assets
1.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan
   WYM3 Land at South Wymondham
   WYM10 General Green Infrastructure requirements for new developments in South Wymondham
   WYM13 New recreation provision in South Wymondham

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

**Statutory duties relating to 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 2011/0505 Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting

   Approved

2.2 2015/1115 Discharge of condition 5 of planning application 2011/0505/O - Design code

   Approved

2.3 2015/1725 Discharge of conditions 4 - Phasing Scheme, 7 - Green Infrastructure Management Plan, 10 - Foul Water Strategy and 11 - Surface Water Strategy of permission 2011/0505/O.

   under consideration

2.4 2015/1766 Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/0505/O for road layout

   under consideration

2.5 2015/1280 Phase 1 development for 10 dwellings including site infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure following outline planning permission 2011/0505.

   under consideration

2.6 2015/1760 Proposed development for 90 new dwellings including parking, garages, road infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure.

   under consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council

   No objection

   - Raised concerns over the green open space in terms of the facilities to be provided and the design of the future community building.
   - Would like to see a number of bungalows.
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd No objection
- There are no Anglian Water surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore has no comments in respect to surface water.
- Mitigation has been identified for foul water however the improvement works have not yet been carried out, therefore Anglian Water can only recommend the part discharge of condition 10 (foul water).

3.4 SNC Design Officer No objection

Comments on amended plans (based on the Design Code):
- Layout and house types have been updated in response to design comments and are considered acceptable.
- The applicant has carried out a Building for Life Assessment, which scores 12 greens out of 12.

Original comments (based on the Design Code):
- The form, scale and mix of buildings types fronting onto the open space could be more varied.
- Whilst it is accepted that we do not known what the exact design and layout of the community facility will be, it is important that the plots along the edge of this space (plots 16 and 17) positively address the future land uses on this site.
- The landscape proposals should be robust enough to create an attractive transition between the edge of the development and A11 at this key entrance to the site.
- The code shows a tree lined verge on both sides of the spine road. However, it is unclear how the trees will be implemented.
- Parking should avoid intruding into the public open space corridor.
- Further detail of the open space/landscape proposals will need to be submitted as part of this application or a future reserved matters application.
- Other detailed comments provided relating to parking, public/private realm, boundary treatments and individual house types.

3.5 SNC Community Services - Protection No objection
- Recommends conditions for a Construction Environmental Management Plan and that guidance as detail in the Contamination Report paragraph 32.2/33 page 21 appendix 2 should be implemented.

3.6 NCC Highways No objection

Comments on amended plans:
- Confirm that the layout is acceptable, subject to conditions.

Original comments:
- The application is concurrently being considered relating to the layout of the main spine roads through the development. Additional information is required in respect of visibility splays, location of trees, visitor parking adjacent to the community green, design speed of shared surface roads, turning heads and parking spaces.
3.7 SNC Water Management Officer

No comment

- We understand that the Lead Local Flood Authority will respond to the above mentioned aspects of this applicant and therefore we will not provide comment at this stage.

3.8 NHS England

No comments received

3.9 GP Surgery

No comments received

3.10 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Object

Comments on amended information:
- Unable to respond within requested timescales.
- Recommends that the principles of the drainage strategy, as well as the management of surface water during the construction of the development phases are finalised in advance of deciding on the Reserved Matters applications.

Original comments:
- Lack of information relating to the prevention of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework para 103 and 109.

3.11 NCC Planning Obligations Co Ordinator

No objection and offers no comments.

3.12 SNC Landscape Officer

No objection

Comments on amended plans:
- Amendments acceptable.

Original comments:
- We need to ensure that the proposed layout is compatible with the requirement set by the Design Code.
- The interface between this phase and Peaceacre open space needs careful consideration, in terms of boundary treatments and management.
- We will need specific details for the tree pits here as will need to establish sufficient rooting volumes under the hard surfacing.
- Whilst public open spaces do not form part of this application, their treatment is implied on the Site Layout and therefore it is necessary to comment so that some issues do not get carried-forward inadvertently.

3.13 Historic England

The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.
3.14 Environment Agency No objection
- We have reviewed the foul water strategy, including details of phasing, and it is considered that the strategy is appropriate for the discharge of the foul water condition.
- The site lies in flood zone 1 and has no other constraints, therefore the only issue to be considered from a flood risk point of view is surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority is now the lead for all surface water matters.

3.15 Highways England No objection and offers no comments.

3.16 Police Architectural Liaison Officer No objection
- The site provides good in-curtilage parking which is preferred by both Secured By Design and crime prevention specialists.
- It has been confirmed that the pathways giving rear access to the affordable dwellings will be lockable with keys provided to respective residents. It is also requested that the pathways access the rear gardens adjacent to the remaining plots.

3.17 Historic Environment Service No objection
- Comments are on the outline application (2011/0505) and archaeological works are secured through conditions of the outline consent.

3.18 SNC Conservation Officer No objection
- There are no listed buildings located within the application site and the site is not within a Conservation Area.

3.19 Natural England No objection
- Natural England does not object to this development since adequate mitigation, biodiversity enhancement measures and green infrastructure has been included, and we do not foresee that European sites will be detrimentally affected.
- Suggests that if planning permission is secured that a Water Strategy/Management Plan.
- Green Infrastructure Statement & Mitigation Strategy and a Construction and Environmental Management Plan are provided by condition.

3.20 UK Power Networks No comments received

3.21 SNC Play and Amenities Officer No objection
Comments on amended information:
- Responses from developer noted and recommend that if play equipment were to be offered to SNDC, then minor changes to the materials of the equipment are made to allow SNDC to provide a positive maintenance regime and keep the parks operational.
Original comments:
- Would like clarification on who will be adopting the play area and if the area along Silfield road is fenced and safe from the road and what measures have been taken to minimise a stray cricket ball from being hit into the play area.

3.22 Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group

Comments on amended information:
- The Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) seems to answer most of the questions but could the developer confirm that there will be silt/pollution traps to ensure the quality of the water entering the River Tiffey.
- The report refers to the Foul Water (FW) sewer crossing two tree-lined boundaries and reducing manholes, but this action does not relate to the FW drain. The comment should refer to the Surface Water (SW) drain.
- We would suggest that The Ecology Consultancy make contact with The Lizard Charity to discuss the mitigation measures and any pipe that crosses their land.
- The pumping station should be cited on the developers land and not in the landscape buffer.
- Please advise how ongoing maintenance of private spaces that is required to maintain the effectiveness of the SUDS scheme will be enforced.
- The group would like to thank the developer for this information which gives more clarity about the green infrastructure contribution as set out in the S106 agreement.

Original comments:
- Pleased to see that a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) has been submitted which covers the mitigation of the adverse impacts of the development and its construction on the ecology of the area, the protection of species and habitat, green infrastructure connections and the management of greenspace areas.
- Would like to see further information on mitigation measures in connection with the formation of surface water and foul water drains in close proximity to the Lizard and Wades Pit County Wildlife Sites and the forming of the new surface water drain across the Lizard County Wildlife site towards the River Tiffey.
- Would also like to see more about the implementation, management and on-going maintenance of the green infrastructure which will be provided as part of the development. The group is concerned about the reliance on future maintenance and/or replacement of hard landscaping by private individuals to contribute to the maintenance of a site-wide SUDS scheme.
- The group would be particularly interested to understand more about the green infrastructure contribution set out in the S106 agreement and how this money will be collected and spent.

3.23 The Lizard Charity

Object

Summary of detailed comments received:
- The below ground facility at the junction of The Lizard and Station Road emits odours on a regular basis which is not acceptable, and gives us no faith in the assurances made.
Please advise that will absolutely not be the case with the new pumping station proposed as part of this development.

- Please also advise the location of the 4m high vent pipe, which we expect to be on the developers side of the pump station, furthest from The Lizard County Wildlife Site.
- Technically we expect the pumping station can go anywhere, however, if the pump station is located within the buffer, then it will erode the effective width of that buffer. Anything that reduces the effective width is not acceptable.
- We would need to see sight of a revised surface water plan before commenting further on the likely root protection zones and number of manholes.
- Do not accept that a note to the Drainage Strategy drawing that refers to this sewer alignment to be agreed on site prior to construction. Alternative routes to the River Tiffey should be explored.
- If a Section 98 Sewer Requisition is used for the sewer this needs to be confirmed. Again, there are alternative routes.
- With regard to Bats, there will need to be a full environmental survey undertaken, with a full EIS prepared in respect of this sewer specifically.
- When alternative routes do exist, it is not in the interests of the public and users of The Lizard to permit any commercial developer-led project to impact adversely on The Lizard Pastures.

Original comments:

- The Charity has no comment to make on the design or layout of the proposed development.
- Implied by the applications is the routing of the Foul Water (FW) and Surface Water (SW) drainage beyond the site and towards The Lizard Pastures.
- The FW sewer is indicated running towards a new pumping station immediately to the south of the Lizard Pastures and the SW drain running across the Lizard.
- The routes are subject to a separate discharge of conditions application and we do not consider that the applications should be separate as one is dependent on the other.
- Consequently we object to this application on the basis that it relies on a separate application being approved, that is not yet approved, and to which we have made separate objections.

3.24 NCC Ecologist No objection

Comments on amended information:

- Consider the responses to be adequate in terms of the issues raised and have no comments to make further to those already submitted. As such we are happy to approve the discharge of condition 7 for case (ref 2015/1725) and to approve the Reserved Matters for cases (ref 2015/1766 and ref 2015/1649).

Original comments:

- Are of the opinion that the commitments made in both provide sufficient confidence for South Norfolk Council to understand the implications on ecology and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site. As such we can recommend the
approval of Reserved Matters in terms of ecology for cases 2015/1649 and 2015/1725, and also discharge of condition 7 for case 2015/1280.

3.25 Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board  
No objection

- Envisage an attenuated site using SUDs, however the route of any normal or exceedance discharge must be provided to confirm whether or not discharges will flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system.
- Should water flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system then further more detailed conditions will need to be met to let this occur.

3.26 Anglian Water  
No objection

- There are no surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore we have no comments in respect to surface water.
- Mitigation has been identified for foul water.

3.27 Representations  
16 letters of objection and 1 letter of support on the following grounds:

- Increased traffic along Silfield Road, the railway bridge and connecting roads to the A11 will be unable to cope.
- The development needs to be accessed on to the A11 from Silfield Road and the railway bridge. A slip road is required.
- Doctor’s surgeries, schools and other facilities will be unable to cope with the extra homes.
- Amenities are required in Silfield if development is to occur, a school and shop as a minimum. Doctor’s surgeries cannot cope already.
- Urge better development of park areas and amenities in the town, current facilities in town are lacking.
- Infrastructure in this area is inadequate.
- As long as sewage, water supply and retail outlets are included then support.
- Strongly suggest a better pedestrian and cycle path into Wymondham town centre along with traffic calming
- Wymondham schools are already full after being changed from Infant schools to Primary and Doctors Surgeries and dental practices are full.
- Lack of local amenities in the Silfield area. We are deficient in a local shop or a decent play area for the children.
- Development requires at least one further swale/reservoir in the event of fires
- Places properties to close to the A11, noise created from traffic creates disturbance
- Sewage works must now be operating beyond its capacity
- Not any means of ingress and egress onto Wymondham railway station platform for those with limited mobility or cycles/ luggage etc.
- Silfield Road realignment is unacceptable and has not been out to consultation and has changed on numerous occasions.
- SNC should be supporting brownfield/infill development and local residents instead of high density inappropriate greenfield development.
- Noise levels in the vicinity of the development reach over 110 decibels
• Before permission is granted a formal full environmental health study should be carried out to ascertain noise levels and impacts on health.

4  Assessment

4.1  The application is a reserved matters application for 129 dwellings. The site relates to an area of agricultural land at South Wymondham to the east of Silfield Road, which forms part of land that has outline consent for 500 dwellings granted on the 6 February 2014 (ref 2011/0505). This application now seeks approval of reserved matters, which include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 129 dwellings.

4.2  Following the grant of outline consent, a Design Code and parameter plans for the whole site was approved, which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development at Park Farm, Wymondham.

4.3  The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed accommodation. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. There is a mix of 2.5 storey, two storey and also some single storey dwellings. An element of affordable housing is also proposed in accordance with the approved S106 Agreement, comprising of 31 dwellings located in two main areas on the site. The mix comprises 1 bed flats, 1, 2 and 3 bed houses and 2 bed bungalows.

4.4  The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site. The principle internal road layout forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, which is currently under consideration.

4.5  A network of open spaces and linear green corridors are proposed that have been agreed as part of the outline consent and approved Design Code and parameter plans. The open spaces comprise of recreation and play spaces located to the west of the site along Silfield Road and to the south of the site along the A11. Members should note that the detailed design of these open spaces and green corridors will be subject to a separate Reserved Matters application and do not form part of this application. The landscaping proposals included with the site boundary for this site are considered in more detail below.

4.6  A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the site and this secured a number of obligations, including contributions for education, libraries, securing the quantum of play and recreation space and the future management and maintenance of those spaces, affordable housing at 15%, off-site highway works and a travel plan contribution.

4.7  The main issues for consideration are the:

- principle of development;
- highways issues;
- open space;
- landscaping;
- layout, appearance and scale;
- ecology;
- drainage;
- residential amenity;
- affordable housing; and
- sustainable construction.
Principle of development

4.8 The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/0505. The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3, WYM10 and WYM13. The site also has regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of up to 500 dwellings. As such the principle is established for residential development and the number of dwellings now proposed for this phase of development for 129 dwellings is acceptable. It is therefore only the details reserved at that outline that are now for consideration, which as mentioned above include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Highways issues

4.9 The principle of the development being served off Silfield Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement.

4.10 The road layout currently forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, which is under consideration at the time of writing this report. The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site.

4.11 This reserved matters application seeks to agree the precise details of highways within the residential development parcels only, which do not form part of the principle road layout.

4.12 The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority which required a number of minor amendments including amendments to parking, driveways, junctions and technical specifications to comply with highway standards.

4.13 In respect of parking provision, policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site, totalling 323 parking spaces. Garage sizes are 7m x 3m which are sized to ensure sufficient storage space in addition to parking that comply with the Parking Standards for Norfolk Guide (2007).

4.14 Car parking is proposed in a variety of different forms throughout the development which include on-plot parking and some on-street parking. The combination of different parking types proposed ensures that the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking and helps create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. Where on-street parking has been proposed, this has been kept to a minimum and is well overlooked and broken down with landscaping to help enhance the character of the street. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.

4.15 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Open space

4.16 The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3 and WYM13. The amount of open space required was set out in the S106 which formed part of the outline planning application and was further developed in the Design Code and parameters plans.
4.17 The open space framework for the overall development creates a network of open spaces and linear green corridors which are designed to be multi-functional and respond to a number of specific design principles as set out in the Design Code. The open spaces that relate to this phase of development comprise of recreation and play spaces located to the west of the site along Silfield Road, known as Peaceacre Park, and the A11 buffer to the south of the site. Whilst the detailed design of these open spaces and green corridors are subject to a separate Reserved Matters application, they continue to inform the design proposals for this application.

4.18 The location of the Peaceacre Park to the west of the site along Silfield Road allows for strong physical and visual linkages between the existing community along Silfield Road and the proposed development, which creates a well-integrated and shared community space. The park itself comprises sports play provision with a football pitch, cricket wicket and Local Equipped Area of Play as well as new tree, shrub and meadow planting. Buildings front on to this space, which helps to enclose the open space and create attractive views across the park.

4.19 In terms of the structural landscape buffer to the A11 corridor along the eastern boundary of the site, this aims to enhance existing vegetation and to provide noise attenuation along the A11. It also provides amenity grassland alongside an informal footpath leading to Peaceacre Park, which responds positively to the edge of the development and creates a transition between the development and edge of the countryside.

4.20 The proposed network of open spaces and linear green corridors associated with this reserved matters application demonstrates that the character of the development will be enhanced by the landscape proposals and provides sufficient detail to ensure that the proposals are acceptable, subject to further details that will be secured by a separate reserved matters application.

4.21 The future management and maintenance of the open space, play areas and green corridors is to be agreed through the S106 which was completed as part of the outline consent.

4.22 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policy WYM13 of the Wymondham Action Plan and Policy DM3.15 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11.

Landscaping

4.23 With regards to the landscaping included within the site boundary for this site, the landscape officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and the scheme has subsequently been amended to ensure that the proposed layout is compatible with the requirement set by the Design Code.

4.24 The interface between this phase of the development and Peaceacre open space has subsequently been amended and the boundary treatments updated to provide better long-term management. Details of street trees within verges have also been reviewed and updated to ensure that sufficient margin has been allowed for these trees to grow without conflict with dwellings or highways, as well as additional planting provided along some boundaries where private drives abut open spaces.

4.25 The Landscape Officer has confirmed that the amendments and revised scheme is acceptable and does not wish to raise an objection to the proposals. Overall in respect of the landscape impact and landscaping, the approach to the landscaping is considered acceptable. The landscape planting, open spaces and careful consideration of building heights, scale, grouping and massing ensures that the proposal would have no adverse
landscape impact to the wider area and would be appropriately screened to its immediate context. It is therefore considered that the proposal would accord with the aims of Policy DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11. Precise planting schedules, management and maintenance details will need to be secured by condition.

Ecology and Green Infrastructure

4.26 Existing features such as trees and hedgerows are to be retained as part of the development and further landscaping proposed. This coupled with the use of open spaces and green corridors around the site to create linked linear parks, buffers and enhancement features such as the creation of grassland habitats and use of native species with proposed planting of shrubs and trees would help create a green infrastructure network and habitat which should result in a net enhancement to biodiversity.

4.27 As required by the outline consent a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) sits alongside this application and has been submitted as a separate discharge of condition application ref 2015/1725, which is currently under consideration at the time of writing this report. The GIMP outlines the proposals for Green Infrastructure and broad measures across the development areas, which include measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the ecology of the area; protection of species and associated habitat; identification of the green infrastructure and provision for the management of greenspace areas.

4.28 The Committee will note that the Green Infrastructure Group have made comments in respect to the GIMP seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of conditions application ref 2015/1725. The comments regard surface water and foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and the maintenance of the Green Infrastructure as well as technical matters such as the position of the pumping station outside of the site boundary. At the time of writing the report further information has been provided by the Ecology Consultancy and discussions with the green infrastructure group and The Lizard Charity are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of conditions application. These matters are to be agreed by condition and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site.

4.29 The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the Green Infrastructure Management Plan as submitted, and the commitments made in the plan provide sufficient information to understand the implications on ecology, water and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site.

4.30 Natural England has also confirmed no object to this development since adequate mitigation, biodiversity enhancement measures and green infrastructure has been included in the GIMP. The outline planning consent also requires that a Construction Environmental Management Plan for protecting ecologically sensitive areas is submitted by condition.

4.31 Therefore subject to the Green Infrastructure Management Plan to be agreed by condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims the Wymondham Area Action Plan WYM10, general Green Infrastructure requirements for development in South Wymondham, NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.
4.32 Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF requires all development to achieve good design.

4.33 The detailed design of the site has been informed by the approved Design Code and parameters plans. The design code provides a framework in which this reserved matters application has been taken forward, ensuring a distinctive and recognisable development whilst achieving a coherent overall identity across the site as a whole.

4.34 The general layout of the site, which has been informed by the Design Code and subject to discussions with Officers following the application being submitted, is considered acceptable. It has been designed to incorporate different character areas, which assist in creating variety and interest through the development with an overall traditional concept.

4.35 This proposal aims to deliver a high quality range of dwellings that reflects the local vernacular using quality materials and appropriate elevational detailing informed by a local character assessment. Three distinct character areas are identified throughout the development from the approved Design Code and comprise of variations in elevational treatments, facing materials, individual plot layouts, and associated landscape & boundary treatments. Buildings are proposed in prominent and logical locations to reinforce the overall character and combined with landscaping with the existing boundary vegetation to provide areas of green infrastructure. The combination of these elements ensures that the local identity is positively reinforced.

4.36 An assessment of the individual house types has been undertaken and the plans amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties. The position of house types and building lines has also been reviewed, which has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces, which is considered acceptable.

4.37 With regard to density, the development proposals achieve an average density of approximately 35dph which accords with the Design Code ensuring the efficient use of land, yet is reflective of the scale of the local area. Density varies across the site, where detached units are located at the entrance to the site to reflect existing densities along Silfield Road, and overlook the open space areas. Higher densities are proposed along the primary street & towards the A11 which reflect the local pattern of development and create attractive street scenes.

4.38 The height and massing of the proposed development varies across the site and helps define key spaces and focal points. Built form is predominantly 2 storeys, to reflect the existing built form and to minimise the impact of new development. However there are some 2.5 storey dwellings in key locations to provide distinctiveness in the street scene, particularly along the primary street, and also fronting the open space areas. The proposed building heights are in accordance with the agreed Design Code and parameters plans, which aim to create distinctive spaces, while also respecting the edges and sensitive uses of the development.

4.39 In terms of car parking, this is proposed in a variety of different forms throughout the development which include predominately on plot parking and some on-street parking. The combination of different parking types proposed ensures that the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking and helps create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. Where on-street parking has been proposed, this has been kept to a minimum and is well overlooked and broken down with landscaping to help enhance the character of the street. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.
4.40 With regard to bin storage, each dwelling has a dedicated and secure bin storage area within its rear garden for both convenience to the householder and to avoid any visual detriment to the external street scene. Where properties are terraced, adequate rear access has been provided in all cases. Travel distances between bin storage areas and the designated collection points have been carefully planned within Norfolk County Council guidelines. Generally, all external private gardens have been carefully planned in terms of their size and shape to ensure adequate external storage can easily be accommodated. Provision for cycle storage is provided in garages and rear gardens.

4.41 A design code compliance statement has been submitted, which shows how the design code has been applied to the detailed designs of the site. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design principles as well as explaining the approach to achieving this by carrying out a Building for Life 12 evaluation, which scores 12 greens out of 12.

4.42 Overall, the scheme, as amended, results in a development with its own distinctive character with a strong green network that relates positively to its surroundings and Wymondham. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.8 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Secured by design

4.43 The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and considers that the site provides good in-curtilage parking which is preferred by both Secured By Design and crime prevention specialists. It has also been confirmed that the pathways giving rear access to the affordable dwellings will be lockable with keys provided to respective residents. The proposals are therefore considered acceptable in this respect and are in accordance with ‘Secured By Design’ principles.

Residential amenity

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

4.45 The design and position of the properties along the boundaries of the site are located some distance away from existing dwellings along Silfield Road, which helps to minimises any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. I am therefore satisfied that the development accords with policy DM3.13 relating to residential amenity.

4.46 In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity. Furthermore gardens of sufficient size and shape for their intended purpose are proposed and adequate space for on-site parking.

4.47 The impacts on the proposed dwellings in respect of noise from the A11 is a key consideration. The layout and design of the scheme has responded to this, ensuring sufficient distance from the A11 is achieved and that acoustic fencing and planting is proposed along the southern boundary to ensure that the noise levels are acceptable. Subject to a further condition to agree the technical specification of the acoustic fencing and specifications of planting, the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this respect.

4.48 The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.
Drainage - Surface water

4.49 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was considered and approved at the outline stage, which confirmed that the site falls within Flood Zone 1 category (low risk) and is not at risk from flooding. This application is supported by a surface water strategy that builds on the recommendations of the FRA to provide details of the drainage proposed, based on the latest site layout. The strategy sets out the methods for implementing a Sustainable urban Drainage System (SuDS) using attenuation techniques, which includes a combination of attenuation lagoons, swales, permeable paving and rainwater harvesting to drain the surface water from the site.

4.50 Anglian Water have confirmed that there are no surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore have no comments in respect to surface water for this reserved matters application.

4.51 The Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board have requested that the route of any normal or exceedance discharge must be provided to confirm whether or not discharges will flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system. Should water flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system then further more detailed conditions will need to be met to let this occur. These matters are to be agreed by condition of the outline consent and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site.

4.52 A separate application has been submitted to discharge Condition 11 of the outline planning application, which requires a surface water strategy to be submitted to include details of the future adoption and maintenance of surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Lizard Charity has raised concerns about the runoff rates, volume of runoff generated from the development, location of off-site surface water routes and the management of surface water during the construction phase.

4.53 Whilst these details form part of condition 11, the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to this reserved matters application on the grounds of insufficient information relating to the prevention of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 103 and 109. The applicant subsequently provided supplementary information that relates to changes to the proposed surface water strategy and location of drainage ponds outside of the site. At the time of writing this report the Lead Local Flood Authority have been unable to provide additional comments in relation to the supplementary information within the timescales requested and recommends that the principles of the drainage strategy, as well as the management of surface water during the construction of the development phases are finalised in advance of deciding on the Reserved Matters applications.

4.54 On this basis it is recommended that authority be delegated to the Director for Growth and Localism to approve the application subject to further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water, and subject to no further substantive issues being raised in this respect.

Foul water

4.55 The principle of the development in relation to the foul water capacity was considered at the outline stage. The proposed strategy provides a foul water network that meets the requirements for adoption by Anglian Water. Both the Environment Agency and Anglian Water has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed foul water strategy, including details of phasing.
The Committee should note that the Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group have also made comments in respect to foul water seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of condition 10 of the outline consent. The comments relate to foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and The Lizard Pastures as well as matters relating to the location of off-site pipes, the pumping station and sewer requisition.

At the time of writing the report discussions with the The Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of condition 10. Therefore subject to compliance with this condition the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable.

Affordable Housing

The Council's Affordable Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the property types and sizes are acceptable, and that they meet need. It should be noted that the affordable housing contributions for the site were secured via the S106 agreement linked to the outline planning permission for the site.

In accordance with the Design Code the affordable housing has been distributed around the site in small groups that are not distinguishable from other housing types in terms of design quality. Their position within the overall development, elevational treatments and detailing are considered to be acceptable in terms of the character created.

The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan in this respect.

Sustainable construction and renewable energy

Condition 13 of the outline application requires that the application shall demonstrate that at least 10% of the expected energy requirements shall be provided by renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques in accordance with part 10 of the NPPF, policies 1 and 3 of the JCS and Policy DM4.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

An Energy Statement has been submitted with this application that sets out how it will achieve the required energy requirements. However it is considered that the information submitted does not provide sufficient evidence to show compliance with the development plan and national planning policy framework relating to the delivery of decentralised energy supply. Whilst these details have not yet been agreed, it is considered that this can be reasonable dealt with through condition rather than it being necessary to agree it through the reserved maters application.

Screening Opinion

The outline application to which this reserved matters relates was Schedule 2 development under the EIA regulations and was therefore accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion has been undertaken through the course of the application. Consideration has been given as to whether this reserved matters application as proposed would have any adverse impact on the environment. Having taken into account the selection criteria in schedule 3 to the 2011 Regulations, it is considered that the development as proposed is not considered to give rise to any adverse impact on the environment.
Furthermore all potential impacts of the development as a whole were considered by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application. The main characteristics of the potential impact of the development for consideration are the physical scale of the development, increased traffic, noise, emissions to air and water. These impacts were fully considered with the submitted Environmental Statement for the outline application. There is no evidence to suggest that the delivery of this reserved matters on this particular phase of the approved outline would increase the impact of the development on the environment over and above that already identified by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline. This reserved matters as proposed is not therefore considered to give rise to significant impacts and the reserved matters application itself is not EIA development and nor does it merit any amendments to the original Environmental Statement.

Financial considerations

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

Other matters

It is noted that Norfolk Historic Environmental Services have requested an archaeological condition to be applied. However, it is noted that there is already a condition in place as part of the approved outline consent ref 2011/0505, which will need to be discharged as part of this application. It would therefore be unreasonable to put in place a further condition.

The Listed Buildings Officer has confirmed that there are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. The Listed Buildings that are closest to the site is Coll's Farm House (Grade II). This is some distance from the application site and it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on these heritage assets and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

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.”

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

Conclusion

The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2011/0505. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout, and is consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission continue to be applicable and will require to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s which the Local Planning Authority has full control over.
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 further information being provided in respect to the surface water drainage strategy and confirmation from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water.

5.4 Subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding matters in respect to the proposed surface water drainage, it is considered that the landscape, layout, appearance and scale and other relevant issues are appropriate and that the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS, Wymondham Area Action Plan and South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Watts 01508 533765
and E-mail: cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee  
11 November 2015

Other Applications

8. **Appl. No**: 2015/1131/F  
   **Parish**: BARFORD

   Applicants Name: Mr V & Mrs J Rodda  
   **Site Address**: Land At Sayers Farm Watton Road Barford Norfolk  
   **Proposal**: Proposed residential development for two dwellings (conversion of cart shed to one dwelling and demolition of existing commercial workshop building and replacement with a single storey dwelling)

   Recommendation: Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 5: The Economy
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM1.3 The sustainable location of new development
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM2.2 Protection of employment sites
   DM2.10 Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use
   DM3.11 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.12 Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.13 Amenity, noise, quality of life
   DM3.14 Pollution, health and safety
   DM4.10 Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

**Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and the setting of Listed Buildings:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2012/2103</td>
<td>Proposed residential development for two dwellings (conversion of cart shed to one dwelling and demolition of existing commercial B2 use workshop building and replacement with a new single storey dwelling)</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2012/2289</td>
<td>Proposed residential development for 2 no dwellings</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2013/1849</td>
<td>Conversion of cart shed to dwelling (Listed Building Consent)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2013/1377</td>
<td>Repairs to dairy building (retention of works) and works to existing rear oubtuilding to form ancillary domestic accommodation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2014/0607</td>
<td>Replacement of existing mono pitched sheet metal roof with pan tiled steeper pitched apex roof over existing out building (annex). Revisions to approved floor plans to enabled improved layout and use of existing street elevation openings (see approved scheme of planning consent 2013/1377/LB)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2014/0837</td>
<td>Replacement of existing mono pitched sheet metal roof with pan tiled steeper pitched apex roof over existing out building (annex) Revisions to approved floor plans to enabled improved layout and use of existing street elevation openings (see approved scheme of planning consent 2013/1377/LB)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2015/0392</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2014/0837/H - Changes from ridge light to roof lights over sun room (Retrospective)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2015/0394</td>
<td>Amendments to approved schemes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2012/1060</td>
<td>Replacement of double glazed windows and main door</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2008/0904</td>
<td>To vary conditions 4 &amp; 6 of 2006/1167 to allow loading and unloading or raw materials and finished materials on and off the site, and for the repair and use of an existing outbuildings for storage in association with the engineering business</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2006/1167</td>
<td>Retrospective application for erection of steel framed workshop</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
No comments received

3.2 District Member  
Delegate  
- I am concerned about over development on this site  
- Is it outside the development boundary?  
- Also the quantity and speed of traffic travelling from the Norwich direction towards Hingham on a blind bend  
- I have put in similar comments before and so has the Parish Council. I do not think we are going to change this view.

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer  
No comments received

3.4 NCC Highways  
Conditional support

3.5 SNC Community Services - Protection  
To be reported

3.6 NCC Ecologist  
To be reported

3.7 Representations  
1 letter of objection  
- outline permission for a single dwelling has been rejected  
- the reason being that the site is outside the parish development area  
- the highways department also had concerns about the added traffic entering and leaving the B1108 Watton Road at a point less than 9.5m from the gateway to Sayers Farm where there are two proposed properties  
- I have in possession an old aerial photograph of Sayers Farm that shows clearly that there was never any farm building where the second building is proposed

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the creation of two dwellings, one of which would be created through the conversion of a cart shed that is curtilage listed and the other through the erection of a new dwelling in a location outside of any development boundaries. Construction of the new dwelling and conversion of the existing building would be achieved through the demolition of an existing building which was permitted for use as a workshop in 2006 (2006/1167).

4.2 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. Barford is situated outside of the Norwich Policy Area in the rural area for South Norfolk which has a housing land supply of 9.11 years. Therefore a 5 year land supply can be demonstrated and this is not an issue for consideration within the determination of this planning application.

4.3 The demolition of the workshop would result in the loss of a business premises. Policy DM2.2 states that the loss of sites in or last used for employment use will only be permitted where the possibility of using the site for a range of employment uses has been fully explored without success or there would be an overriding economic, environmental or community benefit from redevelopment or change to another use which outweighs the benefit of the current lawful use continuing. A previous application (2012/2103) was refused party due to the loss of this employment site without the retention of the site for employment uses being fully explored. The applicant has subsequently marketed the site in accordance with an agreed marketing strategy and it is accepted that there has been no
interest in taking the building on as a commercial concern. As such, we are satisfied that
the continued of the site for employment purposes has been fully explored without success
and that the proposal therefore complies with Policy DM2.2.

4.4 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.
Barford is situated outside of the Norwich Policy Area in the rural area for South Norfolk
which has a housing land supply of 9.11 years. Therefore a 5 year land supply can be
demonstrated and this is not an issue for consideration within the determination of this
planning application.

4.5 The works required for conversion of the curtilage listed building to residential use already
has the benefit of listed building consent (2013/1849). The Conservation Officer was
satisfied with the design that the scheme would enhance the special interest of the building.
In assessing the scheme, consideration has been had to section 66 of the Listed Buildings
Act 1990 in relation to the effect on the listed building and it is concluded that the listed
building would be enhanced as a result of this scheme.

4.6 The existing boundaries of the site allow for the creation of a curtilage for residential use of
the building that would not be harmful to the countryside and the scheme as proposed does
not give rise to any concerns over adverse impact from neighbours such as from
overlooking or noise and disturbance. Given that the employment use of the site has been
discounted through the marketing scheme, it is accepted that the conversion of this building
to create a residential dwelling complies with Policy DM2.10 and is therefore supported.

4.7 The erection of an additional new dwelling to the rear of the site is contrary to policy as the
site falls outside of the development boundaries for Barford. A number of considerations
have been advanced by the applicant in support of a departure from policy to allow for the
erection of a new-build dwelling in this instance.

4.8 The applicant has advanced the case that the new dwelling is needed to fund restoration
work to the listed building, including the conversion of the cart shed that forms the other
part of this application. In order to support this case additional information was submitted
which outlined the substantial costs of the works already undertaken and that which is still
required for the conversion works. Whilst it is accepted and commended that the applicant
has successfully restored many elements of the listed building, these are ultimately works
that come with the responsibility of owning a listed building and would not normally justify
such a departure from policy. Furthermore, we would not normally support a proposal for
an entirely new-build dwelling on the basis that it would enable the conversion of a barn to
dwelling. The creation of a dwelling within the converted building in a location outside of
any development boundaries is the enabling factor in itself. I appreciate that the removal of
the structure to the rear is another factor in this instance, however we do not feel that this
justifies the erection of an additional dwelling.

4.9 The applicant has also suggested that the creation of the new dwelling would enhance the
setting of the listed building by enabling the removal of the workshop. It should be noted
that the impact on the setting of the listed building was assessed at the time of the original
application for the retention of the building and considered acceptable. It is therefore
questionable whether a case can be made that the presence of the building is so
detrimental to the setting of the listed building that a departure from policy can be justified.
In any event, as mentioned above, the creation of a new dwelling through the conversion of
the cart shed, which would necessitate the removal of the workshop in itself, could be seen
as the enabling development in the event this argument were to be accepted.
4.10 The applicant has also made the case that the removal of the workshop and the subsequent loss of the employment use has benefits in terms of the amenities of local residents and in terms of highway safety. As with the impact of the setting of the listed building, these issues were considered at the time of the application for the retention of the building. No objection was received from the highway authority and the impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties was considered acceptable. It is not therefore accepted that use of the building for employment purposes has created a nuisance to neighbours or highway hazard that could justify a departure from policy to allow a new dwelling in this location.

4.11 It is therefore our view that a departure from policy to allow for the erection of a new-building dwelling has not been justified. The applicant has been invited to withdraw the new-build dwelling from the scheme and advised that a scheme only for removal of the workshop and the conversion of the cart shed to a residential dwelling would be supported. However the applicant wishes to pursue the erection a second dwelling. As such, given the conflict with policy identified above the scheme is recommended for refusal.

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

5 Conclusion and Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The new dwelling proposed is outside of the development boundary for Barford. The benefits suggested in the supporting statement are not considered to justify a departure from policy and therefore the proposed dwelling is contrary to Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies DM1.3 and DM1.4 of the Development Management Policies document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tim Barker 01508 533801
and E-mail: tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : HETHERSETT
Applicants Name : Mr Mark Levers
Site Address : Land West Of Ketteringham Lane Hethersett Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of a new 4 bedroom house meeting the criteria of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation : Refusal
1. Outside of development boundaries
2. Does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 and therefore contrary to policy
3. Harm the landscape setting contrary to JCS Policy 2 and DM4.5

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.1 : Renewable Energy

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/1266 Retention of existing mobile home and change of use of land from paddock to residential use. Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve
Recognise that the development is outside the development boundary, however, consider that the innovative design justifies granting permission.
If permission is granted then wish to see a condition with regards to controlling the construction traffic via Ketteringham Lane.

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee
- Section 55 applications should be heard at committee as in my view the judgement of what is an iconic design should be one for elected members and not the officer team

3.3 Historic Environment Service No objections subject to conditions

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer No comments received

3.5 NCC Highways No objections subject to conditions

3.6 SNC Community Services - Protection No comments received

3.7 NCC Ecologist No objections subject to conditions

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design Refuse
- The design of the dwelling in this location does not meet the high test of NPPF 55 which should make an exceptional case to be allowed against policy ENV8 and the protection of the open countryside

3.9 Representations 13 letter of support
- Would like to see an outstanding design built in my local Council area as I believe it would improve the local area and in turn benefit my children and their futures
- Innovative and in keeping with environmental needs
- New homes are always required in this day and age
- A well-built family home in a non-estate position would be welcome
- So that this family can feel comfortable in his home village
- House stands out from other local 'estates'
- Would bring a focal point in design and materials used
- Outstanding design
- Hethersett would really benefit from a building such as this
- Satisfies the Para 55 criteria
- Provides a 'breath of fresh air'
- Modern architecture, technology and sustainability have been considered and results in a prime example of how modern day residential property should be developed

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a 4 bed roomed house with double garage at land west of Ketteringham Lane. The site lies on an existing paddock immediately adjacent to Ketteringham Lane where it crosses over the A11 and the adjacent railway line, which lie to the south. Ashgate House is located to the north of the site. Fields/open landscape surround the site.
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’. The character area includes more recent infrastructure and the guide refers to the A11 as ‘cutting across the plateau and introduces an element of noise and movement into the landscape resulting in marginalised land in the corridor.’ Outside the more built up areas, the general grain and pattern comprises widely dispersed individual dwellings and farm buildings of mixed character set in an arable landscape context. The narrow lane, hedgerows and trees, together with agricultural activity, creates a very rural feel.

4.3 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

4.4 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 DM1.3 and DM1.4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies. No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under these policies and therefore the erection of a new dwelling in this location is contrary to policy.

4.5 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. Hethersett 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 this 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.

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

4.7 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.

Economic role

4.8 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.”

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

4.10 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”.

4.11 The provision of one dwelling in this location which does not relate well to any existing built-up area provides some small social benefit to the occupiers.

Environmental role

4.12 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.”

4.13 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 Policies DM1.3 and DM1.4 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 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 DM1.3.

4.14 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. A range of services and transport connections are available within the settlement of Hethersett. However, to walk to them residents would have no option but 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 the erection of one dwelling 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.

4.15 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 DM1.3 and DM1.4, 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.

4.16 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 for 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."
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, DM1.3 and DM1.4.

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 a design should:

- Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural area
- Reflect the highest standards in architecture
- Significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
- Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area

The 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

In the design and access statement the Architect advises that ‘the design is unashamedly unique and purposely does not relate in its form or character to the neighbouring 1960’s Ashgate House but takes its reference from the dominant character of the surrounding countryside in its design form and use of materials. It is an artistic building which is to be viewed in the same way as a piece of sculpture’. The design is interesting in terms of its ‘artistic’ approach to creating an unusual and bespoke form that has a large distinctive cross wing designed as a ‘supersized’ hay manger constructed with cruck timbers.

b) Reflect the highest standards in architecture

The design is described by the Architect as being innovative in ‘that it is a sculptural form using the inspiration of its rural locations whilst using traditional materials of wood and straw.’ Although there may be no other building where timber has been used to create a supersized hay manager as part of a building, there are existing examples of buildings in a contemporary form built with traditional materials and also using traditional craft skills. The proposal is therefore not considered to be innovative.

With regard to helping design more generally in rural areas, it is considered that this is a highly individual ‘one off’ building, the design is described as ‘unashamedly unique’. It is not a design that could easily be replicated or copied and being a ‘sculptural’ and ‘artistic’ building it is not a type of building that would or should be copied. The use of straw bales, although sustainable, is not unique or innovative. In view of the above it is considered that the application does not meet this criterion.

b) Reflect the highest standards in architecture

The building design is described as ‘unashamedly unique’ and is a highly individual ‘one off’ building. With conditions to ensure that the 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

4.24 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'. Outside the more built up areas, the general grain and pattern comprises widely dispersed individual dwellings and farm buildings of mixed character set in an arable landscape context.

4.25 The building is being constructed on an existing paddock which is different in character to the more open fields which surround the site, however it does contribute positively to the rural character of the area. Within the immediate setting of the site to the north an existing building has been constructed with a modern 'chalet' design, which is not considered to be of any architectural or historic importance. The proposed design due to its size, bulk and massing, that will be partially visible within the surrounding area, would not significantly enhance the immediate setting, as developing on this site erodes the rural character of area.

d) Sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area

4.26 This is a very large contemporary modern building and is distinctively different in terms of form and materials from any dwelling in area. Whilst its design has been inspired by its local rural surroundings of arable fields and farm buildings, this can be a description of many areas of South Norfolk and therefore could be sited elsewhere. It is considered that 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

4.27 The proposal will include the creation of a new access off Ketteringham Lane, which will involve the removal of some hedging, 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 DM3.11.

Residential amenity

4.28 Whilst there is a neighbouring property 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 property, or any future occupants of the proposed dwelling. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policy DM3.13.

Other matters

4.29 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.

4.30 If approved, this application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5. **Reasons 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 Joint Core Strategy Policy 2, Policies DM1.3 and DM1.4 of South Norfolk Local Plan, 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.

5.2 The proposed development is outside any Development Limit or Village Boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015. In the absence of any special need identified, the proposal conflicts with South Norfolk Local Plan, Development Management Policies Document policy DM1.3. The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to being innovative; raising the standards of design; 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 Policy DM1.3 and DM1.4. 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 paddock/pasture land, surrounded by open agricultural land, which contributes to the characteristics this area, its general grain and pattern comprises widely dispersed individual dwellings and farm buildings of mixed character set in an arable landscape context. The proposed design, together with its siting and size of the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the open nature of the surrounding area 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 DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10.  **Appl. No**: 2015/1754/F  
**Parish**: BEDINGHAM

**Applicants Name**: The Executors Of The 11th Duke Of Grafton Deceased  
**Site Address**: Lodge Farm School Road Bedingham Norfolk NR35 2DB  
**Proposal**: Demolition of an existing dwelling / outbuildings and the residential development of 1 replacement dwelling, cartshed garage and associated external works.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Provision of parking, service  
4. Surface Water  
5. Foul drainage to sealed system  
6. New Water Efficiency  
7. Materials to be agreed  
8. Ecology Mitigation as set out in the Ecology report  
9. Boundary hedges to be retained  
10. Replacement dwelling  
11. Slab level to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1  **National Planning Policy Framework**  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 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 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3  **Development Management Policies**  
DM3.6 House extensions and replacement dwellings within the Countryside  
DM3.8 Design Principles  
DM3.11 Road Safety and the Free Flow of Traffic  
DM3.12 Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.2 Sustainable drainage and water management

2. **Planning History**

2.1  No recent history.

3. **Consultations**

3.1  **Parish Council**  
Within planning law - but raise concern regarding programme initial ecology works. While preserving Great Crested Newts it would negatively impact on School Road during the time of year in which this poorly maintained road is often flooded.

Note that the plan area does not include the adjoining land called The Nutyard, which should be taken into consideration.
3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee- enable a decision to be made regarding the impact of demolishing the existing house. Also the quality of design should be fully assessed and any impact on the ancient Nutyard can also be considered

3.3 SNC Community Services - Protection  No comments received

3.4 NCC Highways  Support subject to parking and turning prior to occupation.

3.5 NCC Ecologist  No Ecology Constraints.

3.6 SNC Water Management Officer  Support subject to condition for disposal of surface water and of foul water

3.7 Representations  No comments received

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing two storey dwelling, and to construct a two storey dwelling in a different location within the site. The site was a former farm, but is no longer in use. An existing large barn currently occupies the site proposed for the replacement dwelling, cartsheds to the east of the site are to replace the existing single storey brick outbuildings. The access to the site is off School Road and remains unchanged.

4.2 The site is outside the main village of Bedingham and is assessed against policy DM 3.6 which permits the replacement of existing dwellings provided:

   a) The design and scale of the resultant development is compatible with the area’s character and landscape setting; and
   b) The original dwelling has a lawful permanent residential use and be capable of residential occupation without major or complete reconstruction.

4.3 The Design and Access Statement explains the problems with the existing property which have led to the decision to replace the existing with a new dwelling. The reasons are as follows:

- The dwelling has very poor thermal performance and will be relatively expensive and cost prohibitive to upgrade to comply with current and future building regulations.
- Severe damp issues. The existing floor level is below the existing ground level with no damp proof course or Damp Proof Membranes (dpm’s). The adjacent pond and high ground water table mean the dwelling suffers from severe damp making for a poor quality living environment. To resolve the issue will be cost prohibitive with major building work required such as altering ground levels, filling adjacent ponds, injecting dpc and upgrading floors with dpm’s
- The dwelling is also of relatively poor architectural quality. It is not listed and not likely to be as it is only approximately 100 years old with little architectural or historical merit.

4.4 The scale of the proposed two storey dwelling provides a 5 bedroom property. The dwelling has been designed in a ‘T’ shape with an additional single storey section on the south west elevation. The eaves height of the front element of the dwelling is also lower than that of the main element – further reducing the bulk. The design respects the surrounding landscape setting and has been designed to reduce the overall bulk of the proposed dwelling. The orientation has maximised the benefits of the south aspect which provide the living room and family room with natural light with doors opening out onto the proposed terrace/patio area.
4.5 The character of the area is very rural in nature with a scattering of properties in the immediate area. The existing property is set close to the highway and is white painted brick with a clay pantile roof. A low hedge forms the highway boundary resulting in the existing property being prominent within the street scene.

4.6 The position of the new dwelling is set well back within the site and will occupy some of the footprint of an existing large disused barn which is to be demolished as part of this scheme. For this reason the scheme as proposed will have less visual impact within the landscape setting than the existing dwelling and associated buildings which occupy the site, therefore benefiting the overall landscape setting of the area.

4.7 The existing hedges around the site are to be retained (and conditioned accordingly) to provide the boundaries for the new development and to ensure the overall development respects the rural nature of the site.

4.8 The existing property is currently unoccupied, however, it is a lawful dwelling and albeit requires some modification, is capable of immediate occupation without major or complete reconstruction. I am satisfied that the proposed scheme accords with both criteria a) and b) of DM3.6.

Residential amenities

4.9 The site is isolated from any near neighbours, this fact together with the siting of the replacement dwelling will ensure there is no privacy issues to neighbouring properties. The scheme accords with DM3.13.

Highways

4.10 Access to the site is off School Road which currently serves as the farm access to the buildings to the rear of the site. The access remains unchanged by the proposal and provides adequate visibility onto School Road. Subject to the provision of parking and turning within the site prior to occupation, no objections are raised by the Highways Officer. The scheme therefore accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Ecology

4.11 The site includes a variety of ponds, connecting ditches and hedgerows. An Ecology Report accompanied the application which has been assessed by Norfolk County Ecologists. Subject to the mitigation as set out in the report, no further mitigation is deemed necessary. A condition has been included to ensure the mitigation as detailed forms part of the development.

Other issues

4.12 Concern has been raised by the Parish Council and the Local Member regarding an area of land to the north west of the site which is within the ownership of the applicant, but does not form part of this application. The area of land is referred to as an ancient Nutyard. The actual site referred to as the Nutyard is unaffected by this proposal, but the plans submitted show an access from the site into the adjacent land. The supporting Design and Access Statement states “this access is to be retained to allow the future maintenance of this land”. Given the land is outside the application site, there is no justification to require any restrictive condition. In the event any development is proposed for this additional land it would be the subject of a separate planning application and assessed accordingly along in consultation with the appropriate consultees.
4.13 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed replacement dwelling will be located in a position to be compatible to the area’s character and landscape setting. The design while not reflecting the character of the dwelling which is to be replaced is acceptable, and has been designed to benefit from the south facing orientation of the site. As conditioned the scheme ensures there is no increase in the number of dwellings on the site. Adequate space is available within the site to ensure parking and turning. The scheme as proposed accords with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail:                        jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2015/1835/F  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr A Shayes  
Site Address : Little Ellingham Airfield New Road Hingham Norfolk  
Proposal : Retrospective application for the change of use of land for two aircraft runways. Proposed portacabin, small aircraft hangar, 2 large hooped polytunnel hangars, access road and car park.

**Recommendation**: Refusal  
1. The benefits from the proposal are outweighed by the harm contrary DM2.9; DM3.13.  
2. Harm highway safety contrary DM2.9 and DM3.11

Authorise Enforcement action for the removal of portacabin.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM2.1 : Employment and business development  
DM2.9 : Rural tourist and recreational destinations  
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/1822  
DUPLICATE APPLICATION SEE 2015/1835  
Withdrawn  
Change of use for to existing grass runways that have been used for aircraft activity for the past 8 years. Full planning permission for 1 portacabin, 1 small hangar and 2 large poly tunnel hangars.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council  
Refuse  
Evidence was supplied by the applicant to give an accurate account of the proposed number of flights/movements/increased activity as a result of this application. This gave rise to concerns over the impact that any increased activity at the airfield would have on nearby livestock and neighbours to the airfield.
Hangars would be visually intrusive. Concerns were raised regarding the access to the site - as New Road is very narrow and the exit point from New Road onto the Attleborough Road (the main route from great Ellingham to Hingham) is at a site of reduced visibility.

From information provided and the noted advertising of flights at the airfield - it was felt that the application if granted would result in a significant increase in and change of use of the airfield.

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
This application has attracted a lot of comments both for and against, I would like it to be debated by the Development Management Committee.

3.3 MOD
No safeguarding objections to proposal

3.4 Civil Aviation Authority
No comment received

3.5 Breckland District Council
No comments received

3.6 NCC Highways
Additional information required:
Comments on additional information:
Refuse: The unclassified road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its restricted width; lack of passing provision; and restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policy DM 3.11.

There is also concern that the proposed runways are very close to the public highway. As highway authority we do not have expertise to provide advice regarding the safety of the runways. In the absence of any advice from the CAA, I would consider that there is insufficient information in this respect.

3.7 SNC Community Services - Protection
Additional information required
Comments on additional to be reported

3.8 Representations
10 Letters of objection
- No objections to the infrequent use as at present but increased usage proposed by the required hangers would be worrying in a quiet rural area.
- Need restrictions to ensure there is no growth in future air traffic and that the direction of take-off and landing is not in the direction of nearby residence (Cadges Farm and the overall flight is restricted over residential and equestrian areas.
- Cadges Farm Livery is a peaceful yard that was chosen because of its location, proposal could have a huge impact on this yard for customers and the owners business. Currently offers quiet roads which will become busy and dangerous. The noise could cause the horses to panic not only when out in the fields but when riding and schooling. The road next to the development site is a return loop from quiet sage and pleasurable hacking.
Development Management Committee

11 November 2015

- Existing ‘UFly4Fun’ already operates from other sites and provides a range of commercial facilities including cycle hire and camping facilities, will this happen here?
- Access to the site is via New Road which is a single track road without passing places and with a lethal exit onto Gt Ellingham - Hingham Road.
- Portakabin is an eyesore which has been in position for approximately 3 months but the addition of large polytunnels hangers is going to be a blot on the landscape and inappropriate for a rural area.
- Website www.ufly4fun.com states "Learn how to fly a Paramotor with Ufly4fun Paramotor Club. We are a fully insured Paramotor training school covering Norfolk & South Lincolnshire and have been established since 2009. We operate full time, 7 days a week (weather pending). We can show you the safe way of flying Paramotor in one of our new British built Bulldog aircraft under expert tuition from a former UK competition pilot and fully qualified Instructor. Ufly4fun Paramotor Club are registered schools with the Paramotor Club.org and APPI-PPG. We can offer training from both organisations approved syllabus. We are also a BHPA Recreational & Coaching Club for members rated CP and above." The website currently advertises 3 locations across Lincolnshire and Norfolk where training and club flights occur, operating 7 days a week, one of which is New Rd, Little Ellingham, subject to planning permission. Further to this prices for activities are posted on the site, one of which is £120 per annum membership to Little Ellingham airfield club, or £5 per day for non-members. Plus prices for training packages etc. - This appears to suggest it is to run as a commercial airfield operation out of New Road Little Ellingham creating a club, training facilities and running 7 days a week which is a significant increase in the level of activity to the operations to date.
- Existing Black Turkey Farm which is a well-established business producing 300 free range rare breed Norfolk Black Turkeys for the Christmas market located 660 metres from the site. During April and May of this year we experienced a number frequent noisy low-flying Paramotor activity above and around our premises. On a number of occasions and in response to the predator type objects, the free ranging turkeys panicked, returned to the barn and piled up in the corner. A number of them received significant injuries and died as a result of smothering.
- Increased activity with more people will significantly increase local circuit flight activity above and around our premises as a result of being in line of sight of the take-off and landing of both runways.
- west-east runway has only been used since the spring of 2015.
- What is the intensity of use, hours, number of days, frequency of flights, type of aircraft including Paramotor, microlights light aircraft?
- The change to a flying club will inevitably lead to an increase in air and road traffic and potentially disruption to local businesses (especially the turkey farm).
- Entrance onto New Road of the Attleborough Road is very narrow and is virtually a blind corner - more traffic will increase the safety risks.
- Applicant has suggested that activity will regularly take place most week days and Saturdays and Sundays. With regard to operating hours which are under 'Visual Flight Rules, flights would be permitted half an hour before sunrise up to half an hour after sunset'. If this is the case during the height of summer this could extend up to 15 hours per day. With the potential of flight activity taking place over a
365 day per year rather than the existing 28 days a year limited activity this increase would be totally unacceptable.

- No evidence of why the site has to be in this location.
- Already a degree of airborne noise 7 days a week, which is enough for this small area.
- The proposed development does seem as if it is geared up for expansion, why spend all that money for just a few friends? If it is just for such a few people why couldn't the strip at Hackford continue to be used? The plane has been flying in and out of there for years but now has to come to Ellingham.
- It is said that the whole area will be fenced off, which will leave nowhere for other road users on horse or foot to get out of the way of vehicles.
- Great detriment to existing businesses at Cadges Farm (Livery) and Chestnut Farm (Turkeys farm)

1 letter raisin no objection to the principle but raise concern on safety grounds.

- No objections but raise concern to the safety issues required by CAA CAP793 Safe Operating Practices at Unlicensed Aerodromes. The drawings show 2 runways the shorter of the two appears to be potentially too close to the buildings and closer still to the car park.
- The plans are not clear as to how members of the public will be kept away from the aircraft - given that training is proposed it is reasonable to assume that not all visitors will be aware of the dangers. At Old Buckenham fences and gates clearly marked as to the dangers involved ensure the separation of aircraft and the public.
- Bird Hazard, The proximity of trees to the proposed airfield will doubtless mean that the operators have given due consideration to CAP 772 Bird Strike Risk Management and the requisite bird scaring techniques available which will not cause nuisance to the local population or livestock.
- No mention is given of refuelling and the storage of fuel.
- No details of risk assessment for Emergency Procedures.
- Note that the North/South runway is slightly shorter than the minimum length recommended in CAP793, however the proximity of the buildings is perhaps a more pressing issues that overall length.
- North and West runways directly adjacent to the road, consideration need to be paid to the potential for collision between a landing aircraft and large vehicles. The applicant should consider aircraft warning signs in both directions.
- Old Buckenham is able to accommodate aircraft ranging in size up to a small private jet. The applicant therefore needs to make all users of the application site aware of the speed and location of aircraft heading into Old Buckenham.
- No complaints for over two years this is due to our operations of Noise Abatement procedures which take into account local population centres, isolated housing and livestock. The application site would need to consider this which is also raised as points of concern the CAA's CAP793.
- Would suggest that the proposed 8 to 10 movements per day on weekends is a serious underestimate at an airfield where 5 aircraft are based, training is potentially offered and visitors invited. The expected visitor numbers stated at a peak of 15 people simply do not match the stated movement numbers.
• Proposed usage by Paramotors already advertised online. The stated 'membership fee' for the proposed airfield is considerable at odds with the applicants' statement that they expect one person to be trained per week. Paramotors in our experience are a cause of considerable complaint both in relation to noise and low flying, in both instances abatement procedures is essential.

• No attempt has been made to contact Old Buckenham as stated, these is limited hanger space available and a planning restriction which prohibit microlights of the type which the application would likely use.

• Wish to make to clear this is not an outright objection to the application as aviation is at the core of our long established business and we are eager to work with and assist any organisation who shares those aims.

24 Letters of support

2 letters stating support but no comments made.

• Learnt to fly from this airfield some eight years ago and have flown to and from it ever since without incident or problem.

• Ideally situated on the edge of a Second World War airfield and the alignment of the runways mean you can make your approach and departure without the need to fly close to any of the immediate neighbours. I am aware there are horses stabled to the north and have never seen any signs of disturbance caused by my flying. The noise levels from light aircraft are a fraction of that caused from military aircraft that pass by.

• There is a need for more small airfields for light aircraft and after all some of our next generation of pilots will come from airfields like this one.

• Norfolk airspace and flying locations are slowly diminishing as are other locations around the UK. Airfields are being turned into housing estates and the airspace is constantly shrinking to controlled airspace restricting the hobbyist flyer from enjoying his/her past-time.

• I am currently based at a small airfield close to Norwich, which is surrounded by houses, a farm and livery; the 15 aircraft that fly from the site with most on a Sunday with good flight procedures we never have a complaint from local dwellings or businesses.

• The proposal is missing resident friendly information/procedures that I am sure the applicant can provide such as when flight is from the westerly runway; all circuit traffic is to/from the north thus removing the need to overfly the turkey farm etc.

• I have read most of the comments and I feel the paramotor use has been mis-understood. I'm sure that at best they would operate just a few hours a year. If the paramotor is the major problem then maybe that alone should find somewhere else. I operate around 30 hours a year and most of that time is away from the airfield. Microlight aircraft flying is the least expensive way to get into the air, but even then it's around £45-£70 pounds per hour to operate so as you may understand we are not in the air when we don't need to, even then, staying in the circuit more than we need to is quite boring, going over the same ground over and over again. So we depart as soon as possible.

• The airfield has been in use for 8 years without incident and the approach for both runways avoids overflying built up areas.
The Civil Aviation Authority states that “no aircraft shall not fly closer than 500 feet to any person, vessel, vehicle or structure except for take-off and landing” No fly zones have already been implemented at this site to avoid local residents. The noise created by light aircraft is substantially less than that of the military aircraft that operate in the area.

There is a lot of evidence to show that livestock is not affected by noise from aircraft, for example, Red Hall Farm riding school & Livery is on the approach to Norwich airport, Wood Farm Livery is next to an active runway at Felthorpe flying club and geese at Priory Farm at Tibbenham. The green club hut, in my opinion, is no more of an eye sore than any other agricultural buildings that are in abundance in the area and is not in direct view of local residents.

East Anglia has a rich history of aviation that dates back to the Second World War, it would be nice to ensure the current generation and our children are able to continue this legacy.

I have flown into the field with my husband and it seems very secluded and I can't see the objection to a hanger and portacabin that will be hard to see from the roads.

I live close to proposed air strip ,in the spring summer of this year our family enjoyed watching the planes and the paragliders and in no way did they upset our animals or the noise levels distress them. I used to ride round the village roads and find the gicultural machinery more noisy and frightening but at the end of the day we are living in the country so a few quite planes or paragliders should not course much stress.

I have been flying in Norfolk and Suffolk for 13 years now and there really is a dearth of small airfields available for the microlight pilot to fly from.

Many airfields which are less isolated than Little Ellingham have quite complex noise abatement processes and we're happy to comply with them to ensure their continued operation.

An airfield close to Norwich actually introduced a livery a few years ago and there have been no issues whatsoever - the owner of the airfield and the livery is a microlight pilot so we would have been left in no doubt were there any problem with one activity affecting the other.

The small number of aircraft likely to use the airfield are the type to be very manoeuvrable and therefore able to avoid local sensitive areas.

The vast majority of pilots appreciate the huge privilege their activity provides, and are happy to share this with passengers and interested onlookers. I consider the application should be approved and become a great local amenity that will be enjoyed by the community.

Having used the airfield, the airstrip is perfectly safe for landing and taking off and is like many other grass strips.

I currently use 4 sites to fly from, the more we have the less traffic at any one time at either, so everyone should be happy.

The noise of the aircraft either taking off or landing would be minimal compared to tractor engines as the aircraft is up and gone within a few minutes whereas the tractors particularly during harvesting are running all day from early in the morning until very late into the night.

Finally recruiting members is a good way of controlling who and how people are using the airfield as potential noise sensitive areas and no fly zones can be enforced.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application seeks permission for the change of use of the two existing runways, (previously used under the 28 day rule), retention of the portacabin and for the erection of 2 large hooped hangers and a small aircraft hangar. The site is located to the south of the main settlement of Hingham, located off the main road which connects Hingham and Attleborough. Access to the site is off New Road a single track road to the north of the application site.

Principle of development

4.2 The proposal is within open countryside and is assessed against Sections 3 and 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which under bullet point 2 of Section 3 supports the principle of development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. Section 8 supports the principle of providing sport and recreational facilities including the opportunity for new provision. Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS) also supports new or improved facilities.

4.3 The main local plan policies relevant are DM 2.1 (Employment and business development) which favours proposals that are located on sites well related to rural towns and villages; and it is demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available; and/or which create accessible jobs and business opportunities in the rural area. The other main policy against which the proposal is assessed is DM2.9 (Rural tourist and other recreational destinations). This policy supports proposals for new and expanded visitor recreational and leisure attractions in the Countryside where clearly justified on the basis of location; where they would not cause harm by the nature of the proposal, noise, siting and appearance of any new buildings, the number of people/activity and impact on the natural environment. All proposals are required to have safe and adequate access to serve the whole site, and the local road network and access routes should be sufficient to serve the attraction and surrounding area with a safe and free flow of traffic.

Location

4.4 The NPPF, JCS and the DM Policies support the principle of land based business and recreational uses and activities in the countryside which require a rural location and which respect the character of the countryside. It is accepted the use proposed does require a remote location (or possibly an established airfield). The site, which has two grass strips, has been used for several years under the 28 day rule with a low level of activity which, until earlier this year, had not resulted in complaints to the Council.

4.5 From information received from local residents, in spring of this year the east-west grass strip was widened and the portacabin was located on the site. Consideration has been given to the suitability of the location and supporting evidence to demonstrate other sites which have been investigated to accommodate the proposed use, and why they are considered unsuitable in comparison to the application site.

4.6 Several letters of support have been received from people who have used the airstrips over the years and who welcome the opportunity to continue to do so and enjoy the location.

4.7 The information provided by the applicant has given Shipdham, Old Buckenham, Beccles, and Northrepps airfields, as other venues which have been explored; these venues were not considered suitable due to either their distance, or the lack of hangarage being available. It is noted however, that no hangarage currently exists at the application site.
4.8 I accept the distance of the venues may not be convenient and, I also understand from the applicant and other supporters that there are no other microlight clubs within the vicinity. However, the benefits of the facility, the lack of hangar space on other sites, and the lack of other clubs in the vicinity should be weighed against any detrimental effect the proposal may have on the local and natural environment.

Impact of buildings

4.9 At present the only building on site is a portacabin which forms part of this application for its retention. The proposed construction of the hooped polytunnels and the aircraft hangar will all be new buildings in a location which at present is undeveloped and rural in nature. The site has no hardstanding and is proposed to have an access and car park to provide the necessary parking facilities.

4.10 All of the proposed buildings are located close to an existing hedge on the east of the site, however, they will be in full view from New Road, and the main Attleborough to Hingham road to the west of the site neither of which benefit from any hedging.

4.11 The height of the hangar is 3.6 metres, the hooped polytunnels have an overall height of 3.8 metres. The materials of the proposed buildings will be of galvanised steel construction with juniper green coloured covering to reduce their visual impact within the locality, the steel hangar is of the same colour.

4.12 Concern has been raised about the construction of these buildings and their impact on the appearance of the rural area. However, the overall height is limited and can be compared to other buildings of an agricultural nature which have equal visual impact in otherwise undeveloped locations. It is accepted that an operation of this nature requires safe and secure buildings for the aircraft and associated activities and equipment.

4.13 The construction of the hardstanding with the appropriate drainage will not result in any significant harm or surface water drainage issues which could not be dealt with within the site.

4.14 I therefore consider that the construction of the buildings alone would not result in such visual harm to the locality to justify refusal.

Use of the site

4.15 Until recently the use of the site has been very low key, with minimal traffic movements, and minimal noise and disturbance to the surrounding locality. It is reported from a local resident that during April and May of this year there were a number of frequent noisy low-flying incidents above and around the neighbouring farm, which prompted contact with the Local Authority.

4.16 The proposed change to allow permanent use of the runways rather than the 28 day rule, together with the construction of the new buildings will enable the activities associated with the club who use the site to intensify.

4.17 The application as submitted gave little detail on the number of people using the site or the frequency of flights and associated activity.

4.18 Further details were sought to clarify the following points:

Movements: Typical numbers of aircraft movements for weekdays and for Saturdays and Sundays?
Response: *Flying days in the UK are very few and far between so movements at the airfield are not going to be great, we might get 1 or 2 friends in to see us at the weekends, typical movements are going to be around the same as they have always been about 8 to 10 at the weekends and maybe around 2 to 3 in the week but not every week. There may be weeks with no flying at all.*

**Hours when the airfield is operational?**

Response: *VFR Flying only, aircraft that will be flying from here will be flying under Visual Flight Rules we can fly half an hour before sunrise up to half an hour after sunset.*

**Floodlights?**

Response: *The site isn’t open at night so we don’t need floodlights*

The website (Ufly4fun.com) refers to Ground training/Ground School, Training flights, Experienced Pilots, Tandem Microlight. Given the proposed number of additional buildings, and the intensification of the site I need to establish the potential increase in traffic levels and the potential impact on the surrounding area in terms of noise and disturbance.

Response: I was asked by a friend if they could use our airfield for ground handling and training for Paramotors, this is on a 1 to 1 basis the guy that runs it has sites all over East Anglia and would only use our airfield to train 1 person maybe once a week for a couple of hours, again the weather has to be right i.e. low or no wind and no rain.

Having considered the response to the additional information required, I accept that the numbers at this time are estimated as at present the use of the strips are limited because they are used under the 28 day rule. While I understand this may be the intention at the present time, if the site were permitted, and successful, it is reasonable to assume that if circumstance allowed the number of flights and activity on the site could be significantly higher than the numbers suggested.

As already stated, activity in the locality is limited at present, but concern has been raised by local residents and the Town Council over the impact that any increased activity at the airfield would have on nearby livestock and neighbours in the local area.

Letters have been received in support of the proposal suggesting there is limited impact to residents and livestock from the activities associated with the proposed use. Examples of venues which operate close to livestock premises have been quoted and can be seen in section 3.8 above. It is however understandable that concern is raised on how the increased flights and activities may impact on livestock at the two nearest premises Cadges Farm (Livery) and Chestnut Farm (Turkey farm) and the neighbouring community.

Information received from the applicant suggests they already have a No Fly Zone in place which covers all of Cadges Farm and the other 4 farms around the site. This particular point is not something that can be conditioned or controlled by the local authority. The main issue to consider is the intensification of use of the site and the impact this may have on the surrounding area, including the traffic associated with the use of the site and the potential intensification of traffic.

Comments received from objectors note that a company UFly4Fun advertises Little Ellingham Airfield on their website to provide training. The applicant has supplied additional information to clarify this point and has stated the site is not commercial and is not connected with the company. Any training provided by Ufly4Fun will be limited and is on a one to one basis.
4.24 Notwithstanding these points, I would suggest that as there is a financial investment to be made to provide the buildings, and the works associated with providing the access and car park, the number of people may well increase if the club is to be successful. While it may not be the intention for a commercial operation from the site, there does appear to be limited commercial benefits associated with the facility. From the information provided, the assessment of the existing use and activity of the site together with the potential for the intensification following the financial investment to improve facilities on the site, I consider the impact on the neighbouring community does have the potential to result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance and therefore is in conflict with criteria (2) a), Bi, ii, iii of policy DM2.9.

Highway

4.25 Access to the site is off New Road which is a single track road. The junction of New Road onto the Attleborough Road (the main road between Ellingham and Hingham) has limited visibility. Concern has been raised by the Town Council and local residents to the safety of this junction which will only be compounded with the increased activity associated with the site.

4.26 Comments received from the Highways Authority note that:

“….although the additional information comments that both aircraft and vehicle movements will be similar to existing, the hangar space is said to accommodate up to nine aircraft. This is a considerable change to the number of aircraft that are currently based at this site and is bound to result in a larger traffic generation to and from the site. The additional hangar space will change the site from a very low key space to a much larger enterprise. The web site refers to Ground training/Ground School, Training flights, Experienced Pilots, Tandem, Microlight all of which are likely to increase traffic levels to and from the site to a notable degree. While the applicant has already stated that this is not a commercial site, if the facilities are provided it is reasonable to assume that opportunities to meet the requirements of club members or other economic opportunities to benefit the club would be acted upon.

4.27 New Road, from which this site is served, has a typical carriageway width of just 2.5metres. This width can clearly only cater for single file traffic and falls considerably short of the minimum widths recommended in Manual for Streets Figure 7.1. That document states, to allow two cars to pass safely and to allow a car and a large vehicle to pass each other safely, surface widths of 4.1m and 4.8m are required respectively. There are no formal passing places on New Road and no gateways for drivers to pull into when faced with an oncoming vehicle. It is therefore likely that vehicles will need to pull across the highway verges in order to pass other vehicles.

4.28 The sightline provision available from New Road onto Attleborough Road, as noted above, fails to meet the recognised guidance set down by Central Government and applied locally. In percentage terms, the current available sight distance to the west of 40m is a mere 18 % of the recommended guidance. Accordingly, there is a highway concern in respect of the proposed development which will result in an intensification of the vehicular use of New Road and its junction with Attleborough Road which are considered undesirable and potentially unsafe.”

4.29 For these reasons the proposed scheme is considered to conflict with criteria 3 of policy DM2.9, and DM3.11.
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 Having considered all the factors as set out above, I acknowledge that the proposed use does provide a recreational facility which demands either suitable remote location, or an established airfield. From the evidence submitted, I am not satisfied that justification for this particular location has been demonstrated. The lack of hangar facilities at present on the other sites does not itself justify the current proposal.

5.2 The proposed improved facilities will indeed provide an opportunity for an intensified recreational use of the site. However, the benefits will be for a specialist group of people most of whom are not from the immediate local community. Therefore limited weight can be given to the benefits of providing such a facility in terms of its benefits for the most local community.

5.3 The intensification of the use, which I would consider likely to justify the financial investment will have an adverse impact on the rural nature of the site which is only accessed by the private car and is located in an area where it is not possible to provide safe and adequate access to serve the site as a whole. The surrounding road network is of single track roads with no passing bays, therefore the proposed use would result in highway safety issues which conflict with policy.

5.4 In addition while the activity to date has been limited by virtue of the use of land under the 28 day rule, the potential for increased noise activity, which cannot be controlled by the local authority once the aircraft are airborne, will have an unacceptable impact on the local residents in this quiet rural location.

5.5 On balance, the benefits of the proposed use of the land and the associated activity are outweighed by the harm the use will have on the amenities of the locality and the safe and free flow of traffic. For this reason I consider the proposal is in conflict with NPPF3, DM2.9, DM3.11 and DM3.13.

5.6 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.

5.7 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) however the harm the proposal would have outweighs the financial benefits of CIL in this instance.

6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 The use of the site as proposed will provide leisure facilities, however the use is specific to a limited group of individuals and the noise and disturbance resulting from the intensification of that use to the local area outweighs the benefits. The proposal conflicts with planning policies as expressed in National Planning Policy Framework section 3, and Local Plan policies DM2.9 and DM3.13.

6.2 The existing roads from which the site is accessed are narrow with poor visibility at the Junction of New Road. The increased activity resulting from the proposal will have an adverse impact on the safety and free flow of traffic contrary to Local Plan policies DM2.9 and DM3.11.
12. **Appl. No**: 2015/1967/H  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND

   **Applicants Name**: Mr Roy Barnes  
   **Site Address**: 1 Church Close Poringland Norfolk NR14 7LB  
   **Proposal**: Removal of hedge and erection of 1.8m fence to side and rear of property (retrospective application)

   **Recommendation**: Refusal

   - 1 Adverse impact on character of area
   - Authorise Enforcement Action

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  
      Development Management Policies  
      DM3.8 Design Principles  
      DM3.13 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. **Consultations**

   2.1 Parish Council  
      Approve  
      - Provided the fence is no more than 1.8M

   2.2 District Member  
      Can be delegated

   2.3 Representations  
      2 letters of support received  
      2 letters of objection received  
      - The fence is out of character with low walls and pillars in the rest of the close  
      - The fence is an extra traffic hazard  
      - Colour, texture and form appears to be an ugly addition to Church Close

3. **Assessment**

   3.1 This application seeks consent for the retention of an erected close boarded wooden fence located in a corner plot within the development boundary of Poringland. The fence requires planning consent by virtue of being over 1 metre in height within 2 metres of the highway boundary.

   3.2 The site is a corner plot in a prominent location adjacent to the main B1332 through Poringland. The fence itself is on the boundary with Church Close, which has an open character with dwarf walls and hedges defining the neighbouring front boundaries. There is no other front boundary defined by a high fence such as that erected on this site in the surrounding street scene.
3.3 Two letters of objection have been received in relation to this application with concerns raised as to the height, traffic danger, and adverse effect on the character of the area.

3.4 While the applicant’s wish for privacy is acknowledged, this needs to be weighed against the impact on the street scene and wider character of the area. It is considered that given the open character of the street scene in this location, the harm caused by the fence is substantial, introducing an enclosed and oppressive character to the street scene. Had the application been submitted as a proposed scheme, rather than for retention, it is highly unlikely it would have been recommended for approval as submitted.

3.5 The application is therefore recommended for refusal. Authorisation for enforcement action is requested to secure the removal of the majority of the fence including the entire section fronting the highway. There is no objection to the "rear" fence on the southern boundary of the site to be retained.

3.6 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.

3.7 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as there is no new floor area proposed.

4. Conclusion and reason for refusal

4.1 The fence results in an enclosed and oppressive street scene that does not respect the character of the remainder of Church Close which has an open character, thereby in conflict with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM3.8 of the Development Management Policies document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chrissy Briggs 01508 533832 cbriggs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2015/2145/RVC  
**Parish**: GISSING

Applicants Name : Mr K Greenacre  
Site Address : Crown Bungalow Lower Street Gissing Norfolk  
Proposal : Removal of condition 6 of planning permission 2003/1418 to allow the sale of the annexe

Recommendation : Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/1712 Removal of condition 6 of planning permission 2003/1418 to enable the annexe to be used as an independent residential unit Refused

2.2 2003/1418 Erection of detached annexe Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Approve  
- Crown Public house is considered to a vital community asset  
- Ensuring its viability for the future should be a key factor  
- The applicant has declared that the proceeds of a sale are required as a necessary investment to the business  
- Any sale will be of a kind which will enable the continued occupation by the current resident (older family member)  
- Clarification required on the car parking
3.2 District Member To be determined by committee

- The applicant should be allowed to sell the pub bungalow in the same way as any other property owner can albeit with conditions
- The play area adjacent to the bungalow is hardly ever used so would not constitute a potential noise hazard that a future owner might complain about
- The applicant would be prepared to accept a condition to close the play area or would be prepared to sell it to go with the bungalow
- Strong likelihood that the applicant would have to close the pub and try and sell it in a very uncertain market, thus depriving the village of a much loved and well used amenity. Not a scenario we would like to see happen
- The main reason for recommending refusal seems to be that a future owner of the bungalow may complain about noise from a play areas hardly ever used and one that the applicant has offered to close.
- I find this kind of speculation tenuous at best and should not be used as an excuse for refusal especially as it could lead to the closure of the pub.

3.3 NCC Highways

- Whilst no highway objection
  Request a plan showing the car parking facilities that will be provided if the dwelling is to be sold separately

3.4 SNC Community Services - Protection

- Object
  Received a formal complaint regarding an alleged noise nuisance from the smoking shelter located at the front of the premise in 2010, however the allegations were not substantiated
  We have experience issues with other licensed premises which have introduced new types of entertainment in order to increase business; this has given rise to disturbance to residents where there have been no issues in the past.
  Given the pressures facing licensed premises there is the potential for this to happen in the future.
  Changes to the Licensing Act 2003 have relaxed the requirements relating to live and recorded music up to 11pm and thus this control has been lost.
  Any noise associated with the operation of the premises may not be unreasonable for a pub having regard to the nature of its use and therefore may not amount to a statutory nuisance which would be actionable under nuisance legislation; however it may have a significant impact on the occupants of the annex itself.
  Object it can be demonstrated that concerns cannot be addressed

3.5 SNC Conservation and Design

- No Objection
  - No impact on the heritage asset

3.6 Representations

- One letter of support which was submitted with the application
  - Live in Wilkes Cottage since August 2011 and not had any problems with noise
4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a detached annexe which is within the grounds on Gissing Crown Public House. The annexe is detached from the public house which is a listed building. The annexe is accessed through the public house car park and the external garden for the public house is located directly east of the annexe. The Gissing Heart Community facility is located to the south east. The listed church is located to the south. There is no existing or proposed development boundary for Gissing. This is an identical application to 2015/1712, refused earlier in the year.

4.2 This application is to remove the annexe condition that requires the annexe to be occupied as ancillary accommodation and not sold or leased separately from the public house which would result in annexe being an independent dwelling.

4.3 The NPPF and policy DM3.13, seeks to ensure that noise sensitive uses such as residential are not located close to noise generating uses which may affect their amenity. The annexe is located adjacent close to the public house and the garden area associated with it. Whilst the annexe is being occupied in association with the residential dwelling any disturbance associated with the public house or garden is within the control of the occupiers. If the annexe is occupied independently from the public house then there is a risk that the dwelling would result in noise complaints which could result on a statutory nuisance being caused which may result in restrictions being placed on the public house which may affect its viability in the long term. The applicant has also said that he is prepared to close the public house garden area and sell it with the annexe building; this however, would reduce the facilities and amenities associated with the public house which reduces versatility as a business. Although it is noted that the applicant intends to sell the property, so the family member can still remain resident. Removing the condition would not mean that was not necessary be the case.

4.4 Although the personal circumstances of the applicant have been considered no weight can be given to these in making the planning decision. No evidence has been submitted which demonstrates that the money from the sale is required for the continued viability of the public house.

4.5 The public house is a listed building and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires: “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.” No alterations are proposed to the annexe building which is already fenced off as a result this is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

4.6 The Highway Officer has requested information on the parking arrangement for the dwelling, this has been requested but there is sufficient space within the fenced off area around the annexe to accommodate car parking for a dwelling.

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.
5 Conclusion and Reason for Refusal

5.1 The occupation of the annexe independently from the public house would result in an unacceptable level of amenity for an independent dwelling by reason of being located in close proximity of the building, car park and garden area associated with the public house and having no control over the noise and disturbance created. Furthermore, this could result in environmental restrictions being placed on the public house which may adversely affect the viability of the public house contrary to paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications on land owned by and submitted by South Norfolk Council

14. **Appl. No**: 2015/2244/RVC  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs Debbie Lorimer  
Site Address: Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT

Proposal: Removal of condition 2 following planning application 2015/0581/F - The surround to the external escape stairs which is not a general circulation stairs is to be removed due to no requirement under building regulations this will create a less intrusive visual elevation from neighbouring properties.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Materials to accord with agreed details  
4. Hours of use

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

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 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies Document  
DM2.1: Employment and business development  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0700 Erection of external signage Approved

2.2 2015/0581 External - Extension to reception creating new cafe and larger reception area, extension to sports hall to create a new two storey fitness area.  
Internal - General refurbishment to all areas, new spa, separation to swimming pool & new soft play. Approved
Development Management Committee 11 November 2015

2.3 2015/2066 Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2015/0581 - materials  Approved

2.4 2015/2127 Non-material amendment to planning permission 2015/2581 - Windows shown to entrance curtain walling, new plant shown to link building, and proposed windows removed from pool.  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council  Approve

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  No objections

3.4 Environment Agency  No comments received

3.5 SNC Community Services - Protection  No comments

3.6 SNC Water Management Officer  No comments

3.7 Representations  No comments received

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is Wymondham Leisure Centre, a facility on Norwich Road in Wymondham which is owned and operated by South Norfolk Council. The Leisure Centre is within the development boundary of the town, with Wymondham High School to the north-west and north-east, and residential development to the south-west and south-east. The application is to vary the approved scheme for extensions to the Leisure Centre as part of a scheme to refurbish the facility and allow for the creation of a new cafe, fitness centre, larger reception area and new spa.

4.2 The application is being reported to Development Management Committee because the applicant is South Norfolk Council. The main issues to be considered are the principle of development, design and visual impact, impact on neighbouring occupiers, and highway impact.

Principle of development

4.3 The site lies within the development limits of Wymondham and is for a leisure and community use. The principle of development is therefore in accordance with policies 8 and 13 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS).

Design and Visual Impact

4.4 This application seeks to remove the surround from external escape stairs which is located to the south west/south east corner of the building. It is considered that the removal of the surround would not adversely impact on the design of the approved scheme which significantly enhances the main frontage of the building, modernising its appearance and creating a more active frontage, and are key part of the redevelopment proposals. The design accords with policy 2 of the JCS and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.
Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

4.5 There are a number of residential properties on Norwich Road and Orchard Way which are in close proximity to the site and the location of the escape stairs. The rear gardens of these properties back on to the application site. Given that the stairs will not be used for general circulation, whilst it would enable overlooking into the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties, I do not consider that they would give rise to a situation so detrimental to amenities of the neighbouring residential properties to warrant refusal. No objections have been received to the amended scheme. The proposal complies with Policy DM3.13 in that it will safeguard residential amenity.

Highways Impact

4.6 No objections are raised by the Highway Authority, and therefore the proposal complies with Policy DM3.11.

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 revised application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the floor area is not increased.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The scheme to redevelop Wymondham Leisure Centre would greatly improve the sporting and leisure facilities available to the local community, with associated benefits to health and quality of life. The removal of the stair surround maintains the good design of the scheme, does not adversely impact on the amenities of the surrounding residential area to a material degree and the highway network. The proposal complies with all relevant planning policies and guidance, and is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Agenda Item 7

Enforcement Reports

1. Enforcement Ref : 2014/8042
Parish     : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL
Site Address  : 10A Rectory Road, Dickleburgh, Norfolk, IP21 4NW,
Development  : Garden Shed
Developer    : Mrs Kerry

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a garden shed had been erected without
the benefit of planning permission. The shed requires planning permission as
permitted development rights were removed for ancillary buildings on the original
approval for the dwelling 1997/1193. Furthermore it is 150mm taller that what would
normally be allowed under permitted development.

1.2 The owner of the site was invited to submit a planning application to regularise the
shed. An application was received, however despite a number of requests insufficient
information has been received to validate the application.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Policy 7 – Requiring good design
Policy 12 – 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

2.3 Development Management Policies
DM 3.8 – Design Principles
DM 3.13 – Amenity, noise and quality of life

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

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.”

3. Relevant Planning History

3.1 1997/1193/F Erection of 69 houses, car parking, approved -
infrastructure, public open space, widening
of Rectory Road and provision of parking
and garage to “Homewood”

24/09/1997

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council Minimal difference between size of shed and size that would
normally be permitted. SNC should decide course of action.

4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
4.3 Local Residents  Two letters received raising no objections

5. Assessment

5.1 The site is located in a high density residential area within the Dickleburgh Conservation Area. The shed is sited on the rear boundary of the property adjacent to a communal parking area. It is of a wooden construction with a corrugated metal roof. The shed is predominantly screened by an existing 1.8metre high close-boarded wooden fence.

5.2 The shed by virtue of its size, design and location is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area nor will it adversely impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. In view of this I do not consider it is expedient to take enforcement action.

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

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

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Andy Baines  01508 533840
and E-mail: abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Enforcement Ref**: 2015/8145  
**Parish**: Ashwellthorpe And Fundenhall  
**Site Address**: Rose House, New Road, Ashwellthorpe, Norfolk, NR16 1HF  
**Development**: Unauthorised summerhouse  
**Developer**: Mr Racher

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a summerhouse had been erected without the benefit of planning permission. The summerhouse requires planning permission as it is 150mm taller than the 2.5metres allowed under permitted development.

1.2 The owner of the site was invited to submit a planning application to regularise the summerhouse but has advised that he does not wish to in view of the minor breach.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
**Policy 7 – Requiring good design**

2.2 Joint Core Strategy  
**Policy 2 – Promoting good design**

2.3 Development Management Policies  
**DM 3.8 – Design Principles**  
**DM 3.13 – Amenity, noise and quality of life**

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3.1 2011/0888 Retrospective application for retention of solar panels fitted to garage flat roof Approved

3.2 2010/0089 Proposed flat roof extension to rear with balcony and chimney. Approved

3.3 2006/2454 Proposed extension to rear of house and new pitched roof over flat roof Approved

4. **Consultations**

4.1 Parish Council No comments received

4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

4.3 Local Residents One letter of objection received  
- Proximity of summerhouse to boundary fence  
- No gutters and therefore water run-off will damage boundary fence

5. **Assessment**

5.1 The site is located in a residential area outside any defined development boundary or limit. The summerhouse is located in the rear garden of the property and is adjacent to the northern boundary. It is of a timber construction with a metal corrugated roof.
5.2 Concerns have been raised by a neighbouring property to the north that the location of the summerhouse adjacent to their fence together with the lack of guttering will result in run-off water damaging their fence. Whilst this concern is noted, the damage to the fence from run-off water is not likely to be such that it would justify planning enforcement action.

5.3 The shed, by virtue of its simple design, size and location is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the locality or the residential amenity nearby dwellings. In view of this I do not consider it expedient to take enforcement action.

5.4 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 matter is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 02 October 2015 to 29 October 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/0505</td>
<td>Forncett Caravan At Laynes Fam Gilderswood Lane Forncett St Peter Norfolk NR16 1LN</td>
<td>Mr Adam Gallagher</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0539</td>
<td>Easton The Ash Trees Bawburgh Road Easton Norfolk NR9 5ED</td>
<td>Mr Richard Draper</td>
<td>Replacement of existing mobile home with bungalow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 02 October 2015 to 29 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>2014/0096</td>
<td>Wymondham Land South East Of 9 Spinks Lane Spinks Lane Wymondham</td>
<td>Mr T Skitmore</td>
<td>Erection of five new dwellings and garages with associated works to existing highway</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1358</td>
<td>Hethersett Land At 38 Grove Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr David Feltham</td>
<td>Outline for 4no 2/3 bed bungalows, 2 affordable 2 bed houses and 2no 4/5 bed houses.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2186</td>
<td>Wymondham 2 Cantley Villas Station Road Spooner Row Norfolk NR18 9JR</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs P Dimoglou</td>
<td>Proposed construction of two semi-detached cottage style dwellings</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0365</td>
<td>Needham Land South of Whitehouse Farm High Road Needham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr A Brice</td>
<td>Proposed permanent agricultural dwelling and garage/car port</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with, ongoing investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeches Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27/01/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27/01/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 29/12/11 Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj. to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON</td>
<td>Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan</td>
<td>04.03.15</td>
<td>Further Enforcement Notice served re caravan Compliance date within 3 months of first occupation of the permitted dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAXLINGHAM THORPE</td>
<td>Storage of a caravan</td>
<td>27/02/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 10/03/15 Due to personal circumstances compliance delayed, ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land on the North side of Windy Lane 2013/8069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAXTON</td>
<td>Change of use of stable to residential dwelling</td>
<td>09/10/13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 19/03/15 Residential use ceased, ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butterfly Barn Church Lane 2013/8087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET</td>
<td>Change of use of Agricultural building to use as a dwelling house</td>
<td>10/12/14</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 07/12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saddleback Farm Station Road 2013/8230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Breach of Planning Conditions</td>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 17/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldreds Yard The Loke Longwater Lane 2014/8013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>Construction of hardstanding/roadway</td>
<td>01/04/15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land to rear of Sugar Beat Norwich Road 2014/8218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Breach of Condition Formation of habitable room</td>
<td>19/08/15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 03/06/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Silvo Road 2015/8106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>16/09/15</td>
<td>Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Common Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>16/09/15</td>
<td>Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laynes Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilderswood Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>14/10/15</td>
<td>Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgate House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketteringham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>20/10/15</td>
<td>Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enforcement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices Issued</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices Issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENF-PROC**

29/10/2015