Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

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

Date
Wednesday 9 December 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 have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance
Large print version can be made available
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

The Council has a duty to prepare Local Plan Documents to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The Development Plan for South Norfolk currently consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The Strategy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance and was adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011 (with amendments to the JCS being adopted in January 2014). It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it is adopted, policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

The Council adopted its Local Plan in October 2015. This consists of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham Area Action Plans the Development Management Policies Document. These documents allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criteria based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. These policies are in compliance with the NPPF.

The Long Stratton Area Action Plan is submitted for 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 21)
   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>2015/1059/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Including Extension To Thickthorn Park &amp; Ride Hethersett</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1594/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Phase A1-A Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/1697/F</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/2240/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XA</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/1642/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Land North Of 14 &amp; 16 Roydon Road Diss Norfolk</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/2397/H</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>50 St Leonards Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0JF</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/2069/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>Highland Church Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6RN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/2533/CU</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Car And Lorry Park Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7. Enforcement Reports  (attached – page 87)
8. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 109)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 6 January 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

**Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

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

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 11 November 2015 at 10.00 am.

Committee members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), Y Bendle, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, L Neal, B Stone, V Thomson

Apologies: Councillor F Ellis

(Councillor M Gray left the meeting after application 7)

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

Also in attendance: Adrian Jacklin – Norfolk County Council Highways

(35 members of the public were also in attendance)

229. 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>2015/1810/RVC</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by local member and applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1811/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by local member and applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1812/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by local member and applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1058/DC</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1835/F</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1967/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 230. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 14 October were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 231. 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 Code</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Lobbied by</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2145/RVC (Item 13)</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant Pre-determination – Member left the Committee and did not take part in discussion or the vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2244/RVC (Item 14)</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied Pecuniary Interest – Member left the Committee and did not take part in the discussion or the vote</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.

232. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Dickleburgh and Rushall (ref: 2014/8042)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken.

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall (ref: 2015/8145).

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken.
233. PLANNING APPEALS

Members noted the Planning Appeals.

234. ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS QUARTERLY REPORT

Members noted the Enforcement Proceedings Quarterly Report

(The meeting closed at 3:40pm)

_____________________
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  Appliance 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

Decision: Members voted 8 – 1 for APPROVAL

Approved 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

Updates

Further objections from local residents already summarised in report.
Letter from agent 28/10/2015 sent to Members

- Note Appeal decision to grant permission 2009/0910 despite Highway Authority objection and SNC refusal.
- Note NCC Highways raise no objection to the current applications.
- Note new tree planting proposed as part of the new landscaping scheme compensates for loss of trees previously on site.
- Crushed concrete and asphalt planings previously piled on site were used to form access and parking/circulation areas on site.
- Earth bund on frontage is to be removed as part of current proposals.
- Accident at access referred to was not caused by visitor to the site but a vehicle using the access to turn round.
- Accept existing bunds have been incorrectly formed and are to be re-formed as part of proposal
Development Management Committee

11 November 2015

Further letter of objection received from Cllr G Wheatley. Objections already summarised in report.

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.

Decision : Members voted 5 – 4 (with 1 abstention) (the Chairman exercised his casting vote) for APPROVAL

Approved 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
7. Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturday. The use shall not take place on Sundays or public holidays.

Updates
Further objections from local residents already summarised in report.
Letter from agent 28/10/2015 sent to Members
- Note Appeal decision to grant permission 2009/0910 despite Highway Authority objection and SNC refusal.
- Note NCC Highways raise no objection to the current applications.
- Note new tree planting proposed as part of the new landscaping scheme compensates for loss of trees previously on site.
- Crushed concrete and asphalt planings previously piled on site were used to form access and parking/circulation areas on site.
- Earth bund on frontage is to be removed as part of current proposals.
- Accident at access referred to was not caused by visitor to the site but a vehicle using the access to turn round.
-Accept existing bunds have been incorrectly formed and are to be re-formed as part of proposal

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

Decision : Members voted 5 – 2 (with 2 abstentions) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
Updates

Further objections from local residents already summarised in report.
Letter from agent 28/10/2015 sent to Members

- Note Appeal decision to grant permission 2009/0910 despite Highway Authority objection and SNC refusal.
- Note NCC Highways raise no objection to the current applications.
- Note new tree planting proposed as part of the new landscaping scheme compensates for loss of trees previously on site.
- Crushed concrete and asphalt planings previously piled on site were used to form access and parking/circulation areas on site.
- Earth bund on frontage is to be removed as part of current proposals.
- Accident at access referred to was not caused by visitor to the site but a vehicle using the access to turn round.
- Accept existing bunds have been incorrectly formed and are to be re-formed as part of proposal.

Major application 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.
Decision : Members voted unanimously and AGREED that the site-wide Masterplan and Design Code can be approved pursuant to condition 4 of planning permission 2011/1804

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
Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved 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
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.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director for Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved 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.

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

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

Approved 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.

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

Applicants Name : Mr V and 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)

Decision : Members voted 6 – 1 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL

Refused
1. New dwelling outside of development boundaries

Updates
Parish Council comments should read to say:

No objections to the residential development of the dwellings, but any extra works which could lead to the increase in the number of vehicle movements on the site are not suitable. The Parish Council have ongoing concerns about traffic on this section of the B1108.

9 Appl. No : 2015/1614/F
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.

Decision : Members voted 8 – 0 for REFUSAL

Refused
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

Updates

Agent:
- We would like to point out that this is a self-build project. As the government has chosen South Norfolk Council to be one of eleven authorities to work on the Right to Build pilot project, to identify and test various approaches to enable custom build housing in their area, this is one potential case. As you know it is the latest government backed initiative designed to help aspiring custom or self-builders get their project off the ground. We would ask that you determine this application with this in mind. The above application to be considered under and also in support of, the following Paragraphs of the NPPF 2012: Para 7, Para 14 and Para 50.

Officer
- Para 7 – The 3 dimensions to sustainable development have been assessed in the Committee Report.
- Para 14 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development has been assessed in the Committee Report.
- Para 50 – Deliver a wide choice of high quality homes etc. I believe the agent is referring to the ‘People wishing to build their own homes’. The proposal for the application to be considered as self-build was submitted after the Committee Report was written. I would comment that self-building is a material consideration when determining a planning application but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed in the committee report are of greater significance.

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
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development of 1 replacement dwelling, cartshed garage and associated external works.

Decision : Members voted 8 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. 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

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

Decision : Members voted 6 – 2 for REFUSAL
Refused

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

Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to ensure the removal of the porta cabin within 6 months

Updates
Applicant wishes to amend application as follows:
- Because of the negative comments that have been made about the planning that all seem to relate around UFly4Fun and paramotors, the land owner has said that there is not going to be any paramotoring from this site at all ever, that means that there will only be a few microlight aircraft that will be based here.
- We would like to remove planning permission for one of the polytunnels, the access road and the carpark, these where only going to be gravel tracks and not tarmac with drainage and curb stones.
- With regards to new road and car access, there hasn’t been any accidents on the junction of New Road and Attleborough road and when you consider its used by slow moving tractors all the time that must say a lot.
- If the committee feel it necessary we can move the access to the bottom right in the middle of the main field and access straight onto Attleborough road where visibility is best, anyone leaving the site can clearly see about half a mile in either direction with no obstructions.
- With regards to a blot on the landscape I’m sure nothing is more a blot on the landscape than a LIGHT GRAY Farm building with a big RED door that has recently been granted planning permission at Chestnut Farm, Money Hill, Hingham, Norfolk, NR9
This is in clear view of New Road and Attleborough Road, how can our Green polytunnel and small Green Hangar be classed as a blot on the landscape when they are less likely to be seen.

- If the committee decline the application for planning on the runways then we would revert back to the 28 Day rule, we probably wouldn’t use anywhere near the 28 days a year anyway but we would still like the small hangar, 1 polytunnel and the portacabin to stay.

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)
Decision : Members voted 4 – 3 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL
Refused

1. Adverse impact on character of area

Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken with 1 year for compliance

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
Decision : Members voted 5 – 2 for REFUSAL
Refusal

1. Unacceptable level of amenity and potential to affect the viability of the public house

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
Decision : Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL
Approved 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
## Major applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | 2015/1059/D | HETHERSETT | Persimmons Homes Anglia and Taylor Wimpey East Anglia | Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Including Extension To Thickthorn Park & Ride Hethersett | Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout | 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 built to binder course prior to occupation |

## 1. Planning Policies

### 1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- 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 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.5 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

2011/1489 Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride

2011/1804 Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.

2014/0860 Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O- Alterations to condition 32 and 33. To delete condition 32 and substitute with 32a in regard to commencement of Phase 2 and 32b commencement of Phase 5, deletion of condition 33 and substitute 33a and 33b, 33a in regard to first occupation of Phase 2 and 33b first occupation of Phase 5

2014/0863 Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Deletion of condition 32b footway/cycleway

2015/1058 Discharge of condition 4 following planning permission 2011/1804/O - design code for each phase of development.

2015/1059 Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout

2015/1681 Reserved matters for appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the first phase of development for 129 dwellings in relation to outline permission 2011/1804
### Other discharge of condition applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Condition Discharge</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1577</td>
<td>Discharge of condition 20 - Reserved matters phased landscaping scheme from 2011/1804/O</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1587</td>
<td>Discharge of condition 12 - Ecological Management Plan from 2011/1804/O</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1588</td>
<td>Discharge of condition 26 - Existing and proposed levels from 2011/1804/O</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1589</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition 27 of planning permission 2011/1804 - Street Lighting</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1918</td>
<td>Discharge of conditions 12 - Ecological Management Plan, 26 - Floor levels/boundary treatments &amp; 27 - Lighting details of planning application 2011/1804 and part discharge of condition 20 - Hard/soft landscaping works</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultations

#### 3.1 Hethersett Parish Council
- No comments to make.

#### 3.2 District Members
- There is potentially much more for people to concern themselves with regarding the ecology and tree reports.
- There are not any details regarding the Park & Ride extension.

#### 3.3 NCC Highways
- No objection

Comments on amended plans:
- Confirms no objection to the general alignment and width of Roads 1 and 10. With regards to the street lighting and landscaping there are too many unknowns to be able to completely approve the detail currently being considered through condition. Notes a number of general comments in respect to the original comments and possible improvements to the road layout.

Original comments:
- No specific objections to the alignment of the proposed spine roads but requests further information and amendments in respect to the number, scale and location of junctions onto the two spine Roads; details of proposed means of managing vehicle speeds; carriageway widening; 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 Anglian Water Services Ltd
- No comments received

#### 3.5 NCC Ecologist
- No objection
- The Ecological Management Report (EMP) is fit for purpose; it meets industry best practice. The report explains the detailed rationale for ecological mitigation in relation to the road layout.
and includes an updated ecological assessment. The EMP clearly states the four objectives that it is intending to fulfil and explains how this will be achieved.

- The requirement for a European Protected Species licence is addressed in the light of recent great crested newt surveys and it is concluded no licence is required.
- The EMP is sufficient to meet the requirements of condition 12.

3.6 SNC Landscape Officer

Comments on amended plans:

- Further information addresses street tree planting. Condition to determine species required.

Original comments:

- The details can be agreed by condition, but I consider it reasonable to expect a little more in regards of a positive proposal that can be a point of reference for engineers and other designers to refer to.
- Requests a clear scale plan that sets out the definitive stretches of verge where street trees are both practical and will be positively encouraged in accordance with the Design Code, ideally with minimum numbers.
- 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 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.

3.7 Historic Environment Service

No objection

- The second phase of the archaeological field evaluation has been completed, and full details are in preparation. The investigations did not reveal any deposits of national significance liable to preclude development within the application boundary.
- Further works will be required on deposits of less than national significance, but we are happy for them to be dealt with by conditions.

3.8 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

No objection

- The submitted highways layout includes provision of attenuation ponds. We welcome the use of SuDS features in combination with the attenuation ponds.
- We recommend that consideration is given to utilising grass verges within the highway network as part of the surface water strategy.
- Justification will need to be provided when discharging Conditions 7 as to why conventional methods have been selected above SuDS features.
- The information submitted is not sufficient to discharge Condition 7 and 8.
3.9 Other Representations

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

- Back Lane will be closed to vehicles and downgraded to a Cycleway. This will result in all traffic being diverted along Shop Lane.
- Traffic coming from Little Melton and beyond along Colney Lane and wishing to gain access to the existing village of Hethersett, will not go the long way round.
- Residents of Shop Lane are already concerned about Villagers using the narrow road as a "rat run" and there have been a number of accidents and near misses reported.
- The solution is to allow access only to properties on Shop Lane by blocking or by bollard placement on the road just before or after the Farm Entrance.
- The Application does not mention the Extension to Thickthorn despite its title.
- Agricultural movements will need to access Back Lane/Shop Lane. Are these factored into planning?
- What is the location of the road off Colney Lane and does it take into consideration bends in the road and blind spots?
- Colney Lane junction is shown as having traffic lights and this could cause traffic backlogs particularly at rush hour.
- UKMail currently have a nearby depot that sees a fleet of very large vehicles on the surrounding roads. The access needs to be maintained for these vehicles.
- Site Access via Churchfields is an unnecessary load on Churchfields and the surrounding residents. Back Lane and Burnthouse lane currently allow traffic used by UKMail vehicles which are extremely large so this would suggest that these roads could be used to carry construction traffic.
- Objects to the development of the open farm land.
- The proposed development has not considered the previous objections or views of local residents.
- Poor local infrastructure and services. The area also lacks the suitable roads to cope with increased traffic.
- Proposals do not adequately consider the needs of pedestrians and cyclists nor does it consider the impact on local residents.
- Proposals would be unsafe and put the security and safety of local residents in jeopardy.
- What consideration is given to traffic lights on Colney Lane/Norwich road junction? Is this planned into the development and who will be responsible for this?
- At what stage will 'green areas' be planted and who will maintain them? It must be simultaneous with building work and of equal importance.
- Most importantly-what is the exact location of the road off Colney Lane and does it take into consideration bends in the road and blind spots?
- Given the impact of this development will consideration be put to the Development Management Committee?
- What access is available by vehicle, to those who live on Back Lane/Colney Lane/Shop Lane to both Little Melton and Hethersett?
- What route will lorries from UK Post take from Little Melton during and post construction?
- What route will construction traffic take and how will that be safeguarded? Which routes will it be prohibited to take?
Assessment

The application is a reserved matters application for the primary and secondary road layout for land to the North of Hethersett Village Centre.

The site relates to an area of agricultural land at north Hethersett to the west of Colney Lane, which comprises 83.59ha of land that has outline consent for 1196 dwellings granted on the 22 July 2013 (ref 2011/1804). As part of that consent a further 2.66ha extension to the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride was approved.

This application now seeks approval of reserved matters, which include the road layout of the main spine road through the site for the residential and mixed use parcels only. The application does not consider the proposed extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride site.

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.

The application is accompanied by an Ecology Management Plan and Highway Infrastructure Arboricultural Report. A separate application is required prior to the commencement of development to discharge Condition 7 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.

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 North Hethersett.

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, off-site highway works and a travel plan contribution.

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

Principle of development

The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/1804. The outline consent for the site had regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. The site forms the whole of allocated site HET1 which is allocated for housing led development including community uses, open space and green infrastructure. This outline permission established the principle of up to 1196 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.

This particular reserved matters application relates to the road layout for the residential parcels only. The principle of the overall development being served from a number of access points from the surrounding road network including Colney Lane, Back Lane, Little Melton Road and Great Melton Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to
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off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement. 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 Colney Lane, Back Lane, Little Melton Road and Great Melton Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement. These include improvements at the Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads and improvements to the Great Melton Road and to the new road junction.

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

4.13 In accordance with details indicated at the outline stage, access to the development will be from access points from Churchfields, off Colney Lane and off Great Melton Road. The access points will be connected by the main spine roads running east-west through the site with roads running south to connect to Great Melton Road, Little Melton Road and Back Lane, which links to a primary and secondary spine route running through the site.

4.14 The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority which required amendments and further information to address technical highway specifications. The County 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.

4.15 Concern has been raised by local residents in respect of the off-site highways works and access, however this strategy was set out and approved at the outline stage and the Highway authority has confirmed no objection to these matters.

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

Layout

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

4.18 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.

4.19 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.

4.20 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.
The access and road layout do lead to removal of some significant trees on the site. This matter has been extensively discussed with the applicants to see if removal of these trees could be avoided. Following discussions various options were considered to avoid the trees in question, but to enable the formation of appropriately sized development areas (i.e. not too small to allow a good form of design to come forward at reserved matter stage) the roads could not be moved from the position proposed. On the scale of the scheme however and proposed mitigation measures this was not considered a reason to refuse this application on.

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 full details of species for each of the locations, pit 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

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.

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 has already been considered. The layout of the road as proposed would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of existing properties.

Drainage

The submitted highways layout includes provision of attenuation ponds and features. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) welcomes the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) in combination with the attenuation ponds and recommends that consideration is given to utilising grass verges within the highway network as part of the surface water strategy.

With regards to the overall surface water drainage strategy, a separate application is required prior to the commencement of development to discharge Condition 7 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.

In respect of the road layout, it is not considered that the layout of the road affects the ability to deliver the overall drainage strategy on the site which will include ponds, swales and a piped system. No development can commence until the surface water drainage strategy is approved under a 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.

The LLFA has requested that justification will need to be provided when discharging Conditions 7 as to why conventional methods have been selected above SuDS features. It is considered that these matters can be adequately dealt with through the conditions of the outline planning application and is therefore acceptable.
Ecology and Green Infrastructure

4.29 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.

4.30 As required by the outline consent a Ecology Management Plan sits alongside this application and has been submitted as a separate discharge of condition application ref 2015/1587, which is currently under consideration at the time of writing this report. The Ecology Management Plan outlines the proposals for ecology 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.

4.31 The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the Ecology 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.

4.32 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.

4.33 Therefore subject to the Ecology Management Plan to be agreed by condition, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the general green infrastructure requirements for development in North Hethersett, NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

Heritage assets

4.34 There are a number of listed buildings in the area (to the south of the site), the impact on which was considered as part of the outline application, concluding that no significant impact on the character or appearance of the setting of those listed buildings would result.

4.35 The setting of the Listed Buildings requires consideration under policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies Document. The NPPF Section 12 also requires the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset to be considered.

4.36 This particular reserved matters application relates to the access roads across the site and is separated from the existing listed buildings by some distance and existing intervening features such as landscaping and built development, together with proposed landscape features in the proposed green corridors. As such it is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any adverse harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings nearby and would accord with Policy DM4.10.

4.37 In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

4.38 In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings in Hethersett.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

4.39 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.

4.40 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.

4.41 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

4.42 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.

4.43 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 2011/1804. 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 the application be approved subject to conditions.

5.4 The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan and all material planning considerations, which include policies DM 1.1, 3.11, 3.13, 4.2, 4.4, 4.9 and 4.10 and allocation HET1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, policies 1 and 2 from the Joint Core Strategy, section 7 of the NPPF and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2  **Appl. No**: 2015/1594/D  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

**Applicants Name**: Taylor Wimpy East Anglia  
**Site Address**: Phase A1-A Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Residential development of 95no dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure.

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions:

1. In accordance with amended plans
2. Water efficiency

Subject to resolving the outstanding matters in terms of highways, landscaping and design.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
- Policy 2: Promoting good design
- Policy 3: Energy and water
- Policy 4: Housing delivery
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation
- Policy 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
  - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
  - DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
  - DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
  - DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
  - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
Development Management Committee

09 Dec 2015

DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
DM4.7 : Strategic gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
HET 1: Land north of Hethersett

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

2. Planning History

2011/1489 Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride

2011/1804 Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.

2014/0860 Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O- Alterations to condition 32 and 33. To delete condition 32 and substitute with 32a in regard to commencement of Phase 2 and 32b commencement of Phase 5, deletion of condition 33 and substitute 33a and 33b, 33a in regard to first occupation of Phase 2 and 33b first occupation of Phase 5

2014/0863 Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Deletion of condition 32b footway/cycleway
2015/1058 Discharge of condition 4 following planning permission 2011/1804/O - design code for each phase of development. Approved

2015/1059 Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout under consideration

2015/1681 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

Other discharge of condition applications

2015/1577 Discharge of condition 20 - Reserved matters phased landscaping scheme from 2011/1804/O under consideration

2015/1587 Discharge of condition 12 - Ecological Management Plan from 2011/1804/O under consideration

2015/1588 Discharge of condition 26 - Existing and proposed levels from 2011/1804/O under consideration

2015/1589 Discharge of Condition 27 of planning permission 2011/1804 - Street Lighting under consideration

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

3 Consultations

3.1 Parish Council The application should not be determined ahead of the Masterplan discharge of condition application. The application should only be approved subject to conditions including construction traffic management plan, site opening to exclude Saturdays and Sundays except for marketing and security, construction noise and dust to be monitored, Parish Council to be notified of a named contact on site to enable communication in the event of any breaches of conditions

3.2 District Member Cllr Dale Cllr Dewsbury Application should not be determined prior to the design code and masterplan application. Can be delegated

3.3 Historic Environment Service No objection. Comments made on outline stand and archaeological works are secured through Condition 10 of the outline consent.

3.4 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council No comments received
3.5 SNC Landscape Officer

Revisions and further information sought on original scheme, comments on revised plans to be presented to committee.

Initial general comments:

- Further adjustments to the scheme required in order for it to be acceptable.
- AIA required
- Need to reconcile type and location of proposed street trees with the design and layout of this residential phase
- The bin collection points are not ideal at the edge of the public open spaces.
- Detail planting proposals and a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) have been provided (the discharge of their submission is being formally dealt with formally under DC 2015/1577) – comments are: request hedging for some additional plots; further information on verge trees required in some areas; comment on species used in some areas.

3.6 SNC Play and Amenities Manager

To be reported if appropriate

3.7 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

No comments received

3.8 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

No objection. Would recommend the developer to apply for the Secure by Design Award.

3.9 Natural England

No objection. Re-iterate comments made at the outline stage, however there was no objection at that stage.

3.10 Environment Agency

No objection to the reserved matters application, however we do not consider that adequate information has been submitted to date to allow the discharge of condition 7. The LFFA will need to comment on the discharge of condition application.

3.11 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No comments received

3.12 SNC Design Officer

Comments on original plans following approval of design code:

- A design Code compliance statement is required
- The densities follow the parameters plans in the design code but some of the building heights need amending
- Depths of dwellings, roof forms and spans and pitches need to be considered to form coherent groups in a number of areas
- Generally there is a positive relationship between the development edges with the green corridors but further improvement required to create a more informal arrangement.
- Plots 40 and 41 should be landmark buildings
- Further information on how the development relates to the open space and its phasing is required
- In the ‘village green’ character area – the designs should be amended to reflect the ‘modern’ design approach; materials palette should be simplified; boundary treatment along private frontages to be reviewed
• In the ‘countryside edge’ character area – Buildings should have traditional detailing; boundary treatments to be reviewed against that character area requirements; Juliet balconies should not feature in this character area

• Comments on house types – individual house types need to be reviewed in the context of the approved character areas; if render or weatherboarding used it should wrap around the entire gable; the countryside edge character area should avoid Georgian style door surrounds

• An updated building for life evaluation is required to reflect the latest design codes and any amendments to the scheme

Comments on amended plans following assessment against Design Code approved by committee on 11th November:

• 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.

• The height and massing of the 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. 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 on to open space areas in accordance with the design code and parameter plans.

• The individual house types have been amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties. The style of the house types have also been updated to reflect the styles identified in the design code and relevant character areas (modern and traditional). This has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces and create an identifiable sense of place, which is considered acceptable.

• Buildings are proposed in prominent and logical locations to reinforce the overall character combined with landscaping with the existing vegetation. The combination of these elements ensures that the local identity is positively reinforced.

Overall the general layout of the site and its appearance, which has been informed by the Design Code and subject to discussions with Officers, is in my opinion considered acceptable. It has been designed to incorporate different character areas, which assist in creating variety and interest through the development.

3.13 NCC Ecologist

The Environmental Management Plan report is fit for purpose; it meets industry best practice and is in line with the requirements of BS42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development. The report explains the detailed rationale for ecological mitigation in relation to the road layout, and includes an updated ecological assessment. The EMP clearly states the four objectives that it is intending to fulfil and explains how this will be achieved. The requirement for a European Protected Species licence is addressed in the light of recent great crested newt surveys and it is concluded no licence is required. I share this opinion. I am of the opinion that the EMP is sufficient to meet the requirements of the condition.
4.1 The site to the north of Hethersett has an area of 83.59 Hectares and outline consent for a residential led development of the site was approved by 2011/1804 in 2013. As part of that consent a further 2.66Ha extension to the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride was approved. The site is an arable landscape with fields separated by hedgerows and drainage ditches. The topography of the site is general flat closer to the village but falls away closer towards the watercourse valleys to the north and west and rises again to the north of the site.
4.2 The outline consent secured the principle and the access of the development with the intention that the development would be delivered in phases. The application now to be considered comprises one residential phase of that outline consent.

The application

4.3 The application is for the erection of 95 dwellings at land to the north of Hethersett Village. The application is a reserved matters approval following outline consent 2011/1804. This application seeks approval of the first residential phase and for those matters reserved at the outline stage which include appearance, landscape, layout and scale.

4.4 Following the grant of outline consent, a Design Code and parameter plans for the whole site was approved at Development Management Committee on 11th November 2015, which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development.

4.5 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The majority of the development would be traditional two storey height, 17 of the properties are two and a half storey. The large majority of plots have single storey garaging.

4.6 Of these total dwellings, 19 are proposed to be affordable. These are located in three separate areas across this phase.

4.7 The site comprises of a vehicular access point which 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 2015/1059 for the outline consented site, which is under consideration at the time of writing this report and which Members are also considering under this same agenda.

4.8 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. 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.

4.9 A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the overall site and this secured a number of obligations, including funding for increased capacity of educational facilities and provision of school sites; funding towards libraries; affordable housing; play, recreational and amenity areas; finding towards a travel plan; community pavilion land and funding; funding towards highway infrastructure improvements; provision of neighbourhood centre site; allotments; woodland area; and park and ride requirements.

The main issues for consideration of this application are:

- principle of development;
- access and highways issues;
- open space;
- landscaping;
- layout, appearance and scale;
- ecology;
- drainage and foul water;
- residential amenity;
- heritage assets;
- affordable housing; and
- water efficiency.
Principle of development

4.10 The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/1804, the site area of which is shown in Appendix 2. The site area for this particular reserved matters application is shown in Appendix 1. The outline consent for the site had regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. The site forms the whole of allocated site HET1 which is allocated for housing led development including community uses, open space and green infrastructure.

4.11 This outline permission established the principle of up to 1196 dwellings. As such the principle is established for residential development and the number of dwellings now proposed for this phase of development for 95 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.

Access and Highway issues

4.12 Policy DM3.11 requires the safe and free flow of traffic, ensuring highway safety is maintained and the free flow of traffic on the highway network. Policy DM3.12 has regard to the provision of vehicular parking.

4.13 The principle of the overall development being served from a number of access points from the surrounding road network including Colney Lane, Back Lane, Little Melton Road and Great Melton Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement.

4.14 The internal road arrangement for the overall outline site area currently forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1059, which is under consideration at the time of writing this report. The road layout follows the general parameters and principles set at the outline stage. It has a two connected main spine roads running east-west through the site with roads running south to connect to Great Melton Road, Little Melton Road and Back Lane.

4.15 This reserved matters application seeks to agree the precise details of highways within this phase of residential development and do not form part of the principle road layout.

4.16 The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority. Comments are awaited from the Highway Authority as to whether the amendments overcome their original comments, however these are considered to be largely technical in nature and could require further minor revisions to the layout and Officers therefore seek delegated authority to delegate the decision subject to these final matters being resolved.

4.17 In respect of parking provision, policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site.

4.18 Car parking is 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.

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

4.20 The overall site forms the whole of the HET1 allocation and land approved as part of the outline consent 2011/1804. 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.

4.21 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 the green gateway in the strategic gap area, and the interconnecting green corridors. 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.

4.22 The design and layout of the development has been amended to ensure that strong frontages with a variety of house types and loose edges prevail along the green corridors and open spaces, in accordance with the approach required in the approved design code.

4.23 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.

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

Landscaping

4.25 Policies DM4.9 and DM4.10 have regard to landscaping and trees.

4.26 The overall site wide landscape strategy for Hethersett North as set out in the approved Design Code and Landscape Masterplan, creates a variety of multi-functional, biodiverse, attractive green spaces and streets set within the existing landscape framework.

4.27 This current phase under consideration is located within the south eastern part of the site, south of an area of retained woodland and to the west of the proposed community woodland.

4.28 The parcels of land within this phase would be set amongst a network of public green spaces. Ecological corridors run north-south between the parcels and these would comprise of retained hedgerows, native trees and shrub planting and grassland.

4.29 The northern edge of this phase borders the mixed woodland. The eastern edge of the phase borders the strategic gap which is to comprise a new community woodland, informal open space, formal sports pitches and allotments.

4.30 Precise details and management arrangements of these open spaces will be subject to a separate reserved matters application and compliance with the S106.

4.31 The reserved matters application for the road layout of the site which is subject to a separate planning application includes the verges of the roads and therefore the tree planting and landscaping within them. Some areas of conflict which would result in shading of the new dwellings have been highlighted and comments and amended plans are awaited in this respect.

4.32 In terms of specific landscaping within the parcels of development under consideration for this application, this site lies within the ‘village heart’ and ‘countryside view’ character areas as defined in the approved design code. The proposed landscaping includes a
combination of trees, shrubs, hedges, ornamental planting and amenity grass. The Council’s Landscape Officer whilst having no objection to the principles and overall approach, has raised a number of concerns in regards to some of the existing trees, potential shading, proposed species and relationship of housing and planting/open spaces and boundary treatments etc. These are currently under consideration and amendment by the applicant and Officers consider that agreement on these matters can be reached with amended plans. Members will be updated at committee to this regard and authority to delegate approval in respect of any amendments required is also therefore sought.

Layout, appearance and scale

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

4.34 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.

4.35 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.

4.36 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 relevant character areas identified in the Design Code for this application are the ‘Countryside Edge’ and ‘Village Greens’.

4.37 The Village Green character area should be predominantly modern in design, featuring a number of key buildings along the main routes. There will be strong frontages with a variety of house types with loose edges to the wildlife corridors.

4.38 The code identifies that the ‘countryside edge’ character area should be predominantly traditional in appearance with features and architectural details found in the existing village of Hethersett. Outward facing development cells should face new and existing areas of landscaping. Traditional materials should be used to reflect those used in South Norfolk.

4.39 In terms of what has been proposed, following amendments, 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 The height and massing of the 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. 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 on to open space areas in accordance with the design code and parameter plans.

4.41 The individual house types have been amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties, The style of the house types have also been updated to reflect the styles identified in the design code and relevant character areas (modern and traditional). This has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces and create an identifiable sense of place, which is considered acceptable.
4.42 Buildings are proposed in prominent and logical locations to reinforce the overall character combined with landscaping with the existing vegetation. The combination of these elements ensures that the local identity is positively reinforced.

4.43 With regard to density, the development proposals achieve an average density of approximately 31dph which accords with the Design Code and parameters plans ensuring the efficient use of land.

4.44 Car parking is all on plot, except for two visitor parking spaces within bays on the road 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.

4.45 Overall the general layout of the site and its appearance, which has been informed by the Design Code and subject to discussions with Officers, is considered acceptable. It has been designed to incorporate different character areas, which assist in creating variety and interest through the development.

4.46 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 Hethersett. 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.

Affordable Housing

4.47 Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. Based on development viability, 20% of the proposed dwellings were secured as ‘affordable’ as part of the outline consent.

4.48 This phase of development proposes 19 affordable dwellings and 75 market dwellings which equates to the required 20% and complies with the S106.

4.49 The Council’s Housing Enabling Officer has confirmed that the affordable dwellings proposed comply with the S106 requirements.

4.50 In accordance with the Design Code the affordable housing in this phase has been distributed around the site in 3 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.

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

Residential amenity

4.52 Policy DM3.13 requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

4.53 Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties largely relate to those properties which are to the south of the site on Back Lane. These properties are separated from the development by a green corridor running along this part of the site.
The design and position of the properties proposed together with the distance and separation by a green corridor and planting ensures that there would be no significant adverse impact on existing residential amenity.

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.

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.

Ecology

Policy DM4.4 has regard to ecology. The ecological principles were considered at the outline stage and subject to a condition to require an ecological management plan for each reserved matters the overall impacts on ecology were considered acceptable.

This reserved matters application has been supported by an ecological management plan which builds on the principles established at the outline stage. The County Ecologist confirms the report is fit for purpose and has no objection to the proposal in this respect.

Drainage

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 FRA for the whole sites that builds on the recommendations of the outline FRA to provide details of the drainage proposed, based on the latest overall site layout. The strategy consists of a network of underground pipes and above ground swales which collect water at source and direct it to a series of large balancing lagoons located across the site. In regards to this particular phase, this is split across two surface water systems, the south western area drains via underground pipes to a balancing pond located on the southern boundary which then has a restricted flow rate into the adjacent public sewer. The north western area of the phase drains via underground pipes and swales to the north western balancing lagoons, with a restricted discharge into the existing watercourse.

A separate application is required prior to the commencement of development to discharge Condition 7 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 Environment Agency has advised they have no objection to the reserved matters application and has indicated that the detailed surface water strategy will need to be agreed under the discharge of condition.

In respect of this residential reserved matters, it is not considered therefore considered that the layout of the phase 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 this residential phase prior to the surface water drainage condition being discharged.
Foul water

The principle of the development in relation to the foul water capacity was considered at the outline stage and a condition was imposed on the outline to ensure the precise design of the strategy is agreed prior to commencement of development.

Heritage assets

There are a number of listed buildings in the area (to the south of the site), the impact on which was considered as part of the outline application, concluding that no significant impact on the character or appearance of the setting of those listed buildings would result.

The setting of the Listed Buildings requires consideration under policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies Document. The NPPF Section 12 also requires the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset to be considered.

This particular reserved matters application relates to a phase in the south east area of the site and is separated from the existing listed buildings by some distance and existing intervening features such as landscaping and built development, together with proposed landscape features in the proposed green corridors. As such it is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any adverse harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings nearby and would accord with Policy DM4.10.

In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings in Hethersett.

Water efficiency

The applicant has adequately demonstrated through their submission that the water efficiency requirements of JCS Policy 3 can be complied with. A condition is required to ensure compliance with these measures.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

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 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**

4.73 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.

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

### Conclusion

5.1 The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2011/1804.

5.2 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.

5.3 All other matters relating to residential amenity, surface water, foul water, heritage assets, open space, ecology and affordable housing are considered to be appropriately provided for.

5.4 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.

5.5 Final matters relating to highways and landscaping are sought to be agreed under delegated powers, but as outlined in this report in principle there are no concerns that would merit refusal of this application, with just final details on these matters need to be agreed.

5.6 The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan and all material planning considerations, which include policies DM 1.1, 1.4, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.15, 4.2, 4.4, 4.9, 4.10 and allocation HET1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, policies 1, 2 and 3 from the Joint Core Strategy, section 7 of the NPPF and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  
Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814

and E-mail: tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3  Appl. No : 2015/1697/F
Parish : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Vello Ltd
Site Address : Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 27 dwellings, access, roads, open space, parking areas and associated works

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

1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Surface water management plan
4 Reporting of unexpected contamination
5 Ecology mitigation measures
6 Standard Estate Road construction conditions
9 Construction Traffic Management
10 Highway Improvements – Offsite works
11 Boundary treatment to be agreed
12 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
13 Ecology management and maintenance
14 Details of foul water disposal
15 Water conservation
16 Renewable energy 10% provision

Subject to resolution of any surface water disposal matters and completion of Section 106 agreement relating to affordable housing and open space provision and management.

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 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 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.2 : Meeting rural housing needs
DM3.9 : Advertisements and signs
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2012/1836 Outline application for residential development (20 Dwellings) and associated infrastructure works, including highway improvement works at the Mill Road/School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction  
Approved

2015/2510 Modification of S106 Agreement for permission 2012/1836/O, dated 29 April 2014 - Removal of Affordable Housing provision of 7 dwellings  
under consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  
Object  
40% of site is outside area approved in outline application doubling the number of existing properties to be affected  
Nearby roads are not suitable for increased traffic  
Drainage has changed to be reliant on existing drainage network. However no evidence there is a network and area has long history of drainage problems  
Not complying with required percentage of affordable housing.

3.2 District Members  
Cllr Wheatley and Cllr Kemp  
Application can be delegated

3.3 SNC Landscape Officer  
Cannot support the scheme due to landscape proposals not according with the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment and current proposal does not offer best and most practical landscape approach. The scheme would result in the loss of two birch trees and plot 25 would partly encroach on a root protection area. Contrary to policies JCS 2 and DM4.9 of the local plan.

Revised scheme does little to address previous concerns.

3.4 NCC Planning Obligations Co-ordinator  
No comments received

3.5 Historic Environment Service  
No recommendation for archaeological work

3.6 SNC Play and Amenities Manager  
To be reported if appropriate
3.7 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd
If Council minded to approve condition requiring Surface water management strategy

3.9 SNC Design Officer
Affordable housing compressed in corner with dominant parking court. Open space bordered on two sides by access roads, open space located more centrally with housing fronting on to it, could be carried through to drainage area to open up views to the countryside. Open space associated with larger dwellings is wasteful, unlikely to be used by larger dwellings as they have large private gardens. Larger units should be spaced out throughout the development. Medium size properties may be better located to the south of the site in a position with similar existing plots. Meeting required as points would result in red in the Building for Life assessment.

Revised plans
Revisions address some concerns. Resulting Building for Life assessment as follows:
7 Greens
5 Ambers
No reds

3.10 NCC Ecologist
If minded to approve impose condition preventing the development proceeding without receiving a copy of European Protected Species licence identifying mitigation measures

3.11 SNC Community Services - Protection
No objection subject to condition
Revised Plans
No further comments

3.12 NCC Highways
Revised off site highways work plan required
Footways should wrap around instead of stopping at ends of highway
Plot 17 only has 2 useable spaces
Radii of junction adjacent plots 19 and 20 could be reduced
Surface water disposal
little if no access for maintaining ditches

After further information highways are content with all points apart from surface water which can be conditioned.

3.13 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
Concern at the scheme not providing a policy compliant level of affordable housing. The Council must be fully satisfied by the viability case provided. The developer has purchased land knowing that there was a requirement to provide 7 affordable units.

3.14 NHS England
No comments received

3.15 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
No comments received

3.16 Hethersett Surgery
No comments received
### 3.17 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Full comments awaited, to be updated to committee.

### 3.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Parking court adjacent play area. This could cause anti social behaviour

Concerns regarding fencing to rear of properties.

Following revised plans
Still concerned about boundary treatments

### 3.19 Other Representations

10 objection letters covering the following issues:

- Seen together with 2 other applications in area already overload traffic on Mill Road, any increase adds to overloading
- 7 additional dwellings will exacerbate the traffic and safety problems
- Mill Road unsuitable for amount of traffic, foot path is only distinguished by type of surface no raised kerb
- Greater risk to people walking to village hall
- Increase in traffic will result in terms of dangerous fumes
- Very limited bus service so virtually all traffic from village is by private car
- Refuse collection lorry when in Mill Road makes it virtually impossible for traffic to pass, has to reverse into Gibbs Close due to lack of turning space
- Gibbs Close has 20mph speed limit which is often broken, potential of more young children in the area is an accident waiting to happen
- Unsafe junctions and introduction of minimal raised roundabout will result in traffic going over the top of so called roundabout
- Access opposite property so resident will be unable to park outside front of their property
- Another access should be discussed for safety reasons
- Residents of Homecroft pay a service charge to maintain road as it has not been adopted
- Subsidence in Gibbs Close and Homecroft is due to collapsed drains
- Water table high and often surface water flooding, more development with impervious surfaces will exacerbate problem
- No acceptable or feasible drainage plan
- Only part of land is within area set aside for development
- Outside the approved development boundary
- Over development of site
- Plans used are out of date, objectors house has been extended which is not shown indicating the planning application has not been completed with suitable rigour
- Land north of Gibbs Close is inhabited by a range of wildlife
- Insufficient research done to protected the Great Crested Newts
- Incorrect and inaccurate exclusion zone around pond
- Woodland Trust urging us to get out in our countryside, soon "countryside" might have to be in inverted commas
- Harm the rural feel of the village
- Overlooking
- Loss of privacy
- Longer waits for GP appointments
- Closeness of dwellings could result in emotional and nervous problems caused by pressure of lack of space, also caused when drivers have to wait in queue to access School Lane
4  Assessment

Site history and proposal

4.1 The site is approximately 2.7 hectares and is located to the north of Gibbs Close on the edge of the existing built up area of Little Melton. To the south of the site are the existing dwellings at Homecroft and Gibbs Close which comprise of a mix of detached bungalows and two storey dwellings. To the east is open countryside with a pond adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. To the north and west is open countryside.

4.2 Outline planning permission was granted on the western portion of the site (1.3 hectares) in 2012 for 20 dwellings seven of which were affordable (2012/1836). This current application seeks full planning permission on an enlarged site which includes the approved site. The enlarged site results in an additional 7 dwellings, and therefore 27 in total. These consist of:

- Open market housing
  - Single storey
    - 1 x 2 bedroom
    - 3 x 3 bedroom
  - Two storey
    - 1 x 2 bedroom
    - 6 x 3 bedroom
    - 9 x 4 bedroom
    - 3 x 5 bedroom

- Affordable housing
  - Two storey
    - 3 x 2 bedroom
    - 1 x 1 bedroom

Key planning issues

4.3 The area of land approved for 20 dwellings (2012/1836) which forms part of the current application site lies within the adopted development boundary in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this part of the site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary. However, the remainder of the application site lies outside of the development boundary and is therefore designated as open countryside.

4.4 On this basis part 2 of Policy DM1.3 is directly relevant. This states that:

“2) Permission for development in the countryside outside of any defined development boundaries of settlements will only be granted if:

c) Where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or
d) Otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as addressed in Policy 1.1.”

4.5 The scheme proposed is not considered to meet 2 c) as set out above. However, 2 d) highlights the need to have regard for overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions which replicate the three roles set out in the NPPF for determining whether a scheme represents a sustainable development.
4.6 It is also necessary to acknowledge that when considering residential applications Policy DM1.3 cannot be considered up-to-date as the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable housing sites within the Norwich Policy Area. Policy DM1.1 of the South Norfolk Plan as referred to in 2 d) also highlights that where "the relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, then the Council will consider the impact of the proposal in each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions jointly and simultaneously".

4.7 In light of the contents of 2 d) of Policy DM1.3 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF, it is considered appropriate to determine whether the current scheme represents a sustainable development having regard to the contents of the NPPF.

4.8 The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have also been reiterated in Policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, namely the economic, social and environmental roles.

Economic Role

4.9 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."

4.10 The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.11 The NPPF confirms the social role as:

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

4.12 As the development will provide additional housing where there is a recognised need (there is not a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply) then this would help to make a positive contribution albeit this would be modest given the limited overall number proposed having regard to the level of shortfall.

4.13 In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 4 of the 27 units would be affordable (15%) and therefore the applicant has submitted a viability appraisal to confirm that it is only viable to provide 4 units as affordable properties. This has been assessed by the Council’s Property Consultant who has concluded that in overall terms the case made in support of the delivery of 4 affordable units is not unreasonable.

4.14 It is evident that the previously consented scheme for 20 dwellings on part of this site (2012/1836) did secure 33% as affordable units (7 units). Given this point, the applicant has also provided a viability appraisal to confirm why this is now not achievable/viable. This matter is now being pursued through a S106BA application (as highlighted at para 2.2 of this report). This process allows for:
“An application may be made to the local planning authority for a revised affordable housing obligation. This application should contain a revised affordable housing proposal, based on prevailing viability, and should be supported by relevant viability evidence. The local planning authority may prepare its own viability evidence or provide commentary on the evidence submitted in support of the application. Further guidance on procedures for applications, including the Mayor of London’s role, is given in Annex B.”

4.15 The above being taken from the Government’s guidance document entitled “Section 106 affordable housing requirements Review and appeal April 2013”

4.16 Having due regard for the guidance contained within the Government’s guidance document entitled “Section 106 affordable housing requirements Review and appeal April 2013”. The application has been considered by the Council’s Property Consultant and it is considered that the submission has proven that the scheme could not be delivered if affordable housing was provided.

4.17 As highlighted through the consultation process, it is apparent that the developer acquired the site knowing what contributions were required as part of the planning permission (2012/1836), namely 7 of the 20 units are to be affordable, and therefore this should have been taken into account in purchasing the site. In response to this point, the applicant contends in their viability case for the site that the land price paid is consistent with benchmarked land values elsewhere in Norfolk. It is evident that government guidance (DCLG Section 106 affordable housing requirements, Review and Appeal April 2013) confirms the option of using benchmark values is acceptable in the absence of an original viability appraisal, as is the case here. Therefore, in terms of assessing a viability case, the purchase price is considered to be reasonable.

4.18 On this basis, whilst it is unfortunate that the Council will not obtain the 7 dwellings anticipated from the previous approval, or 9 across the expanded site (9 being 33% of 27) it has been satisfactorily that neither is viable and as such the 4 proposed on the current 27 dwellings is an acceptable proposition having regard to the viability assessment submitted.

4.19 Safeguarding residential amenity, is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment. It is considered that the relationship between the existing dwellings and the proposed properties, as well as the relationship the new dwellings have with one another has been assessed and it is considered that the separation distances are adequate in all respects to safeguard amenity levels of existing and future residents. This also means that the proposal satisfies policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.14 of the Development Management Policy Document.

4.20 In summary, it is considered that as the scheme would contribute additional housing where there is a need and provides an attractive scheme for future residents.

Environmental Role

4.21 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

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

4.22 There have been a number of ecology surveys carried out in association with both this application and the previous outline application. This application is supported by an ecological assessment which is regarded as fit for purpose by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. There is the presence of Great Crested Newts in the pond adjacent to the application site and an European Protected Species Licence (EPS) licence will be required for the proposed development to proceed.
A condition is required on the approval notice to prevent the development proceeding without the Council receiving a copy of the EPS licence which will identify appropriate mitigation measures. It is also apparent that a condition would be required for the future management maintenance of the ecological protection zone, such a condition was attached to the outline approval and is recommended to be re-imposed here.

4.23 It is evident that the outline approval on the site also sought to introduce a specific ecological mitigation arrangement, with condition 19 of 2012/1836 requiring an ecological buffer zone. Whilst it is evident that the buffer zone does not fully follow that suggested through condition 19, the alternative proposed is considered acceptable by the Council’s ecologist.

4.24 In terms of landscape impact, concern has been expressed at the reduced landscape buffer from the 20m buffer presented in the illustrative layout plan submitted as part of 2012/1836 which was led by the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that had been prepared as part of that submission. It is evident that the buffer has been reduced from that indicated on the illustrative plan submitted with the outline approval, however, it is evident that the planning condition attached to the outline approval (condition 19 of 2012/1836), and its accompanying reason, made provision for this buffer to be provided in the interests of primarily safeguarding ecology rather than as a landscape protection condition, albeit it would have contributed towards limiting the landscape impact.

4.25 With this in mind it is evident that the proposed ecological buffer zone to the northern and western boundaries of the site within the submitted scheme achieves its aim of safeguarding ecology as is demonstrated by the Council’s ecologist confirming that they have no objection subject to a condition as set out above in paragraphs 4.21 and 4.22.

4.26 It is also considered that the landscape impact of the current scheme could be further reduced by appropriate planting being undertaking in the ecology zone and as such it is considered appropriate to attach a condition to agree a landscaping scheme for the site. It is also evident that the proposed layout does keep the proposed dwellings away from the site boundaries which does also help to limit landscape impact.

4.27 In summary, whilst the concerns are acknowledged in respect of landscape, and the indications provided in the approved scheme 2012/1836, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact.

4.28 The Council’s landscape officer has also raised concerns regarding the lack of accessibility to the ecological zone for the purposes of maintenance and management. The developer has confirmed that two access points for maintenance would be provided, one adjacent to plot 7 on the western boundary of the site, and another adjacent to the SuDS feature in the public open space on the northern boundary of the site.

4.29 Reference has been made to the loss of two birch trees on plot 19. It is evident that the revised plan means that only one of these would be lost. In terms of the tree that would need to be removed, it is evident that this is not presently the subject of any formal protection and it would not be an appropriate tree in this instance to seek to protect it formally now, and whilst it is regrettable that the tree would be lost, it is retention could not be insisted upon as it would not represent a sufficiently robust reason to refuse the application. It should also be noted that the indicative plan in the previously approved scheme 2012/1836 would have been likely to result in the loss of both of these trees.

4.30 In terms of encroachment into the RPA of plot 25, it is evident that this is a very modest encroachment, which is acknowledged by the developer in their arboricultural impact assessment. This document highlights what tree protection measures should be put in place throughout the development, including plot 25. The protection measures outlined would be a condition of any approval.
4.31 The environmental role also seeks to secure high quality built environment, the site layout has been subject to revision during the application process following discussions with the agent regarding the positioning of the open space and car parking within the site. In particular there were concerns about the size of the open space and the lack of surveillance of it. The amended scheme has addressed these issues with the parking in the western part of the site now including greater levels of parking within the plot and the open space now being a larger centrally located space with improved natural surveillance.

4.32 The Council's Senior Conservation and Design officer has undertaken a Building for Life assessment which has concluded a score of 7 greens and 5 amber, and no red scores.

4.33 In terms of the environmental role, on balance it is considered that the scheme fulfils this requirement.

4.34 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that there are benefits to the scheme through the creation of housing where this an acknowledged need, sufficient open space is provided and the scheme satisfies requirements in relation to highway safety ecology etc and as such these outweigh the negative impacts in terms of limited surveillance, landscape impact and as such, when considered as a whole, the scheme represents a sustainable development. The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and also 2 d) of Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Other issues

Drainage

4.35 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) full comments are still awaited at the time of writing this report. It is evident that the previous scheme including a condition to secure a SuDS scheme and this has been given due regard in this instance. An update will be made orally to the committee on this matter.

Highways

4.36 Access to the site was agreed as part of the outline approval which included a number of offsite highway improvements including a roundabout at the junction of Mill Lane and School land and road calming measures along Mill road which will be delivered by condition. The proposed scheme does not compromise the ability to deliver these and they will be a requirement of this full approval through suitably worded conditions.

4.37 The layout within the site provides a scheme that is acceptable in highway safety terms including the provision of acceptable on-site parking levels and therefore the proposal is in accordance with DM 3.12. The Highway Authority require details of the surface water drainage arrangements to be secured by condition.

Environmental Impact Assessment

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

Other considerations

4.39 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the Council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of a greater significance.
4.40 The application is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of the relevant local planning policies and guidance and the requirements of the NPPF in providing a residential development that meets an acknowledged need in a sustainable location.

5.2 The proposed layout and design of the units would relate satisfactorily to its surroundings and not compromise neighbour amenity, highway safety, ecology or drainage. It is noted that the social benefits are reduced to some degree through the lower provision of affordable housing than the policy requirement of 33%. However a viability assessment has been provided which adequately demonstrates the level provided is appropriate given the costs of the site, and it is not considered reasonable to refuse the planning application on this basis.

The overall social benefit of additional housing in this location on the edge of a service village in the Norwich Policy Area where there is not a sufficient five year housing land supply is considered to be greater than the limited environmental harm caused by the small extent of further development outside development boundaries in the open countryside in this instance.

5.3 For this reason the application is recommended for approval subject to resolution of any surface water matters and the completion of S106 legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and open space management/maintenance sums.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 53381 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Lynn Armes 01508 533968 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>2015/2240/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants Name: Mr M Davey
Site Address: Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XA
Proposal: Erection of energy building (dual fuel bio-mass) to provide heating and energy to poultry units.

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

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Full details of external lighting
4. Programme of archaeological works
5. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
6. Provision of parking, service
7. Waste material from site only

Subject to no objection being raised on ecological grounds in light of the awaited response from the Council’s ecologist and resolution of any surface water disposal matters with Lead Local Flood Authority

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 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 5: The Economy
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
- DM2.7: Agricultural and forestry development
- DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
- DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
- DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
- DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
- DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
- DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

2.1 2013/0216 Extension and alterations to existing garage building to form holiday accommodation. Works to include demolition of existing 'Anderson' style building (revised application) **Approved**

2.2 2013/0967 Screening opinion of poultry shed 9 at Wild Rose Farm. Environmental Impact Assessment Not Required

2.3 2013/1199 Erection of cart lodge to provide parking **Approved**

2.4 2013/2038 Erection of energy building (bio-mass fuel) to provide heating to poultry units. **Approved**

2.5 2014/0216 Extension to poultry unit no 9 **Approved**

2.6 2014/1937 Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2013/2038 - Soft Landscaping. **Approved**

2.7 2014/2231 Proposed addition of garage doors to cart lodge. Erection of boundary wall **Approved**

2.8 2012/0049 Extension and alterations to existing garage building to form holiday accommodation. Works to include demolition of existing 'Anderson' style building. **Refused**

2.9 2006/1575 Retention of extension to existing building to form farm vehicle and equipment building **Approved**

2.10 2006/0039 Extension to poultry shed (extension 5 of 5) **Approved**

2.11 2006/0038 Extension to poultry shed (extension 4 of 5) **Approved**

2.12 2006/0037 Extension to poultry shed (extension 3 of 5) **Approved**

2.13 2006/0036 Extension to poultry shed (extension 2 of 5) **Approved**

2.14 2006/0035 Extension to poultry shed (extension 1 of 5) **Approved**

2.15 2005/2291 Proposed change of use from agricultural machine store & maintenance to light vehicle servicing and maintenance building Withdrawn

2.16 2002/0351 Change of use from redundant farm building to storage and distribution of paper goods **Approved**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Approve - Reduction of CO2 on A140

3.2 District Member Can be delegated decision Cllr Fulcher

3.3 NCC Highways If minded to approve condition requiring turning area be laid out before first occupation
3.4 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority  No objection

3.5 Historic Environment Service  If approved development should be subject to a programme of archaeological work with appropriate conditions

3.6 NCC Ecologist  Further details required, further details have been forwarded and their comments are awaited.

3.7 SNC Community Services - Protection  No objection

3.8 SNC Landscape Officer  A more substantial scheme required in respect of additional planting/landscaping

3.9 SNC Conservation Officer  To be reported if appropriate

3.10 Other Representations  2 letters of objection

- Who will monitor emissions
- Who is the manufacturer of the plant and have they be approved by local authority
- Will the unit be used for use of Wild Rose Farm only
- Lack of information
- Concerns regarding water
- Who will monitor traffic movements
- Wood chip imported from where
- Landscaping not adequate
- Lack of consultation

4  Assessment

Proposal and site description

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a dual fuel biomass facility to provide heating and energy to the existing poultry units. The building will house two boilers that will burn litter taken from the existing on site poultry buildings and also when required wood chip or wood pellets imported from off site. There are also sealed fuel storage areas with automated hoppers and feed conveyors to supply the boilers. The boilers will provide heating for the poultry units with the propane gas tanks being moved but retained for times of maintenance of the new plant. The building would be 54 metres by 25 metres having a total floor area of 1350 square metres and would be 10.2 metre high to the ridge of the pitched roof. The building would be constructed using a steel portal framed structure with external profiled metal cladding. The development will be accessed using the existing access to the site.

4.2 The site is a poultry unit consisting of 14 poultry sheds which at the moment are heated by propane gas heaters. The site produces between 3.85 and 4 million chickens a year. The proposed building will be set back from the highway adjacent to the access road and existing poultry buildings on the site. The farmhouse connected to the site, which is a Grade II listed building is located adjacent to the highway to the west of the proposed building. There are a group of residential properties approximately 200 metres to the north of the site with an agricultural field in between. There is a dwelling and small industrial estate situated to the south of the site. The site and surrounding area are in a site of archaeological interest due to being located in the area of a Roman Settlement.
By way of background, there has been a previously approved application for the same facility albeit it a smaller one in the same location (total floor area of 600.6 square metres with a height of 9.2m application ref: 2013/2038). In addition, the fuel source for the facility as previously agreed was to be woodchip/pellets and did not involve the waste from the existing poultry units as a fuel type. Regard for this extant permission will be given in the following assessment.

Principle of development

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

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

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

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

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

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

The adopted development management policy DM4.1 also takes a positive approach to renewable energy projects as long as the adverse impacts do not individually or cumulatively outweigh the benefits.

The policy position is therefore generally supportive of renewable energy provision subject to there being no particular negative impacts in terms of site specific matters such as impact on highway safety, visual impact and neighbour amenity. This support in principle is demonstrated through the granting of permission under 2013/2038 as highlighted above.
Having established that the principle of this renewable energy facility is acceptable in planning terms, the remaining key considerations in determining the planning application are as follows. This assessment of these will also have due regard to the extant permission on-site:

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

Loss of agricultural land

Para 112 of the NPPF states that 'Local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land." It also states that in the case of "significant" development of agricultural land it should be proven to be necessary.

The site lies on Grade 3 agricultural land, however in the absence of undertaking site investigations it is not possible to determine whether the land to be used for the boiler unit is 3a or 3b, this being important insofar as 3a is classified as "best and most versatile" but 3b is not. However, if it was assumed that if the land was 3a ("best and most versatile") the scheme is not considered to amount to a significant loss of agricultural land given the limited amount of land required to construct the development.

It is also evident that the applicant does not have any "poorer" land at its disposal where the building could be sited (Grades 4 or 5) having checked Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification Maps.

The extant permission for the smaller facility would have resulted in a loss of agricultural land, albeit a smaller area.

Having due regard to the above, officers are satisfied that there has been sufficient consideration of the choice of location in relation to the loss of agricultural land.

Development in open countryside and impact on landscape.

The site is located in the open countryside outside of the development limits defined in the Development Management Policies Document. Government guidance in the NPPF and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy place a strong emphasis on the protection of the landscape and the countryside. In addition to the renewable energy policies, para 17 of the NPPF requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and para 109 seeks to protect and enhance valued landscape.

The land and surrounding area is flat with existing hedging and trees around the wider site with a main A road running to the east. The existing poultry units are to the south of the proposed site with fields to the north and west.
4.20 The building would be visible within the area but the materials are to be agreed and are intended to give the general appearance of a plain and functional looking agricultural building consistent with the general nature of the poultry units on-site. The proposal is to be sited in close proximity to the existing agricultural buildings so as to maintain a tight sense of grouping on-site and minimise incursion of built form in the countryside. Correspondence is taking place with regard to providing further additional landscaping and planting to minimise further any landscape impact. The inclusion of a landscaping condition to mitigate the visual appearance of the proposed development is considered appropriate to ensure a suitable scheme is provided. On balance although the proposal will be visible within the landscape setting it would not result in any significant visual harm to the rural landscape. This assessment is also taken in the context of the Council having already established that an impact on the countryside could be accommodated on this site as demonstrated by the granting of permission for a smaller facility previously.

4.21 Residential amenity including odour, emissions and traffic movements.
Two letters of objection have been received to the proposal from the neighbouring properties to the north of the site concerning amongst other things emissions, traffic movements and lack of information.

4.22 Further information has been provided which gives greater clarity on what is involved with the proposed process to be carried out within the building. The Council's Environmental Protection Team has no concerns with the proposal in the context of neighbour amenity. It is also evident that the site is presently the subject of control via the Environment Agency's environmental permit regime and the proposed plant would also be the subject of a permit which controls any emissions from the building and does have enforcement powers in the event of any breach of the terms of the permit.

4.23 In terms of the traffic implications of the scheme, the application indicates that overall traffic movements would be reduced, via the removal of the need to remove chicken litter from the site and reductions in number of vehicle movements associated with propane deliveries being greater than those associated with wood pellet delivery and ash removal. In addition, a condition is recommended that only chicken litter from the site can be used with none being brought in from other sites, in order to control/limit the traffic movements into the site and also would be beneficial in controlling any odours which could arise from imported material.

4.24 The application has been assessed by the highways officer and they have confirmed they have no objections.

4.25 As highlighted above at paragraph 4.20, concerns relating to inadequate landscaping will be addressed by the implementation of a landscaping condition.

Heritage assets

4.26 The farmhouse connected to the site is a listed building and as such it is essential to assess the impacts the development would have upon the listed building and its setting. It is considered that the degree of separation between the listed building and the proposal coupled with the significant intervening built features, namely the existing chicken sheds on-site, means that the impact on the listed building and its setting would be minimal.

4.27 In light of the above it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of S66 (1) Listed Building Act 1990 and relevant policies of the Local Plan and NPPF.

4.28 The site is within a site of archaeological interest and the Historic Environment Service have asked for a programme of archaeological work in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework to be carried out, which is recommended to be secured through condition.
Flood risk and drainage

4.29 The site is within Flood Zone 1 and is less than 1 hectare in size so the proposal does not require a Flood Risk Assessment. The disposal of surface water is a key consideration however and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems would be required to dispose of surface water. The applicant has indicated their intention to use soakaways or existing ditch water courses. Comments are currently being sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority on this matter.

Ecology

4.30 Further information was required from the Ecology Officer and a response to the additional information is awaited. Details on this will be reported via the update sheet or orally to the committee.

Local financial considerations

4.31 This application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for any part of the building which people would enter into.

4.32 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the Council is require 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 details above are of greater significance.

5 Conclusion


The benefits of being able to introduce a renewable energy source to an existing commercial operation are not outweighed by any demonstrable harm to the locality, including visual impact, neighbour amenity or highway safety subject to planning conditions and therefore the proposal is recommended for approval subject to no objections being raised by the Council’s ecologist as part of their outstanding consultation and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk Lynn Armes 01508 533960 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

5  Appl. No : 2015/1642/F
Parish : DISS

Applicants Name : Danny Ward Builders
Site Address : Land North Of 14 & 16 Roydon Road Diss Norfolk
Proposal : Proposed 1 x 4 Bedroom & 1 x 3 Bedroom Single Storey Bungalows with 3 x Garages.

Recommendation : Refusal
1 Substandard form of development

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 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 13 : Main Towns
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
DM3.5 : Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Development Boundaries
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
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

2013/0566 Full Application- Construction of 85 dwellings, public open space, vehicular access and associated infrastructure (part amendment to approved scheme 2007/0555/F)
3. Consultations

3.1 Diss Town Council
No objections subject to conditions relating to the submission of a protected wildlife species survey, the maintenance of existing hedgerows, root protection measures for the oak tree and adequate access visibility splays from the site onto Roydon Road. The application should be dealt with by the committee in view of the local resident’s objections.

3.2 District Member Cllr Kiddie
To be determined by Committee. I have had concerns raised to me over this proposed development on the grounds of density and suitability of the site (i.e. back land development). To examine these issues.

The reasoning behind my request is that much of the current development in Diss seems to be of the back land or "garden infill" type, where some properties seem to have been put into very small plots indeed. Perhaps there needs to be a wider discussion (not in committee) as to what is acceptable re. size/ density/ location of such future developments?

Whilst I would accept there are issues with the application there is also a plus side in that they are proposing to build two bungalows which are in rather short supply in the Diss area. Which whilst in itself is not a planning consideration per se, it is certainly a social consideration given the current state of the age demographics of our population.

3.3 NCC Highways
Visibility for vehicles leaving the site onto Roydon Road is poor and it should be 43 metres from a point 2.4 metres set back from the edge of the highway. The required visibility splays should be included within the red line of the application site plan.

Updated comments
The revised site layout (428-05B) now shows the required visibility splay at the entrance to Roydon Road within the red line of the application site. As such the proposal as submitted is now acceptable. If your authority is minded to approve the application conditions are requested.

3.4 NCC Ecologist
There is no specific ecological information to support this application. The site is surrounded by residential development however it does seem to contain a number of trees. In addition there is a pond adjacent to the site. This development does appear to involve the demolition of a number of sheds which theoretically could have bat potential. Without further information it is difficult to assess whether this development could have an impact on ecology. We would therefore request a Phase 1 Habitat Assessment or a reasoned justification as to why one is not required before commenting further.

Updated comments
A Phase 1 Habitat Survey has now been submitted. The report is fit for purpose. Overall the site was deemed to have low ecological value however the pond adjacent to the site was found to contain Great Crested Newts (GCN) as such certain actions are required of the applicant in order for the proposed development to minimise the potential impact on this species.
The author has given some general action points however there is no detail as to how this would be undertaken. As such we would like to see a mitigation plan and timetable of actions to be undertaken in order to provide sufficient confidence that the small GCN population would not be affected by the proposed development.

3.5 SNC Water Management Officer
Surface water drainage should follow the hierarchy for surface water drainage disposal with infiltration at source the preferred option. The applicant must demonstrate that more sustainable options have been investigated and do not provide a viable option. Anglian Water asset maps indicate that surface water sewers may require entry to third party land. Access to the nearest foul sewers may also require access through third party land. The applicant will need to respect any rights of drainage (including future management) and ensure that any existing pipes or drainage devices are protected from damage.

3.6 SNC Community Services – Protection
To be reported if appropriate

3.7 SNC Landscape Officer
I have no particular concerns about this proposal. From the information available to me on the file it appears that none of the existing trees on the site are particularly remarkable, and the revised site access means that the TPO tree within the garden at 7 Hall Hills is unlikely to be affected.

3.8 Other Representations
10 letters of objection, 2 letters of support and 1 observation
(Summarised)

- Need to retain access to turn a motor home into the rear entrance of our garden [18 Roydon Road]
- Hedge along east of 18 Roydon Road should be maintained at its present height or replaced by a suitable fence to afford us the same level of privacy [18 Roydon Road]
- Would prefer not to have additional buildings at rear of gardens
- Concern about impact on of noise during the construction period
- The orchard on the land is a wildlife habitat
- Impact on property values, privacy, security, noise and light pollution concerns
- Compensation must be considered
- This application has no consideration for the people it will affect the most
- The land proposed for development contributes to the local landscape character and has numerous mature trees, bushes, shrubs, orchard and grassed area
- Alarming level of denudation proposed
- Loss of views
- Existing wooden fencing will provide inadequate security
- The proposed access will be directly opposite a junction on the other side of Roydon Road and there is almost constant 2-way traffic along Roydon Road
- This development will inevitably create more traffic than the estimated 5x cars and could exacerbate traffic problems at the busiest times
4. We agree change is often desirable but respectfully request it is only allowed within reason.
4.1 We have found information of a drain going from our large pond over the said building land; there is no mention of what will happen to the drain from our pond over the land which on our deeds is clearly marked and we have a right of way to inspect the drain and pipe. It also stipulates no damage to either.
4.2 Great Crested Newts in adjacent pond.
4.3 Diss needs this type of development.
4.4 These bungalows are only likely to appeal to residents of a certain age, and there are unlikely to be any undue noise or traffic ramifications.
4.5 This land currently offers no material useful purpose and with suitable sites close to two being scarce, it would appear to be a sensible proposition.
4.6 No ‘material planning reasons’ raised by objectors that carry any weight.
4.7 No-one is entitled to a right to a view under English law save that deemed pertinent to residential amenity.
4.8 As long as NCC Highways have no objection and biodiversity and landscape matters are protected then the application should be approved.

4. Assessment

Proposal and site context

4.1 The application seeks full consent for the construction of two detached bungalows on land to the north of the rear gardens of 14, 16, 18, Roydon Road, Diss. The development proposal includes detached garages for each dwelling and a replacement garage for 14 Roydon Road.

4.2 Vehicular access to the site is proposed between 7 Hall Hills and 14 Roydon Road.

4.3 The application site is currently garden land associated with nos. 14 and 16 Roydon Road and currently has a number of buildings in situ. The land is substantial in size and irregular shape extending to the rear of the dwellings at 16, 18, 20 and 22, Roydon Road as well as the rear of nos. 19-27 Bramley Road. Access to the development site runs along the rear boundaries of dwellings within Hall Hills to the east.

4.4 The properties along Roydon Road consist of a row of detached modern houses with large rear gardens measuring between 16 and 36 metres in depth (approximately). The adjoining dwellings situated within Hall Hills to the east of the site as well as those to the north of the site have more modest rear gardens of between 8 and 10 metres in depth (approximately). Dwellings along Bramley Road are of more modest proportions and have smaller amenity space.

4.5 There are a number of trees and hedgerows within the application site boundary and there is a large pond to the north east of the application site. A protected tree is located within the rear garden of 7 Hall Hills, adjacent to the proposed access to the site.

The main issues to be considered with the application are:

- principle of the development;
- design, scale and layout;
- residential amenities of existing and future occupiers; and
- highway implications.
4.6 The application must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in accordance with Paragraph 49 of the NPPF and Development Management Policy DM1.1. JCS Policy 13 identifies Diss as one of the four main towns in the area with a housing allocation of 300 dwellings within the plan period.

4.7 The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.8 The application site falls within the Rural Policy Area and as such a supply of housing land well in excess of 5 years has been successfully demonstrated by the Council.

4.9 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development; this will reveal any harm that needs to be weighed against the benefits of the development. The principle issues will be considered, and then a balance made against the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainable development.

Design, scale and layout

4.10 Planning policy seeks to ensure a high standard of design for all development. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that "permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions." Development Management Policies DM3.5 and 3.8 specifically refer to the Council's design aspirations.

4.11 The application consists of two conventionally designed detached bungalows. Plot 1 comprises of a 4 bedroomed detached bungalow with a detached double garage in front of the building. The dwelling has a large gable roof feature with two smaller gable features at each side of the building. Plot 2 consists of a 3 bedroomed detached bungalow with a detached double garage at the side of the dwelling. The building has a simple gable roof design for the rectangular shaped structure.

4.12 In principle there are no objections to the detailed design of the bungalows for the two sites, or the replacement garage for no. 14 Roydon Road, which are all simple in form.

4.13 Notwithstanding the above point, the proposed development is considered by Officers to be an overdevelopment of the site which results in a cramped layout that is detrimental to the overall character of the proposed application site and the immediate area. Particular concerns about the layout of the development focus on the cramped appearance of Plot 2 resulting from the awkward dimensions of this section of the application site. In addition, whilst it is recognised that the applicant proposes single storey dwellings only, the close proximity of the northern flank of the dwelling proposed for Plot 1 to those properties to the north of the site (particularly no. 21 Bramley Road) is considered to be overbearing for those existing residents.

4.14 Consequently, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the overall character and appearance of the area, introducing a substandard layout that would be detrimental to both existing and future occupiers. It would, therefore, conflict with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy to the extent that it requires proposals to respect local distinctiveness, including the varied character of towns and villages. Nor would it accord with policies DM3.5 and DM3.8 of the Development Management Plan as the proposed form fails to improve the both the character and appearance of the existing buildings and the character and quality of the area.
4.15 The proposal to construct two detached bungalows on the site needs to be assessed against the impact it would have upon the adjoining properties as well as the surrounding area. Management Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 state that development proposals must not endanger highway safety, prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic and must provide adequate parking provision.

4.16 The Highways Officer has assessed the proposal and has not raised an objection to the scheme following the submission of a revised plan that includes the appropriate visibility splays. Sufficient parking facilities are provided for each of the properties. Whilst local concerns about the juxtaposition of the proposed access with an existing junction has been noted this has not been raised as a matter of concerns by the Highways Officer. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in highway terms.

Residential amenity

4.17 Development Management policies DM3.5 and 3.13 seek to protect the residential amenities of both existing and future occupiers including privacy, overlooking, noise and the provision of adequate private amenity space.

4.18 The constraints of the site layout and the cramped development proposed are considered to conflict with the aspirations of these policies, resulting in an un-neighbourly form of development particularly for those properties to the north of the application site which are modest in size and benefit from limited rear amenity space. Concerns have been raised about a loss of privacy as a result of the development and I share this concern, particularly for those properties to the north of the site some of which have low level boundary treatments at present. The applicant proposes additional planting along this boundary and whilst it is acknowledged that this would provide a softer boundary treatment than a timber panel fence it would however take time to reach maturity and provide an effective level of screening across the full length of the boundary. It is noted above that the scale and layout of Plot 1 will result in an overbearing form of development for those properties to the north of the site, particularly nos. 21 and 23 Bramley Road thus conflicting with the requirements of those policies set out above.

4.19 Residents along Hall Hills have also expressed concerns about the traffic movements along their rear boundaries. Whilst the traffic generated by the development may be considered to be relatively low the close proximity of the access point to these dwellings will result in some additional disturbance to these residents however due to the limited form of development this is not considered to be to a degree that would justify the refusal of planning permission on this ground.

4.20 The future occupiers of Plot 2 are shown to benefit from a limited amount of private amenity space due to the constraints of the site. The main area of amenity space would be to the south of the dwelling with a narrow strip extending along the rear and a small parcel to the north. Due to the orientation of the site there would be significant shading of the area to the south from the existing mature trees within the rear garden of 16 Roydon Road, further reducing the functionality of this space. It is acknowledged that not all occupiers require large gardens however there is no mechanism to control the occupation of the bungalow and as a three bedroom bungalow it could be occupied by a household with children.

4.21 Consequently, the proposal would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers as a result of the inadequacy of the private outdoor space proposed. As such, it would conflict with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy to the extent that this policy requires proposals to achieve a high standard of design. It would also conflict with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which, among other things, requires developments to secure a good standard of amenity for future occupiers in addition to paragraph 64, which concerns the need for design to improve the character and
quality of an area and the way it functions as well as Development Management policy DM3.5 which requires subdivided plots to provide adequate private amenity and utility space.

Landscaping and ecology

4.22 The site contains a number of mature trees as well as other vegetation which would be removed to accommodate the development. The Landscape Officer has not raised an objection to the removal of these trees from the site. It is also noted that whilst a tree adjacent to the proposed site access is subject to a Tree Preservation Order this would not be adversely affected by the proposal. The Landscape Officer has however verbally raised concerns about the increased pressures that could be placed on the existing trees to the rear of 16 Roydon Road due to the shading effect on Plot 2.

4.23 The applicant has submitted an ecological survey to support the application. This identified the presence of Great Crested Newts in the pond adjacent to the north east boundary of the application site. Further mitigation measures have been identified in response to the comments of the county ecologist and these are currently being considered by the ecologist whose comments will be reported to the committee as appropriate, but it is likely appropriate mitigation measures could be achieved.

4.24 Local residents have commented on other wildlife species that use this space however this has not been raised as a matter of concern by the ecologist. The loss of the trees would however have an adverse impact on the habitat value of the site.

Drainage

4.25 The applicant proposes connection to mains sewer for both surface water and foul water drainage. In accordance with policy guidance the applicant is required to follow the hierarchy for surface water drainage disposal with connection to a surface water sewer as the final option. The Water Management Officer has reviewed the proposal and has raised a concern that access to both the surface water sewer and the foul sewer may require access across third party land in order to achieve a connection. In addition, concerns have been raised locally about private drainage from the adjacent pond with particular concerns about the future maintenance and management of existing drainage features. It will be for the applicant to ensure that these rights are respected and both of these matters have been brought to the attention of the applicant.

Consideration of sustainable development

Economic role

4.26 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.”

4.27 The construction of two dwellings may bring some benefit to the local economy during the construction phase. The occupiers of these new dwellings would also bring some economic benefit to the local economy. However, the development is small scale in nature within an established market town which is set to experience reasonable levels of growth during the plan period. As such the overall economic benefits of the development should be considered as limited only.

Social Role

4.28 The NPPF confirms the social role as “supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future
4.29 The new dwellings will clearly provide accommodation for two additional households within the market town however given the supply of housing land in excess of the required five year supply to be limited. The Council has no evidence to support local comments that private market bungalows are specifically required within the Diss area. Due to its location and proximity to existing dwellings in vicinity of the site the development would have an impact on the amenities of some of the existing occupiers which may be considered as a social impact of the proposed development.

Environmental Role

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

4.31 Environmental concerns may be various but the main issues to be considered as part of this proposal are biodiversity, landscaping and highway safety. The development would undoubtedly intensify the use of land that currently is largely undeveloped. Existing vegetation and trees on the site would be removed and there is potential for biodiversity to be adversely affected by the proposal. The trees however are not protected and could be removed at any time, and protected species identified could be protected from harm through appropriate mitigation measures. It is therefore difficult to justify as a reason for refusal on this basis. The environmental harm from the cramped layout and form of development in the plot however would be a significant environmental disbenefit.

4.32 Paragraph 12 of the Framework advises that proposals which conflict with up to date development plan policies should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Regarded in the context of the housing needs of the District as a whole, the benefit of two additional dwellings would carry limited weight in favour of the proposal. Therefore, it is considered that the adverse social and environmental of the proposal through impact on residential amenity and poor layout and form of development significantly and demonstrably outweighs the social benefits of delivering two dwellings when there is more than sufficient supply of housing and the limited economic benefits identified above. As such, irrespective of the location of the site within the development boundary, Officers consider that the proposal would not be a sustainable form of development and does not benefit from the presumption in favour of development set out at Framework paragraphs 14 and 49.

4.33 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This application would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Although the development may be considered to be in a sustainable location the limited social and economic benefits of the site identified above are outweighed by those factors identified above that would result in significant harm. The size of the site when balanced against level of development would result in a cramped layout and form of development that would be contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and policies DM3.5 and DM3.8 of the Development Management Policies Document. Furthermore, the cramped layout would result in a substandard form of development that would appear overbearing to existing residents in proximity to the site (especially those to the north). Future occupiers of Plot 2 would also be disadvantaged by the constrained amenity space associated with this dwelling in direct conflict with the requirements of policy DM3.5. The application is therefore recommended for refusal for the following reason:
6  **Reason for Refusal**

6.1 The size of the site when balanced against level of development would result in a cramped layout and form of development that would not form good design, contrary to the design requirements of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and policies DM3.5 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015), the cramped layout would result in an overbearing form of development to existing residents in proximity to the site (especially those to the north) and future occupiers of Plot 2 have a poor level of amenity space associated with this dwelling contrary to the provisions of policy DM3.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015).

6.2 The adverse social and environmental of the proposal through impact on residential amenity and poor layout and form of development significantly and demonstrably outweighs the social benefits of delivering two dwellings in an area with more than sufficient supply of housing and the limited economic benefits. It is not considered the development would be a sustainable form of development and therefore contrary to paragraphs 14 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
tli@norfolk.gov.uk

Kate Fisher 01508 533960
kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applicants Name : Mr Glen Hammond
Site Address : 50 St Leonards Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0JF
Proposal : Retention of a 4ft fence with 2ft trellis above with concrete posts to the boundary, replacing a 7ft hedge.

Recommendation : Refuse
1. Adverse impact on character of area
Contrary to policy JCS 2 SNLP DM3.8
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
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. Planning History
2.1 None

3. Consultations
3.1 Town Council
Refuse
Contrary to policy - poor standard of landscaping in relationship to surrounding area
Unneighbourly form of development
If approved suggest height is reduced to 1 metre

3.2 District Member
Can be delegated

3.3 Other Representations
6 neighbour responses
2 letters of objection
Out of keeping with the surrounding area
Out of character
Support 4 letters of support
Would like to see greenery growing through trellis
Since removal of hedge visibility has improved on corner of close
Fence tidier and neater
Other examples in Wymondham
4  **Assessment**

4.1  This application seeks consent for the retention of an erected 4ft fence with 2 ft trellis above with concrete posts to the boundary, replacing a 7 ft hedge. The application is located in a corner plot within the development boundary of Wymondham.

4.2  Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of a good design and do not adversely affect the character of the existing street scene to a material degree, or have an adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring properties.

4.3  The applicant's dwelling is located in a corner plot within a prominent location and within the Wymondham development boundary. The street scene is one of front gardens with low walls and hedges defining boundaries.

4.4  The applicant’s fence has been erected within 2 metres of the highway boundary over 1 metre in height without planning consent. Had this been subject to an application prior to the erection of the fence, it is considered that this would have been refused. However, planning consent is not required for the erection of a fence to a maximum of 1 metre in height as permitted development rights have not been removed for the erection of boundary treatments on this site.

4.5  2 letters of objection has been received in relation to this application with concerns raised as to the height and adverse effect on the character of the area with four letters of support received.

4.6  The fence results in a harsh, highly visible enclosure that does not respect the character of the remainder of St Leonards Close which is mostly characterised by hedges and lower walls and fences around the front gardens. The application is therefore recommended for refusal. Authorisation for enforcement action is requested to secure the removal of the fence.

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

5  **Conclusion**

5.1  The fence results in a harsh, highly visible enclosure that does not respect the character of the remainder of St Leonards Close which is mostly characterised by hedges and lower walls and fences around the front gardens. In these circumstances the fence conflicts 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
Applications on land owned by South Norfolk Council

7  Appl. No : 2015/2069/F
Parish : THURLTON

Applicants Name : Mr B Rivett
Site Address : Highland Church Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6RN
Proposal : Change of use of land from freehold open space to garden land.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. Planning Policies
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Development Management Policies
DM2.8 : Equestrian & other changes of use of agricultural land
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space

2. Consultations
2.1 Parish Council No objection.
2.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
2.3 SNC Property Team To be reported if appropriate
2.4 Arboricultural Officer No direct harm to the adjacent trees. Potential for requests to
undertake pruning works to the council owned trees.
2.5 Other Representations One letter of representation received in support.

3. Assessment
3.1 The application is for the change of use of freehold open space in Thurlton to garden land.
The open space is owned by South Norfolk Council and this is the reason why the
application is being determined by Members at DM Committee.

3.2 The open space surrounds a public footpath which connects Church Road to Links Way In
Thurton. The open space is not used for sports and its main function an open space
providing a visual gap in the surrounding development. The piece of land for proposed
change of use is 2.5 metres wide at its widest, 1.2 metres at its narrowest with a total
length of 11.5 metres. The strip of land is behind a group of mature trees, and It therefore
has limited amenity value in terms of public open space.

3.3 South Norfolk’s Development Management Policy DM3.15 states that development must
not result in a net quantitative or qualitative loss of existing open space unless it can be
demonstrated that there is surplus of amenity space. Whilst there will be a loss of open
space it will not result in a loss of useable open space.
3.4 Chapter 8, paragraph 74, of the NPPF states that existing open space and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless; as assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements.

3.5 This report represents the assessment that the piece of open space would not harm the overall open space that is available.

3.6 The Arboricultural Officer does not consider there will be direct harm to the adjacent trees. However if the garden is extended to the edge of the tree line there is potential for requests to undertake pruning works to the South Norfolk Council owned trees, which wouldn’t necessarily be required at the moment to prevent overhang and prevent dead wood, leaves etc from falling into the garden. This is only a potential request of the future landowners, but not a reason to refuse this application and would be considered by the Council as owners of the trees separate to the planning application process.

3.7 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.

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

4 Conclusion

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Peter Freer 01508 533848 and E-mail: pfreer@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8 Appl. No: 2015/2533/CU
Parish: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs G Bray
Site Address: Car And Lorry Park Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal: Change of use from grassed area at existing car/lorry park to a trading pitch for hot food takeaway.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
   1. Full Planning permission time limit
   2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM2.6: Food, drink and takeaways
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. Planning History

1998/1071 Renewal of permission for mobile refreshment kiosk and seating area (Ref: 94/0048 F) Approved

1994/0048 Standing of two mobile refreshment kiosks Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council No objections
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Licencing Team No objections
3.4 NCC Highways To be reported
3.5 SNC Community Services – Protection To be reported
3.6 Other Representations To be reported
4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks permission for the standing of a steel container for the use as a hot food takeaway on land which forms the grass verge of the existing lorry park off Ayton Road. The lorry/car park is owned by South Norfolk Council. The building will replace the existing mobile food van which already occupies the corner of the car/lorry park. The site is within the Development Boundaries of Wymondham and within the industrial area of Ayton Road.

4.2 Section 1 of the NPPF, and Policy 5 of the JCS both seek to support the local economy. Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, support commercial proposal in sustainable locations and more specifically Policy DM2.6 food, drink and takeaways, which supports these outlets both within defined Town Centre Areas, local centres and elsewhere within Settlements where development does not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts including noise, odour and general disturbance which would adversely affect amenity of nearby occupiers and which could not satisfactorily controlled by conditions.

4.3 A hot food take away (van) has operated from the car park for some significant time providing a service to the employees of the industrial estate and passing traffic. The steel container which is to be sited on the grass verge which in terms of design, is not out of character with the industrial buildings immediately opposite the site and to the west. To the east of the site is the Browick Road Recreation Ground. There are no residential properties in the immediate vicinity which could be adversely affected by the proposal.

4.4 The opening hours are proposed from 07:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturdays inclusive. These hours are proposed to cater for the shift work which is operates from several of the premises on the industrial estate. Given the location of the proposal I do not consider these to be unreasonable, I would suggest the majority of the traffic in this location, even in the evening, would be associated with the shift work and other activities associated with the commercial environment. With no immediate residential properties in close proximity to the site there would be no loss of amenities. Having assessed all of these points, I consider the siting; type of structure proposed, the use and the proposed hours of operation are acceptable for this location and the proposed scheme accords with policies DM2.6, and DM 3.13.

4.5 In terms of highways, a high proportion of the trade is generated from employees and trade associated with the industrial estate, therefore much of the traffic is already generated from the industrial estate activities rather than the take away. The location of the takeaway does not result in additional high levels of traffic, and no objections are raised by the Highways Authority. The proposal accords with policy DM 3.11

4.6 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.

4.7 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The proposal is for the use of land for the standing of a container and does not generate floor space in the same was as a new structure.
5 Conclusion

5.1 The standing of a steel container for the use of a hot food takeaway is acceptable in this location as it benefits the existing commercial premises within the immediate and neighbouring locality without harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. The traffic associated by the proposal is likely to me limited with the majority resulting from the existing industrial estate. The proposal accords with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail: jackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Reports

1 Enforcement Ref : 2014/8233
Parish : HINGHAM

Site Address : Land to The North of, Woodrising Road, Hingham, Norfolk
Development : Change of Use of Land For the Standing of Residential Caravan
Developer : Mr M FENNINGS

1. Background

1.1 Retrospective planning permission for the caravan was applied for in January 2015. When the application was not determined within the statutory 8-week period the applicant appealed against non-determination of the application. After the appeal was submitted, the Council determined that it would have refused the application. The appeal decision has now been issued in which the Inspector has dismissed the appeal.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF07: Requiring good design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 17: Smaller rural communities and the countryside

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2015
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 The Sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 Environmental quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.7 Agricultural and Forestry Development
DM2.8 Equestrian and other changes of agricultural land
DM4.9 Incorporating landscape into design

3. Relevant Planning History

3.1 2014/2058 Retention of caravan and proposed polytunnel on plot of land Appeal against non-determination dismissed

4. Consultations (in response to planning application)

4.1 Parish Council Approve
4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
4.3 NCC: Highways No objections
4.4 Community Protection Team No objections
4.5 Local Residents No comments received
5  Assessment

5.1 The site is located outside of any defined development boundary in a rural location. The caravan is located on a site that is about 0.1 hectares in area with access from Woodrising Road. The owner of the site had previously made enquiries with the Council regarding the residential use of the site, but the caravan is not connected to services and the owner stated that it was being used for “shelter and refreshments while tending to the plants and maintenance of the land”. The owner’s residence is remote from the site (Romford, Essex).

5.2 The position of the Council is that the caravan standing on the site is excessive in size and inappropriate in design to serve an ancillary function to the agricultural/horticultural use of such a small parcel of land. The site is clearly not large enough to support a viable agricultural business and does not justify the standing of a large static caravan clearly designed for residential purposes. We are also of the view that the static residential caravan detracts from the rural character and appearance of the site and surroundings, causing environmental harm. It would provide very limited economic or social benefit and consequently does not represent sustainable development.

5.3 The Inspector has agreed with the Council’s case, noting that the caravan exceeds any requirement for a shelter in connection with any agricultural or horticultural use of the land. He also agrees that the caravan is residential in appearance and out of character with the area and concludes that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The full decision is attached as an appendix.

5.4 The caravan remains on the site. Enforcement action is therefore required to secure its removal. As the caravan is not being used as residential accommodation, it should be possible for arrangements to be made for the caravan to be removed in a reasonably short period of time and therefore an enforcement period of three months is proposed.

5.5 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.

6  Recommendation

6.1 That enforcement action is authorised to secure removal of the caravan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tim Barker, 01508 533801 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk and E-mail:
APPENDIX 2

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2015

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 November 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/15/3007397
Plot adjacent Woodrising Road, Hingham, Norfolk NR9 4NN

- The appeal is made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Max Fennings against South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2014/2058, is dated 25 September 2014.
- The development proposed is described as “a 28 foot caravan and a 60 foot pd tunnel. The caravan will only be used for shelter and refreshments while tending to the plants and maintenance of the land.”

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The caravan is already in place on the site and I shall consider that part of the proposal as retrospective.

3. The Council has explained that had it made a decision within the prescribed period, it would have refused permission. The Council’s putative reasons for refusal are that the caravan is not needed in connection with any agricultural or horticultural use of the land and that it detracts from the character and appearance of the area.

4. The Council has advised that the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (DMP) was adopted in October 2015 and that the policies of the 2003 Local Plan which are referred to in its statement have been superseded. I shall consider the proposal against the relevant DMP policies.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in the appeal are, firstly whether the caravan is necessary in connection with agricultural use and secondly the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Necessity

6. The site is about 0.1 ha in area and is in the open countryside. It is enclosed by hedges and there is a barred gate onto Woodrising Road. At the time of my visit there appeared no evidence of agricultural use on the site although I note...
that it is the appellant's intention to grow plants there. The caravan was in place and positioned towards the rear of the site.

7. The appellant owned the caravan before making the application. His intention is that this would be used as a shelter and for refreshments in connection with growing plants on the site and maintenance of the site. The caravan is said to have no water or electricity supply and would not be used as residential accommodation.

8. The caravan is some 20 feet in length and is designed to provide overnight accommodation notwithstanding that there are no services connected. There is no information before me as to the nature of the proposed agricultural or horticultural use but it would seem to me that the caravan would exceed any requirement for a shelter in connection with such use. On this basis the caravan has not been demonstrated to be necessary in connection with any agricultural use. The caravan does not accord with policy DM2.7 (a) of the DMP which requires agricultural development to be necessary for the purpose of the farm unit. Policy DM1.3 of the DMP allows for development in the countryside provided it complies with other policies or demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of sustainability. The proposal does not accord with that policy.

Character and Appearance

9. The site is within an open rural area adjoining agricultural land. There is an isolated dwelling adjacent to the site but this does not alter the overall rural character. Although the site is quite well screened by boundary hedges, the caravan is visible through the access. It is possible that it may be visible in part above the hedges although these could be allowed to grow to provide fuller screening. The boundary screening does not however alter my concern that the caravan is residential in appearance and is out of character with the countryside surroundings.

10. Policies DM2.7 and DM2.8 of the DMP require developments to take into account the character of the local area and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk has a similar requirement. The development would not accord with those policies for the reasons given.

11. The Council has no objection to the proposed polytunnel on the grounds that it would be consistent with the agricultural character of the surrounding area. I see no reason to disagree with the Council's view on this matter.

12. For the reasons given the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. I note that no objections were raised by the Parish Council, the Highway Authority and others. However this does not alter my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

Nick Palmer
INSPECTOR
2 Enforcement Ref : 2015/8008
Parish : SURLINGHAM
Site Address : Builders Store, Beerlicks Loke, Surlingham, Norfolk, NR14 7AJ
Development : Unauthorised fence
Developer : Mr T Guyton & Mr S Hall

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a new fence and entrance gates had been erected at the above site. Following a visit to the site it was apparent the fence and gates exceed the permitted height of 2 metres. The owners of the site were invited to submit an application to regularise the fence but unfortunately no application has been submitted and the fence remains in situ.

1.2 The fence and gates are constructed of white metal corrugated sheeting and have wooden telegraph pole support posts. The fence and gates are approximately 2.2 metres in height and the posts are up to 3.2 metres in height.

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 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
Policy 3.8 - Design Principles

3. Relevant Planning History

2011/0631 Certificate of Lawfulness - Existing use as Builders yard/store and Manufacture of Play Equipment pursuant to and in accordance with planning permission 1995/0647

2009/0914 Proposed additional storage building and replacement building

1995/0647 Renewal of permission 93/0235/F to continue to allow manufacture of playground equipment

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council No comments received

4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

4.3 Local Residents 6 letters received raising a number of concerns
- Not in keeping with surroundings
- More appropriate fencing could be erected whilst still providing the security required
- Looks like high security/prison fencing, warehouses etc
5  **Assessment**

5.1 The site is located down a small private loke in a rural area just off The Street. There are residential properties to the west and south and the Broads to the east.

5.2 A number of concerns have been received from the nearby residents relating to the appearance of the fence and gates and their impact on the surroundings. Further concerns have been received relating to the relocation of the access gates closer to the loke and the adjacent property and relating to its structural integrity.

5.3 The concerns relating to the location of the fence and gates closer to the loke are noted but I do not consider their location marginally closer to the loke has a material impact on the visual amenity of the locality. Again their location marginally closer to the adjacent properties rear boundary will not materially affect their residential amenity.

5.4 The concerns relating to the structural integrity of the development and that they have not been assessed by a building inspector are noted. However, there are no requirements for a building inspector to check boundary fences and the solid construction of the development suggests it is structurally sound.

5.5 The fence and gates by virtue of the materials used, colour and location are considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the locality. The appearance of the development could be improved by painting it a recessive dark green or brown colour. This would soften its impact and help it integrate into its surroundings.

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 case is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6  **Recommendation**

6.1 That enforcement action be authorised requiring the fence be painted a dark recessive green or brown colour with a compliance period of One Month.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk and E-mail:
1. **Background**

1.1 Turnpike House is a grade II listed 17th century detached property that is set back some distance from the road in a rural setting. It has a thatched roof and rendered finish and is situated immediately to the east side of two semi-detached properties, comprising Turnpike Cottage and Lavender Cottage, the former separating Turnpike house and Lavender Cottage.

1.2 In August 2015 the Council received complaints regarding CCTV cameras and a satellite dish installed at Turnpike House. Following this, a listed building consent application was submitted by Mr Wilkinson for the retention of these items, a revised location for the dish having been agreed prior to submission of the application. The application is due to be determined by 23rd December and is likely to be approved, any small level of harm to the special architectural/historic interest of the building being outweighed by the benefits of the proposal to the existing residential use.

1.3 With regard to the CCTV cameras, which are on the north, south and west elevations of the building, in addition to the requirement for listed building consent, planning permission is also required due to the cameras being installed on a listed building. As a planning application for the cameras has not been submitted (this was requested by the Council) this report has been prepared for the Committee to consider whether any further action should be.

1.4 Following receipt of the current listed building consent application, issues were also raised regarding the following other fittings attached to Turnpike House: an alarm box on the front elevation at first floor level; an electric charger unit for a vehicle on the ground floor side elevation and various light fittings on the house. None of the items have been included in the current listed building consent application (planning permission is not required for these items). There is also a CCTV camera fixed to one of the outbuildings in the rear garden (the building is not covered by the listing of the main house) that requires planning permission. All of these matters have also been included in this report for consideration by the Committee.

2. **Planning Policies**

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

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
- JCS 2: Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies
- DM 3.8: Design Principles
- DM 3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
- DM4.10: Heritage Assets
2.4 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.”

3. Relevant Planning History

3.1 2013/1135 Replacement of windows to double glazed units and doors Approved

3.2 2015/2438 Consent to keep CCTV cameras that were installed with the house we purchased 5 years ago. Also to re-site the satellite sky dish. under consideration

3.3 2002/0736 Proposed erection of summer house in rear garden Approved

3.4 2002/0735 Proposed erection of summer house in rear garden Approved

3.5 1999/1539 Erection of pavilion to rear of dwelling Approved

3.6 1999/1388 Erection of conservatory to dwelling Approved

3.7 1999/0887 Erection of conservatory to dwelling Refused

3.8 1995/0186 Erection of porch to front of dwelling Approved

3.9 1994/1466 Replace straw thatch with reed Approved

4 Consultations

4.1 There has been no formal consultation on the existing light units, alarm box and electrical vehicle charger, all of which require listed building consent only. There has also been no formal consultation on the camera fixed to the outbuilding at Turnpike House. Neighbours have been consulted and comments received in respect of the current listed building consent application for retention of a satellite dish and CCTV cameras on the house. This report has been prepared giving careful consideration to the impact on neighbouring amenity and heritage assets and has taken into account the comments on these matters provided by the neighbour at Lavender Cottage in their response to the current application. In their comments concern was raised about other items of the building not included in the application— the alarm box, electrical vehicle charger and lighting units. Reference was also made to a CCTV camera on an outbuilding which points towards Lavender Cottage.

5 Assessment

Design/Heritage Assets

5.1 Section 66 (1) of the Act 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.”
5.2 In respect of the requirements of Section 66 of the Act, the alarm box, various light units and electric charger unit which are all fixed to the Turnpike House do cause a small degree of harm to the special architectural/historic interest of the building. However, the resulting level of harm is not significant and it is considered that the benefit the fittings provide to the existing residential use outweighs the level of harm. Having considered the requirements of sections 66, these items are therefore considered acceptable and accord with sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF regarding design and heritage assets. Due to the small level of harm being outweighed by the benefit to the residential use, the requirements of policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies are also satisfied.

5.3 The impact of the CCTV cameras on the house in terms of heritage issues is being considered in the assessment of the current listed building consent application, which is likely to be approved for reasons previously explained in the first section of this report.

5.4 With regard to the CCTV camera on the outbuilding, this is quite small and does not cause any harm to the setting of the listed house. Its impact has been carefully considered under the requirements of section 66 and its size and location accord also with all of the aforementioned policies.

Neighbouring Amenity

5.5 With regard to the CCTV cameras, those located on the front and rear of Turnpike House will have little impact on any neighbouring amenity due to their position in relation to neighbouring properties. The existing rear extension at Turnpike House also provides some blocking of views from cameras to the west side. The cameras on west gable end of the building could, however, be orientated to provide some degree of over-looking onto the rear garden boundary of Lavender Cottage but it is considered that this would not result in any significant impact on privacy at Lavender Cottage or at the immediate neighbour Turnpike Cottage, which is currently overlooked by a first floor window at Lavender Cottage at the west side.

5.6 The camera on the outbuilding is to provide security for an adjacent storage shed and due to its distance from the neighbouring property and the 7ft fence at the boundary with Lavender Cottage it is considered that this does not result in any increased overlooking, particularly as the first floor window at Lavender Cottage is already visible from the rear garden of Turnpike House. It is therefore considered that the impact of the cameras is not of such significance so as to be contrary to policy DM3.13 of the Local Plan Policies 2015.

5.7 Other than the CCTV cameras other items on the building do not impact on any neighbouring amenity and only require listed building consent.

6 Conclusions

6.1 Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states, ‘Effective enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and to local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control.…’

6.2 The CCTV cameras on the house and CCTV camera on the outbuilding all require planning permission. Other items fixed to the house – the alarm box, electric charger unit and light fittings – all require listed building consent. No such permission or consent has been sought or provided. However, I consider that none of these items cause sufficient harm to the special architectural/historic interest of the building or to its setting or any neighbouring amenity to make them unacceptable under the requirements of national and local policies listed above. Although breaches of planning control have occurred, I do not consider that enforcement action is justified in this case.
7 Recommendation

7.1 That no further action be taken in respect of the following items:

1. CCTV camera on the outbuilding
2. CCTV cameras on the house
3. Light fittings on the house
4. Alarm box on the house
5. Electrical vehicle charger on the house

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Philip Whitehead 01508 533948 pwhitehead@snorfolk.gov.uk and E-mail:
1. Background

1.1 Lavender Cottage is a grade II listed 17th century semi-detached house situated some distance back from the road in the open countryside. It has a rendered finish and clay pantile roof with the attached house on the east side, Turnpike Cottage, having a thatched roof. Immediately to the east side of Turnpike Cottage is Turnpike House, a detached property also grade II listed and dating from the same period as Lavender Cottage. Although Turnpike Cottage separates Lavender Cottage from Turnpike House, the rear garden of the latter extends to the west side immediately behind the rear gardens of the two semi-detached cottages, therefore sharing their rear garden boundaries.

1.2 Following the erection of a 7ft panel fence in 2014 at the rear boundary of Lavender Cottage, complaints were received about the size of the fence, the posts extending higher than 7ft by approximately another foot. A formal application was submitted by the occupants of Lavender Cottage (2015/0356) for retention of the fence and approved in June 2015 but with agreed amendments which involved reducing the height of the fence posts and providing further panels at ground level. These amendments were to ensure that the fence did not cause harm to the setting of the listed building as well as helping to reduce the impact on neighbouring amenity. Works are to be carried out in the new year to bring the fence in line with the approved details.

1.3 Following this approval, a large sheet of timber boarding has recently been attached to part of the rear boundary fence at Lavender Cottage, and is much higher than the existing fence. It is understood that this has been erected to reduce the level of disturbance from a night security light which is attached to an outbuilding in the rear garden of Turnpike House. It is also understood from the occupants of Lavender Cottage that the boarding is only temporary having been put up at night to deal with disturbance from the light.

1.4 Whilst the boarding may only be temporary, planning permission is still required as it is secured by screws into the existing fence. The attached boarding is the subject of this report for the Committee to consider whether or not the Council should take any further action.

2. Planning Policies

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

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Promoting good design
3. **Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and the setting of Listed Buildings**

3.1 **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. **Relevant Planning History**

4.1 2013/2171 Replacement of all windows
     Approved

4.2 2014/0499 Proposed one and half storey and single storey extension to side of cottage
     Approved

4.3 2014/0500 Proposed one and half storey and single storey extension to side of cottage
     Approved

4.4 2015/0356 Retrospective planning permission for a garden summer house and fencing.
     Approved

4.5 2015/0362 Retrospective planning permission for 2 CCTV cameras and a Sky Dish.
     Approved

5. **Consultations**

5.1 No formal consultation with neighbours has been carried regarding the unauthorised boarding that has been erected but relevant considerations in respect of heritage assets and neighbour amenity are clear.

5.2 The occupants of Lavender Cottage, who have erected the boarding, have provided further comments confirming that the structure is not erected during daylight hours and has been put up to screen a security light within the adjacent property. The light does not require planning permission or listed building consent.

6. **Assessment**

6.1 The key considerations regarding the unauthorised erected boarding are the impact on heritage assets, which in this case is the setting of the listed building, and the impact on neighbouring amenity.

   **Design/Heritage Assets**

6.2 Section 66 (1) of the Act states: “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.”
6.3 The newly erected timber boarding does have an adverse impact on the setting of Lavender Cottage, although the level of harm is not substantial. It is considered that any benefit the boarding may have in terms of reducing the visual disturbance from the neighbour’s security light does not sufficiently outweigh the level of harm to the heritage asset.

Therefore, in light of the requirements of Section 66 of the Act, the proposal does not accord with sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF regarding design and heritage assets and is contrary to policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Development Management Policies 2015.

Neighbouring Amenity

6.4 The National Planning Policy Framework Core Planning Principles paragraph 17 states that planning decisions should ‘always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.’ In addition to this policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015 requires that ‘development should ensure a reasonable standard of amenity reflecting the character of the local area.’

6.5 The Community Protection section of the Council has been involved in the issue with the lighting unit on the outbuilding at Turnpike House. The Community Protection Officer dealing with the issue has confirmed that although the light does cause some degree of disturbance it is not considered to be a statutory nuisance. The installed light unit does not require planning permission or listed building consent, the outbuilding to which it is fixed being a post 1948 structure not covered by the listing.

6.6 The timber boarding that has been erected to deal with the light issue, if left in position in day light hours, is visually intrusive and does cause harm to both neighbouring amenities at both Turnpike Cottage and Turnpike House. However, if the boarding is only erected at night then the impact on neighbouring amenities would be greatly reduced and not so significant in which case, purely in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity, the level of harm would not be contrary to policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015. The Council, however, could not have any effective control over when the boarding is erected or taken down.

6.7 Should a formal planning application be submitted for the boarding then it would not be CIL liable as it does include additional floor space.

7 Conclusions

7.1 Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states, ‘Effective enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and to local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. ….’

7.2 Although the boarding does cause some harm to the setting of the listed buildings and residential amenity, this harm is less than substantial and the boarding itself is of a minor nature. The harm caused is further reduced if the boarding is removed during daylight hours, as indicated by the developer.

7.3 I am also of the opinion that taking enforcement action in respect of the boarding would not be conducive to encouraging co-operation between local residents to resolve this and other minor breaches of planning control that seem to threaten wider interests of residential amenity and protection of heritage assets.

8 Recommendation

8.1 No further action at present but the need for action to be reviewed should circumstances change.
5 Enforcement Ref: 2015/8242
Parish: HEDENHAM

Site Address: Maize Maze, Brickyard Barn, Norwich Road, Hedenham, Norfolk
Development: Alleged Breach of Condition 5 of Planning Approval 2006/0133/CU
Developer: Ditchingham Estates

1. Background

1.1 Planning permission was granted on 30 March 2006 under reference 2006/0133/CU for ‘Proposed car parking facilities for a seasonal Maize Maze (July to September)’. Condition 5 of the approval required a proposed planting scheme shown on the approved plan 1237/02A (attached as appendix) to be carried out prior to the use being brought into use.

1.2 A complaint was received earlier this year that the planting had not been carried out and the condition had therefore not been complied with. Following a visit to the site it was apparent that planting had been carried out but there were a few gaps in the planting on the boundary with a residential property, High House, and some of the plants had not taken. It appears that the condition was complied with but as a detailed specification was not required the plan is open to interpretation.

1.3 Since the planting was first carried out the circumstances have changed, in that, the land on the northern side of High House has been purchased by the owner of High House. Planning permission has been granted for this land to be used as residential curtilage and has been encompassed within the curtilage of High House. In view of this change of ownership the Council can no longer require Ditchingham Estates to provide additional planting along this boundary. However, the planting that has failed along the western boundary should be replaced as required by the Condition.

1.4 The Estate has agreed to replace the failed planting and provide additional Scots Pine along the western boundary during this planting season.

1.5 The occupier of High House have expressed dissatisfaction with the planting undertaken and considers that further mature planting as well as screen panels should be installed along his boundary.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Policy 7 - Requiring Good Design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 - Promoting good design

2.4 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
Policy 3.14 - Amenity, Noise and Quality of life
Policy 4.9 – Incorporating landscape into design
3. **Relevant Planning History**

2015/1105  Retrospective application for the consent to display a fascia sign and vertical banner  Approved

2015/1104  Variation of Condition 4 – opening hours of planning permission 2012/2170/F – to extend café closing time to 1800hrs Monday to Saturday inclusive  Approved

2012/2170  Change of use of barn from agricultural to retail (farm shop & cafe) to include external works and car parking area  Approved

2009/2142  Proposed extension to single storey brick barn  Approved

2006/0133  Proposed car parking facilities for a seasonal Maize Maze (July to September)  Approved

4  **Assessment**

4.1 The site is located on the Norwich Road (B1332) at Hedenham in an area of open countryside.

4.2 Condition 5 of Planning Approval 2006/0133/CU required implementation of planting along the roadside and along the (then) boundary with High House. We have no record of a detailed specification for the planting which is shown only diagrammatically on the plan referred to in condition 5.

4.3 Planting has been carried out which can reasonably be said to accord with the diagrammatic location of planting shown on the approved plan. Notwithstanding this, the land-owner (Ditchingham Estates) have agreed to carry out additional planting and to replace failed plants. The voluntary offer from the Estate to provide additional planting in the gaps including Scots Pine and to replace the planting that has not taken will further improve the boundary treatment on the western boundary of High House.

4.4 The operation of the maze includes a central lookout tower and items of play equipment for the visiting public. These items are a considerable distance from the residential property however, and I do not consider that any landscaping other than that approved could reasonably have been required.

4.5 In these circumstances I do not consider that any enforcement action is currently justified.

5  **Recommendation**

5.1 No further action.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Planning Appeals
Appeals received from 30/10/2015 to 30/11/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2014/2465 | Easton  
Land Rear Of 1 Keepers Cottage  
Hall Road Easton Norfolk | Ms S Eaglesfield       | Outline New single detached dwelling                                       |
| 2015/0075 | Ketteringham  
Land North Of High Street  
Ketteringham Norfolk | Mr Michael Austin | Use of land for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erectin of day room, and retention of existing gates. |
| 2015/1051 | Costessey  
7 Silvo Road Costessey Norfolk  
NR8 5EL | Mr Affsor Ali       | Retrospective conversion of car port to living accommodation.            |
| 2015/1148 | Marlingford And Colton  
Land North Of The Ugly Bug Inn  
High House Farm Lane Colton  
Norfolk | Mr & Mrs T Crowland | Proposed erection of timeshare swimming pool building and associated residential accommodation |
| 2015/1152 | Diss  
Home Farm Walcot Green Diss Norfolk  
IP22 5SR | Mrs A Turrell | Proposed detached dwelling and garage                                         |
| 2015/1438 | Bramerton  
Land East Of Orchard House The Street Bramerton Norfolk | Mr & Mrs N & J Walker | Erection of 140kw solar photovoltaic panel array on part of the two acre field used as amenity land |
| 2015/1698 | Diss  
Land Rear Of 41 & 43 Victoria Road  
Diss Norfolk | Mr K Bobbins       | Residential development comprising three two-storey houses              |
<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>2014/2058</td>
<td>Hingham Land North West Of Ivy Lodge Woodrising Road Hingham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Max Fennings</td>
<td>Retention of caravan and proposed polytunnel on plot of land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appealed for Non Determination</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2077</td>
<td>Thurlton Land Rear Of Norman Close Thurlton Norfolk</td>
<td>Tredwell Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of 7 bungalows : 4 x 2-bed semi-detached bungalows (Plot 7 to be affordable in perpetuity) and 3 x 3 bed detached bungalows.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0276</td>
<td>Diss 37 Mere Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4AG</td>
<td>Aldi Stores Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of signage; a graphic panel.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>