

Development Management Committee

Agenda

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Cllr V Thomson (Chairman)
Cllr L Neal (Vice Chairman)
Cllr D Bills
Cllr J Halls
Cllr G Minshull

Date & Time:

Wednesday 20 October 2021
10.00am

Place:

Council Chamber, South Norfolk House, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE

Contact:

Leah Arthurton tel (01508) 533610
Email: democracy@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk
Website: <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk>

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE / PUBLIC SPEAKING

This meeting will be live streamed for public viewing via the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCZciRgwo84-iPyRlmsTCIng>

If a member of the public would like to observe the meeting in person, or speak on an agenda item, please email your request to democracy@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk, no later than **5.00pm on Friday 15 October 2021**. Please see further guidance on attending meetings at page 2 of this agenda. Places may be limited.

Large print version can be made available

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

Public Speaking and Attendance at Meetings

All public wishing to attend to observe, or speak at a meeting, are required to register a request by the date / time stipulated on the relevant agenda. Requests should be sent to: democracy@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk

Public speaking can take place:

- Through a written representation
- In person at the Council offices

Anyone wishing to send in written representation must do so by emailing: democracy@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk by 5pm on Friday 15 October 2021.

Please note that due COVID, the Council cannot guarantee the number of places available for public attendance, but we will endeavour to meet all requests.

Democratic Services will endeavour to ensure that each relevant group (ie. supporters, objectors, representatives from parish councils and local members) can be represented at meetings for public speaking purposes.

All those attending the meeting in person must sign in on the QR code for the building and arrive/ leave the venue promptly. The hand sanitiser provided should be used and social distancing must be observed at all times. Further guidance on what to do on arrival will follow once your initial registration has been accepted.

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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 a Local Plan 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 adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011, with amendments adopted in 2014. It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it has been endorsed by an independent Planning Inspector, the policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications. A further material planning consideration is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was issued in 2018 and its accompanying Planning Practice guidance (NPPG).

South Norfolk Council adopted its Local Plan in October 2015. This consists of the Site-Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham Area Action Plan, the Development Management Policies Document. The Long Stratton Area Action Plan was also adopted in 2016. These documents allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criterion-based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. The Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan was also made in 2014, Mulbarton Neighbourhood Development Plan made in 2016 and Easton Neighbourhood Plan made in 2017, and full weight can now be given to policies within these plans when determining planning applications in the respective parishes.

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, and**
- **Be consistent in the application of our policy**

Decisions which are finely balanced and contradict policy will be recorded in detail to explain and justify the decision and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.

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 to identify substitute members;
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 guidance form and flow chart attached – page 8)
4. Minutes of the Meetings of the Development Management Committee held on Wednesday, 1 September 2021 and Wednesday, 22 September 2021
(attached – page 10)
5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
To consider the items as listed below: (attached – page 22)

Item No.	Planning Ref No.	Parish	Site Address	Page No.
1	2021/0758/O	HETHERSETT	Land North of Hethersett Village Centre (Phase 4) East of Harness Makers Way Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk	21
2	2021/1198/H	STOKE HOLY CROSS	Devonia, 3 Brickle Road, Stoke Holy Cross, NR14 8NE	43
3	2021/1300	PULHAM MARKET	Land north of Guildhall Lane, Pulham Market, Norfolk	48
4	2021/1365/RV C	WYMONDHAM	Barnards Farm Youngmans Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0RR	53
5	2021/1848/H	FORNCETT	The Granary Northfield Road Forncett St Peter NR16 1JY	60
6	2021/1849/LB	FORNCETT	The Granary Northfield Road Forncett St Peter NR16 1JY	60
7	2021/2069/F	DISS	4 Denmark Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4LE	66
8	2021/2070/LB	DISS	4 Denmark Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4LE	66
9	2021/1786/F	KETTERINGHAM	Unit 1 Station Lane Ketteringham NR9 3AZ	72
10	2021/1896/F	BURSTON	Bell Cottage Back Lane Burston IP22 5TT	76

Updates received after publication of this agenda relating to any application to be considered at this meeting will be published on our website:

<https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/south-norfolk-committee-meetings/south-norfolk-council-development-management-planning-committee>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

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

7. Planning Appeals (for information);

(attached – page 80)

8. Date of next scheduled meeting- Wednesday 17 November 2021

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.

MICROPHONES: The Chairman will invite you to speak. An officer will ensure that you are no longer on mute so that the Committee can hear you speak.

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.

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

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

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 2015

Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document

Development Management Policies Document

WAAP - Wymondham Area Action Plan

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 you should not partake in general discussion or vote.
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



Agenda Item 4

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council, held on 1 September 2021 at 10am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, J Halls, L Neal and G Minshull.

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (T Lincoln), the Area Planning Managers (C Raine & G Beaumont), the Senior Planning Officer (P Kerrison) and the Principal Planning Officer (S Everard)

one member of the public was also in attendance

572 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Application	Parish	Councillor	Declaration
2021/0307/F	DISS	G Minshull	Other interest Local Member for Diss
2021/0365/F	FORNCETT	G Minshull	Other Interest Trustee of Norfolk Tank Museum who occupied land adjacent to the application site

573 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 28 July 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

574 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Place, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

Application	Parish	Speakers
2021/0307/F	DISS	E Taylor – Town Council Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member
2021/0365/F	FORNCETT	D Avery – Applicant Cllr B Duffin – Local Member

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of the 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 Place.

575 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting concluded at 11:45 am)

Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 1 September 2021

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	2021/0307 One additional representation has been received. This has set out detailed comments including concern with the following: – Initial consent was for a pub and a hotel, why was the pub allowed to be built without the much needed hotel. – Unclear is key planning issues were discussed at the pre-application meetings – No reference to access from the Morrisons roundabout. – Bus station is a poor reflection on Diss, however it is a shame that there isn't a connection to it. – Why was there no discussion about cycle routes and provision for cycle storage? – Why do so many of the dwellings face north? Why are they single aspect with no cross ventilation? Why do so many of the units have no open private space? Why are the internal corridors so long and narrow and artificially lit? – Given these homes are for retirees and a population which will in most instances become more infirm, why is there no provision for mobility scooters close to the apartments? Why are they parked in a cluster at one end of the car park? – Why are there no footpaths alongside the road on the west side of the site? Are residents to be expected to walk in the road when collecting their order from the Fair Green Fish & Chip shop? Who owns and who will be responsible for the maintenance of the road and its lighting? – Is a site adjacent to a pub car park and overlooking an electricity sub-station a suitable place for retirees? – Diss needs better from the applicants and the SNC planning department. Let's try to improve design standards and not simply fall back on old layouts because they're cheap and simpler to implement	Pages 16-32
Item 2	Additional reason for refusal proposed based on appeal decision (attached) for adjacent site. Wording as follows: Accessibility of the Site: <i>By virtue of the works associated with this application, the unit will create a greater transport and traffic movements as an independent dwelling as opposed to an annex ancillary to a dwelling. The application site is approximately 930m outside of the development</i>	

	<i>boundary that has been defined for Forncett St. Mary. Given the nature of the highway network in the area and in light of the approximately 2.5km distance to Long Stratton and the frequency of the bus service, it is considered likely that residents will rely on the private car to access a wider range of services and facilities. The location of the site is not considered to encourage sustainable patterns of transport movements and the development will not minimise the need to travel or minimise greenhouse gas emissions. The application is therefore contrary to Policies 1 and 6 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM3.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015.</i>	
--	--	--

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 Place's final determination.

Other Applications

1. **Appl. No** : **2021/0307/F**
Parish : **DISS**
Applicant's Name : Churchill Retirement Living
Site Address : Land to the Rear of Thatchers Needle Park Road Diss
Norfolk

Proposal : Redevelopment of the site to form 58 retirement
apartments and 15 retirement cottages including
communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to advise officers that they
are minded to refuse the application and to give delegated
authority for officers to continue to negotiate on
outstanding issues.

Minded to Refuse

1 Over development of site
2 Insufficient information – viability
3 insufficient information – drainage
4 Contrary to DM3.15 – Insufficient levels of open space

2. **Appl. No** : **2021/0365/F**
Parish : **FORNCETT**
Applicant's Name : Mr & Mrs Avery
Site Address : The Old Safety Valve Station Road Forncett St Peter NR16
1JA

Proposal : Proposed change of use and extension of existing annexe
to create separate dwelling.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**

Refused

1 Building not suitable for conversion
2 Outside of Development Boundary
3 Accessibility of the Site

Agenda Item 4

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council, held on 22 September 2021 at 10am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, J Halls (for items 2-4), L Neal and G Minshull.

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (T Lincoln), the Area Team Manager (C Raine) and the Principal Planning Officers (C Watts, T Barker)

Eight members of the public were also in attendance

576 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Application	Parish	Councillor	Declaration
2020/2418/F	WYMONDHAM	J Halls	Other Interest As a Trustee of the Lizard Charity situated near to the application site, Cllr Halls did not partake in any discussions regarding the application.
2020/2461/RV C	KETTERINGHAM	D Bills L Neal	Other Interest Chair of the CNC Broad Other Interest Cabinet Member covering CNC Building Control.

577 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Place, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

Application	Parish	Speakers
2020/2418/F	WYMONDHAM	S Humphrey – Project Manager for the Applicant
2020/2461/RV C	KETTERINGHAM	D Skedge -- Applicant
2021/1261/F	BRESSINGHAM & FERSFIELD	S Roberts – Agent
2021/1262/LB	BRESSINGHAM & FERSFIELD	S Roberts – Agent

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of the 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 Place.

578 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting concluded at 11:23am)

Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 22 September 2021

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	None	9
Item 2	Correction to paragraph 5.15 of the report insofar as it should state: <i>On the basis that the scheme complies with the relevant part of the Building Regulations as confirmed by CNC it is considered that an objection on flood risk grounds could not be substantiated.</i> 2 additional conditions required: - Bird box for each dwelling to be provided as required under a previous approval - First floor window in east elevation of plot 3 to be obscure glazed	31
Item 3 & 4	District Councillor - I support this application and hope that it is passed as recommended by the planning officer	39

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 Place's final determination.

Other Applications

1. **Appl. No** : **2020/2418/F**
Parish : **WYMONDHAM**
Applicant's Name : Mr Tim Mills
Site Address : Land west of Oil Storage Depot Stanfield Road
Wymondham Norfolk

- Proposal** : Construction of an Energy Innovation Park to comprise workshops, flexible office space, cafe, social/breakout space and associated facilities, car-parking, service yards, associated access and infrastructure including surface water drainage basin and landscaping. Construction of a replacement carpark for Goff Petroleum staff.

- Decision** : Members voted unanimously to delegate authority to **Approve** subject to the satisfactory resolution of discussions relating to off-site mitigation relating to ecology and subject to the following conditions and completion of any relevant legal agreement e.g., S33 Agreement

Approve with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Restriction of use Classes
4. Standard highways conditions
5. Details of construction of roads and footways
6. Off-site highway works, including cycle path/footway
7. Construction Management Plan
8. Highway conditions including off-site works for cycleway
9. Surface Water Drainage scheme
10. Foul water to Package Treatment Plant
11. Contamination Investigation
12. Contamination Remediation/Mitigation
13. Contaminated land during construction
14. In accordance with submitted Noise Report
15. Fire Hydrants to be provided
16. Construction Environmental Management Plan
17. Biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity)

- 18. Landscape and Ecological Management Plans (LEMPs)
- 19. Arboricultural Impact Assessment for off-site cycleway
- 20. Tree protection measures
- 21. Materials to be agreed
- 22. Submission of a copy of the EPS licence
- 23. Subject to completion of Section 33 agreement to secure off-site biodiversity mitigation

2.	Appl. No	:	2021/2461
	Parish	:	KETTERINGHAM
	Applicant's Name	:	Mr M, Mr J & Mr & Mrs D Skedge
	Site Address	:	Land West of Cherry Tree House, High Street, Ketteringham Norfolk
	Proposal	:	Variation of conditions 2, 4, 5 and 6 of reserved matters approval 2018/0991 pursuant to condition 3 of outline planning permission 2017/1572 - revised dwelling and garage types, details of boundary treatments and materials
	Decision	:	Members voted 4-1 for Approval
			Approved with conditions
			1 In accordance with plans
			2 Access as approved
			3 Visibility
			4 Details for highways
			5 Construction workers parking
			6 Boundaries as submitted
			7 Ecology measures
			8 Surface water
			9 Foul water as submitted
			10 Water efficiency
			11 Tree protection
			12 Phasing
			13 Ext materials as submitted
			14 Bird box for each dwelling to be provided as required under previous approval
			15 First floor window in east elevation of plot 3 to be obscure glazed


3. **Appl. No** : **2021/1261/F**
Parish : **BRESSINGHAM & FERSFIELD**
Applicant's Name : Mr & Mrs S Bradfield
Site Address : Fenners Farmhouse Fersfield Road Fersfield IP22 2AW
- Proposal : Change of use from residential care home to single dwelling. Demolition of modern extension with replacement windows and Internal alterations.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
2 In accordance with submitted drawings
4. **Appl. No** : **2021/1262/LB**
Parish : **BRESSINGHAM & FERSFIELD**
Applicant's Name : Mr & Mrs S Bradfield
Site Address : Fenners Farmhouse Fersfield Road Fersfield IP22 2AW
- Proposal : Demolition of modern extension with replacement windows and Internal alterations.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
2 In accordance with submitted drawings

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Place

Major Applications

Application 1



1. **Application No :** **2021/0758/O**
 Parish : **HETHERSETT**

Applicant's Name: Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon
Site Address Land North of Hethersett Village Centre (Phase 4) East of Harness
 Makers Way Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk
Proposal Outline planning application (all matters reserved) for an 'uplift' of up
 to an additional 200 dwellings (market and affordable units) on
 Parcels A4 (part) and B4 of Phase 4 of the Hethersett North village
 expansion area (subject of approved planning consent 2011/1804/O).

Reason for reporting to committee

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary :

Approval with Conditions

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The site forms part of the development to the north of Hethersett which was granted outline permission under reference 2011/1804 in July 2013 for a residential led mixed use development of 1,196 dwellings and associated uses, including a Primary School and local shops.
- 1.2 This application seeks outline planning permission for an additional 200 residential units, including 28% affordable dwellings, on land on the most western area of the consented site which forms part of the original Phase 4 development.
- 1.3 The application site has an area of 5.10 ha, comprising of sub phases A4 (part) and B4 of the original outline consent. Phase 4 will also accommodate around 50-55 residential units (including affordable housing) approved by the original planning consent.
- 1.4 Indicative plans have been submitted to demonstrate how the additional number of dwellings can be accommodated based on the original approved parameter plans and design code.
- 1.5 The reason for the additional units is that the developers have used less land than originally anticipated to accommodate the permitted number of residential units (1,196) by building closer to the upper end of the density ranges agreed in the approved Design Code and Parameter Plans. This means that the original planning permission's housing numbers limit will be reached using less land than anticipated by the original planning permission.
- 1.6 It is for this reason that this application proposes an increase in numbers with a nett addition of 200 dwellings over those permitted by the original planning permission. Outline approval is therefore being sought for the principle of this.
- 1.7 The additional units (uplift) consist of 128 market dwellings split between Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon, and 50 affordable dwellings. An additional area of land to accommodate approximately 22 affordable dwellings is also provided for affordable homes to be secured by the Local Authority should it elect to do so, under the terms of the original outline consent and S106. In the event that the Local Authority do not elect to deliver the additional affordable homes, then these will revert back to market dwellings, including 28% as affordable homes.

2. Relevant planning history

2.1	2014/0860	Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O- Alterations to condition 32 and 33. To delete condition 32 and substitute with 32a in regard to commencement of Phase 2 and 32b commencement of Phase 5, deletion of condition 33 and substitute 33a and 33b, 33a in regard to first occupation of Phase 2 and 33b first occupation of Phase 5	Approved
2.2	2014/0863	Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2011/1804/O - Deletion of condition 32b footway/cycleway	Approved
2.3	2015/1058	Discharge of condition 4 following planning permission 2011/1804/O - design code for each phase of development.	Approved
2.4	2015/1059	Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout	Approved
2.5	2015/1577	Discharge of condition 20 - Reserved matters phased landscaping scheme from 2011/1804/O - Area A1-A only	Approved
2.6	2015/1587	Discharge of condition 12 - Ecological Management Plan from 2011/1804/O - Phase 1 only	Approved
2.7	2015/1589	Discharge of Condition 27 of planning permission 2011/1804 - Street Lighting - Area A1-A only	Approved
2.8	2015/1594	Residential development of 95no dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure.	Approved
2.9	2015/1681	Reserved matters for appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the first phase of development for 126 dwellings in relation to outline permission 2011/1804	Approved
2.10	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 for Phase One Persimmon Only	under consideration
2.11	2016/0140	Discharge of conditions - 5 - water usage restrictions and 6 - arboricultural impact assessment of planning permission 2015/1594/D	Approved

2.12	2016/0214	Discharge of condition 4 from planning permission 2015/1059 - Road Infrastructure Phasing Plan.	Approved
2.13	2016/0284	Discharge of condition 9(a) of permission 2011/1804/O - written scheme of investigation for archaeological trial trenching evaluation for Persimmon Phase 1 only	Approved
2.14	2016/0315	Discharge of conditions 5 - Open Space Phasing Plan, 7 - Surface Water Drainage Scheme, 9 - Foul Water Strategy, 13 - Road & Drainage Details, 21 - Tree/Hedge retention 22 - Tree Protection Plan and 23 - Contamination Investigation & Risk Assessment and 32a - Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads (signals) of permission 2011/1804/O	under consideration
2.15	2016/0426	Discharge of condition 6 - materials and condition 22 - tree protection plan/arboricultural plan for Phase A1-A (as approved by application 2015/1594) of outline consent 2011/1804	Approved
2.16	2016/0971	Discharge of Conditions 13 and 26 of planning consent 2011/1804 (Mixed use development) - Road and Drainage Details and levels	Approved
2.17	2016/0974	Discharge of conditions 2 and 3 of planning consent 2015/1594 (95 dwellings) - Road, Footway, cycleway, foul and SW drainage details and Compliance with LPA and Highway Authority Specifications	Approved
2.18	2016/1059	Discharge of conditions 15, 16 & 17 of planning permission 2011/1804/O - 15 - on-site parking scheme, 16 - construction traffic management plan, 17 - Wheel Cleaning facilities	Approved
2.19	2016/1197	Intake sub-station and gas governor	Approved
2.20	2016/1797	Discharge of condition 6 of planning permission 2011/1804/O - Materials - for Phase A1-A	Approved
2.21	2016/1832	Discharge of conditions 24 and 28 of planning permission 2011/1804/O - Contamination remediation scheme and fire hydrant provision	Approved
2.22	2016/2129	Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2015/1059 (Reserved Matters for Road Layout) - Landscape scheme - Highway Verges	Approved

2.23	2016/2230	Reserved Matters following planning permission 2011/1804 (Mixed Use Developement) - Structural Landscaping	Approved
2.24	2017/0151	Reserved matters following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O - proposed residential development (phase A1-B) comprising 91 dwellings including 20% affordable housing and associated open space and infrastructure.	Approved
2.25	2017/1104	Reserved Matters Application following 2011/1804/O for phase B1-B - appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for 107 dwellings.	Approved
2.26	2017/2083	Discharge of Conditions 6 and 26 of planning consent 2011/1804 (relating to sub-phase A1-B of 2017/0151) - external layout of materials and existing and proposed ground levels.	Approved
2.27	2017/2084	Discharge of conditions 12, 22 and 28 of planning permission 2011/1804/O - (12) Ecological Management Plan, (22) Tree Protection Plan, (28) - Fire Hydrants Provision.	Approved
2.28	2017/2086	Discharge of Conditons Application following 2011/1804/O - (13) road and drainage details.	Approved
2.29	2017/2089	Structural landscaping for areas surrounding phases A1-B and B1-B within Phase 1 pursuant to outline consent 2011/1804	Approved
2.30	2017/2138	Discharge of condition 20 - Phased Landscaping Scheme of permission 2011/1804	Approved
2.31	2018/0749	Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 of planning consent 2017/1104 - renewable and low carbon sources and water consumption.	Approved
2.32	2018/0753	Discharge of condition 3 from planning consent 2015/1059 - Landscape scheme to highway verges (Road R2).	Approved
2.33	2018/1812	Discharge of conditions 2 - Renewable energy, and 3 - water efficiency, of permission 2015/1681	Approved
2.34	2018/2326	All reserved matters application for proposed residential development (phase A2) comprising 181 no. dwellings. Including 20% affordable housing and associated open space and infrastructure following 2011/1804	Approved

2.35	2018/2500	Reserved Matters details of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping of the second phase of development (phase B2) for 191 dwellings. (The outline submission included an Environmental Statement)	Approved
2.36	2019/0863	Non material amendment following 2015/1594 - To amend plot 82 roof tile	Approved
2.37	2019/1726	Discharge of condition 6 of outline planning permission 2011/1804 (in respect of phase A2 only) Proposed Materials Layout	Approved
2.38	2019/1727	Discharge of conditions 12, 20, 22 of planning permission 2011/1804 (In respect of phase A2 only) - arboricultural impact assessment, boundary treatment details, car parking layout, ecological management plan, landscape management plan, site layout, soft landscaping, tree protection & removal plan, tree schedule	under consideration
2.39	2019/1728	Discharge of conditions 13, 24, 26 of outline planning permission 2011/1804 (In respect of phase A2 only) - Highway details, foul and on-site water drainage, contamination remediation scheme, ground and floor levels of buildings.	under consideration
2.40	2019/1729	Non material amendment of 2017/2089 - Minor amendments to approved landscaping scheme in light of constraint posed by overhead power cables	Approved
2.41	2019/2572	Details for condition 28 of 2011/1804 - fire hydrant provision	Approved
2.42	2020/0388	Non material amendment of 2018/2326 - to amend garage sizes	Approved
2.43	2020/0431	Details for condition 10 of 2011/1804 - archaeological work	Approved
2.44	2020/0651	Non material amendment to 2018/2326 - Replacement of the approved screen walls with a 1.5m close board fence with 0.3m trellis	Approved
2.45	2020/0658	Details for conditions 13, 14, 16 and 26 of 2011/1804 - (13) Highways and drainage, (14) highways surfacing, (16) wheel washing, and (26) Levels	Approved
2.46	2020/0659	Details for conditions 6, 10A, 15, 17, 20, 27 and 28 of 2011/1804/O - (6) Materials, (10A) Archaeology, (15) Construction Traffic Management, (17) Wheel Washing, (20)	Approved

Landscaping, (27) External Lighting and (28) Fire Hydrants

2.47	2020/0660	Details for condition 4 of 2018/2500 - (4) Construction work within root protection areas	Approved
2.48	2020/0820	Not material amendment to 2017/0151 - Change of LEAP play area design and equipment	Approved
2.49	2020/2238	Non material amendment of 2011/1804 - to amend brick type	Approved
2.50	2020/2289	Reserved Matters following outline planning permission 2011/1804 for detailed structural landscaping to areas SL9, SL10, SL11, SL12 & SL13	Approved
2.51	2020/2290	Discharge of condition 6 of planning permission 2011/1804 - Materials	Approved
2.52	2021/0013	Details of conditions 6, 20, 26, 27 and 28 of 2011/1804 - (6) materials, (20) landscaping, (26) levels (27) flood lighting details and (28) hydrants	Approved
2.53	2021/0052	Details of conditions 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of 2011/1804 - (13) estate roads, (14) construction traffic parking, (15) construction traffic route (16) wheel cleaning facilities and (17) Travel plan	Under consideration
2.54	2021/0053	Details of condition 10 of 2011/1804 - (10) Archaeological work	Approved
2.55	2021/0759	Discharge of condition 6 of outline planning permission 2011/1804 - external materials	Approved
2.56	2021/0760	Discharge of condition 10 of outline application 2011/1804 - Archaeological work (C)	Approved
2.57	2021/0761	Non material amendment of planning permission 2011/1804 to allow for an amended location of sub station.	Approved
2.58	2021/0876	Discharge of condition 15, 16 and 17 of outline application 2011/1804 - Master Traffic Management Plan	Under consideration
2.59	2021/1273	Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2015/1059 - Landscaping scheme (Phase R3)	Approved
2.60	2021/1274	Discharge of condition 18A of planning permission 2011/1804 - Interim Travel Plan	Under consideration

2.61	2021/1681	Details of condition 32a of 2011/1804 - (32a) Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads (signals)	Under consideration
2.62	2021/1965	Reserved matters following outline planning permission 2011/1804 for residential development (Phases A3 & A4) comprising 200 no. dwellings including 20% affordable housing and associated open spaces & infrastructure.	Under consideration
2.63	2021/2090	Discharge of condition 18B of planning permission 2011/1804 -Signed Residential Travel Plan.	Under consideration
2.64	2021/2094	Non-material amendment application of planning permission 2011/1804 to allow for an amended Brick type. Drawing 20840/A2/520/E to be replaced with 20840/A2/520/G.	Under consideration
2.65	2011/1804	Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.	Approved
2.66	2011/1489	Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride	Approved

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- NPPF 02 : Achieving sustainable development
 - NPPF 04 : Decision-making
 - NPPF 05 : Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 - NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy and safe communities
 - NPPF 09: Promoting sustainable transport
 - NPPF 11 : Making effective use of land
 - NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
 - NPPF 14 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - NPPF 15 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 - NPPF 16 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

- 3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
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 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

- 3.3 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
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

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

- 3.5 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

S16(2) and S66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission or listed building consent 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. Consultations

4.1 Hethersett Parish Council

Objects on the following grounds:

- The Parish Council support the comments made by the Flood Risk Officer regarding localised flooding and the lack of details relating to the connection to a wider watercourse network.
- Members are concerned about the design of the main highway passing through the development. Why is it necessary to have two right angle bends?
- Having read the Arboriculture Survey & Impact Assessment members are concerned about the potential felling and destruction of trees and the impact that this will have on the local landscape, environment and wildlife.

- The enhanced facilities detailed within the original application have not been forthcoming. The existing infrastructure cannot cope with any additional development.
- Historic England do not appear to have been consulted on this application. In view of the proximity of the proposed development to the Roman Village, should they not be a statutory consultee?
- The Socioeconomic and Health Addendum suggests that there will be a concentration of social housing in this one area. It was originally agreed that the social housing would be distributed across the entire development.
- Why is a planning application being submitted which necessitates movement across the Beck Hithe Ecological Buffer Zone? Clear guidance was provided within the original planning consent that no residential or commercial development should take place within the buffer zone.
- There is no clarity surrounding the number of new homes to be built in Hethersett. The Parish Council raised this concern in responding to the Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 19 publication. Plans for new development including infill continue to be submitted and it feels as if development in the village is out of control. There needs to be a holistic plan in place for the whole village.

4.2 District Councillor's (Cllr Hardy, Cllr Dearnley)

- I wish to confirm that I have submitted a joint objection to this application with Councillor Hardy, and should officers be minded to approve I request that it goes before the DMC.
- We do not need this proposed 'uplift'.
- We do not need a further 200 homes in Hethersett with a 5 year housing land supply position, and with a village clusters policy in the pipeline that will alleviate pressure on Hethersett to keep taking new development in line with housing targets.
- We acknowledge that permission was already granted on the site within the previous application, but it is not acceptable to cram another 200 homes in because the developer squeezed the 1200 homes agreed into a more dense site area.
- A new doctor's surgery was included in the 2013 outline application but the existing surgery opposes it but the existing surgery is unable to cope and deliver an acceptable level of service to our existing residents.
- The chemist is not big enough to service Hethersett.
- All the shops and facilities promised in the 2013 outline application have not come
- Additional traffic
- Need surface water drainage strategy
- Need further ecology surveys
- Loss of green space
- Erode the enjoyment of the countryside

4.3 NCC Highways

Comments on original submission:

- Concerns raised and further discussions required.
- It is acknowledged the Junction Impact Assessment is based upon 250 dwellings, rather than the 200 of the application but given the trip rate discounts and the traffic growth factors are challenged, the capacity estimate at the junction is a significant concern and needs further consideration.

Comments on further information:

- The Highway Authority has previously raised some concern regarding impact of the proposal at the New Road junction with the B1172. This impact could be mitigated either by providing capacity improvements at the New Road approach to the junction, or through measures to reduce development traffic using New Road
- As it does not appear to be feasible within the highway, to provide a capacity improvement at the New Road approach to the junction, the Highway Authority considers that encouraging sustainable travel through a Travel Plan would be an appropriate way to reduce the vehicular demand associated with the development. In light of this the applicants have advised that they can agree to a £50k contribution towards completion of the cycleway at Colney Lane, between Hethersett and Colney, with any residue to be used to support cycling and walking within the local area.
- The proposed support for completion of the cycleway to Colney along with other measures to enable active travel from the additional dwellings would exert downward pressure on vehicle trips and the Highway Authority considers this would provide suitable mitigation of impact from the proposal.
- Subject to inclusion of the above contribution in a S106 agreement and the following requested conditions being secured, the Highway Authority would not wish to object to the proposal.

4.4 NCC Historic Environment Service

- We have no comments to make on application 2021/0758 as we believe the required further archaeological work in the Phase A4 and B4 areas is secured through Condition 10 on 2011/1804/O.

4.5 NCC Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator

- The following infrastructure will need to be funded through CIL:
Education: Mitigation required at Early Education Sector for 19 places and the Primary Sector for 56 places.
Library Provision: Improvements to existing library facilities. 200 houses x £75 per dwelling = £15,000.
- Norfolk Fire Services have indicated that the proposed development will require 1 hydrant per 50 dwellings (on a minimum 90-mm main) for the residential development at a cost of £921 per hydrant.

4.6 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Comments on original submission:

- We object to this Outline application in the absence of an acceptable drainage strategy or supporting information relating to:
- Details of how the surface water flood risk to the north west of the site will be accommodated within the drainage strategy. As the site is currently undeveloped, there is an opportunity for the drainage strategy to be revised such that the basin is relocated away from the surface water flooding.
- Due to the evidence of flooding in the system, preliminary consideration / plans showing the routes for the management of exceedance surface water flow routes that minimise the risk to people and property during rainfall events in excess of 1% AEP return period need to be provided. Floor levels associated with the drainage system should not be less than 300mm below the finished ground floor levels.
- Evidence of a connection to a wider watercourse network and confirmation that any increase in flows can be accommodated without increasing the flood risk, including the provision that the ditches will be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

- Calculations for greenfield runoff rates to watercourses should be based on the proposed area of impermeable land within the sub-catchment of the watercourse for the location of the proposed discharge.

Comments on further information:

- The applicant has now provided further information and evidence to support the application in addressing the LLFA concerns which has been reviewed for this response.
- Having reviewed the submitted information from the applicant, we are now able to remove our objection to this Outline application subject to the conditions previously applied to the original outline approval, ref 2011/1804/O being attached to any consent.

4.7 NCC Ecologist

Comments on original submission

- In accordance with BS42020:3013 (para 9.24 (c & d))² it would be acceptable for surveys of great crested newt to be conditioned as no evidence of this species was found in the pond onsite during 2010, 2013 or 2018.
- It is recommended that surveys for bats are completed and the results submitted to inform the outline application.
- It is recommended that the scope/extent of the verification survey (relating to badgers) is clarified as it is not clear what land was and was not surveyed. It is recommended that the sett(s) are monitored in accordance with standing advice to prove if the entrances are active/not active (including the number and status of the setts). This information should be used to inform the impact assessment and mitigation requirements within the Environmental Statement addendum.
- Until surveys for badgers have been completed and the results used to inform the impact assessment it is not possible to determine the level of mitigation required.
- As a result of the lack of survey information and details of mitigation it is not possible to consider whether Natural England would be likely to grant a licence to interfere with the sett should planning permission be granted.
- While outline consent has established the principle of the development, the applicant is seeking to uplift Phase 4 however consideration should be given to reducing the density of housing on Phase 3 to avoid having to close the entire sett, and allow the creation of a green corridor (see below) which would permit badgers to continue to commute to foraging areas offsite.
- Details of the proposed mitigation and compensation should be provided, which address the impacts identified - e.g. sett closure, fragmentation and habitat loss.
- It is recommended that the impact assessment on the CWS should be amended once the additional information required by the LLFA has been obtained.
- It is noted that the Beckhithe Meadow CWS buffer zone is included with the Ecological Management Plan as part of Condition 12.
- It is recommended that consideration is also given to providing signage, and information packs to residents regarding the provision of recreational GI onsite and areas that are not publicly accessible (i.e. the CWS).

Comments on further information

- No comments received.

4.8 SNC Landscape Architect

- No comments received

4.9 SNC Senior Heritage & Design Officer

- No objections

4.10 SNC Housing Enabling Officer

- The applicants propose that 28% of total dwellings are to be affordable homes, excluding land on which the Council has an option to purchase. On this basis, I have no objection to the application.

4.11 SNC Environmental Quality Team

- No objection. Conditions to attach relating to contamination and mitigation, requiring a construction management plan, air/ground source heat pumps.

4.12 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

- It is encouraging that the D&A statement references 'Quality design that encourages security through design'.
- The site forms part of a wider master plan, presenting 2 x parcels of land towards the west of a much larger, broadly rectangular area and includes the main spine road into the development site. Vehicular and pedestrian access into the residential development is to be provided through new entrances broadly from north to south. The dwelling frontages are set parallel to the roads which will assist natural surveillance over the community and the planned orientation of units allows for back to back garden – a design that helps reduce vulnerability to the rear of homes and is supported.
- Communal spaces are designed with natural surveillance supplied from nearby dwellings, with safe routes for users to come and go. Dwelling Boundaries: Good provision of suitable rear fencing had been indicated within the D&A Statement, together with appropriate boundary treatment to the front and provision of defensive space.
- Where shared paths leading to rear gardens are required, it is recommended that the location of gates are situated on or as near to the front of build line as possible, and that these gates should be capable of being locked.
- The indicated parking spaces appear mostly en-curtilage, the remainder in small courts mostly to front of housing which is supported. The absence of rear parking courts is commended. Consider opportunities to further improve on natural surveillance (and thereby guardianship over some car park spaces), by providing windows on gable ends.

4.13 Norfolk & Waveney Health & Care Partnership (ICS Estates)

- Applying the approach used by the ICS to developments would result in a contribution figure of £147,836. This is therefore the contribution the ICS would seek to support the practice in developing a project to meet the additional registration demand.

4.14 Humbleyard Practice

- As a practice we would like to know what provision the planners/developers have made for medical services and what infrastructure levy payments have been set aside for the development and provision of medical services, as at present we are full to capacity.
- Without financial provision, our practice will not be able to provide services for a population which is growing exponentially. Therefore, we would request that we be involved in this process and financial assistance made available for our practice to

look at expansion in order to cope with the increasing demands if we are going to be expected to provide primary medical services to potential new residents.

4.15 Other Representations (summarised)

38 representations have been received from residents objecting to the proposals (some of these are from the same address). The objections are summarised as follows:

- Was refused on the original application
- Company just wants profits, question the reasons for this extra housing
- There is a 5 year housing land supply
- Will spoil the rural character of the village
- Taking out greens areas which were shown
- Where is the new Country Park, sports pitches, new shops which were promised
- Parking problems at existing shops will get worse
- Increased traffic – already a rat run – dangerous
- Poor access, no path danger to pedestrians
- Too much new housing – have reached capacity
- Infrastructure cannot cope
- Not enough facilities; doctor, dentist, play space, schools, business, youth, broadband
- Sewage, drainage and run-off problems
- Loss of habitats, hedgerows already destroyed, Red Kites, birds and bats here
- Recent ‘accidental’ removal of trees
- Loss of farmland
- Will take away the local walks
- The housing is poor quality and crammed in
- Where is the affordable housing
- Disturbance from the construction
- Antisocial behaviour has/will increase

5 Assessment

Principle

- 5.1 The site benefits from outline consent for a residential mixed-use development approved in 2013 ref 2011/1804. The site is also allocated for residential development (HET1) in the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies document (2015). The allocation is intended to be carried forward as part of the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan which includes the additional 200 ‘uplift’ units, totalling 1,369 homes.
- 5.2 The outline consent secured the principle of the development with the intention that the development would be delivered in phases. This application comprises parts of the residential Phase 4 (two parts of A4 and all of B4) of that outline consent, as such the principle of development on this site is acceptable.
- 5.3 The main issues relate to whether the proposed additional residential units are acceptable, having regard to the approved Design Code and Parameter Plans required by the outline consent.
- 5.4 The current application documents state that; *“It has become evident that the developers will use less land than anticipated in the original outline consent to accommodate the permitted number of residential units (1,196). This means that the original planning permission’s housing numbers limit of 1,196 units will be reached using less land than anticipated by the original planning permission.”*

- 5.5 It is important to note that not all of the units in Phase 4 will be 'uplift' units, as Phase 4 will also accommodate around 50-55 units from the original outline consent numbers (1,196) including Affordable Housing Option Land required by the original S106 agreement and carried forward to this proposal. These are not included in the "red line" of this application.
- 5.6 Having regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in principle and complies with Policies 4, 6, 9, 10 and 14 of the JCS and Policies DM1.1, DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan subject to consideration of the impact of the 'uplift' in numbers as discussed below.

Access and Highways

- 5.7 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 for the development.
- 5.8 It is noted that the principle means of access into the site is already approved by Reserved Matters consent 2015/1059, which approved the main spine roads for the entire development and identifies the main access road through Phase 4 from which these development parcels will be served.
- 5.9 The estate roads, footpaths and driveways etc., will be included within future Reserved Matters applications for the development parcels/sub-phases.
- 5.10 With regards to the wider impacts of the development on the surrounding highway network, concerns have been raised by local residents, Councillor's and the Parish Council regarding the additional units. The Highway Authority also raised initial concerns with regards to the impacts of the development at the New Road junction with the B1172
- 5.11 Following discussions with the applicant, the proposals now include a financial contribution to mitigate the impacts of this development through a Travel Plan and improvements to the cycleway at Colney Lane, between Hethersett and Colney.
- 5.12 The Highway Authority have assessed the amended proposals and considers that this is an appropriate way to reduce the vehicular demand associated with the development and to encourage cycling and walking within the local area to mitigate the impact of this development.
- 5.13 The Highway Authority have commented that *"the proposed support for completion of the cycleway to Colney along with other measures to enable active travel from the additional dwellings would exert downward pressure on vehicle trips and the Highway Authority considers this would provide suitable mitigation of impact from the proposal, in particular to address concerns previously raised regarding the impact of the proposal at the New Road junction with the B1172."*
- 5.14 Subject to inclusion of the above contribution in a S106 agreement and conditions being secured, the Highway Authority have no objections to the proposal.
- 5.15 In respect of parking provision, it is considered that the indicative plan demonstrates that policy compliant levels of parking could be provided across the site in accordance with the County Highways standards. This would be fully assessed through a Reserved Matters application.
- 5.16 The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Indicative Layout, Open Space and Landscaping

- 5.17 Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy DM3.8 of the Local Plan require new development to be of a high standard of design.
- 5.18 The additional 200 dwelling units will be contained within residential development parcels as set out in the approved Design Code Parameter Plans, which are based on the parameter plans supporting the original planning permission. The additional units have been laid out to comply with other approved aspects of the Design Code, and its Parameter Plans including Land Use; Developable Area, Movement and Access (Vehicular and Pedestrian/Cycle and bus), Landscape Masterplan (and strategy); Building Height, and Density.
- 5.19 The indicative layout shows that the overall design and layout of the development has been drawn to ensure that strong frontages with a variety of house types and loose edges along the rural edges can be achieved, in accordance with the approach required in the approved outline consent.
- 5.20 In terms of density, the scheme proposes an average density of 40 dwellings per hectare to meet the requirements of the design code. Storey heights are mostly 2 storey with an element of 2.5 storey as a focal point or feature within the street scene. Higher densities are proposed towards the centre of the scheme and along the spine road, and lower densities along the western edge, intended to help create a sense of arrival around the central open space, with focal buildings and a transition into the countryside along the rural edge. Further details regarding design will be considered at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 5.21 In summary, the resultant indicative layout is considered to be an acceptable approach to developing the site and in principle complies with Policy DM3.8 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD. Furthermore, the 'uplift' scheme conforms to the approved Design Code Parameter Plans (pursuant to the original outline application and subsequent Reserved Matters applications) which will ensure the scheme integrates well with its surroundings, including the character of the originally approved scheme.
- 5.22 In terms of the amount of public open space, Policy DM3.15 requires new housing development to provide adequate outdoor play facilities and recreational open space commensurate with the level of development proposed in order to meet the need of occupants. The Council's adopted Open Space SPD provides the standards for open space provision as well as the minimum amounts of recreational open space and play facilities to be provided.
- 5.23 The application proposes public open space in accordance with the Council's Open Space SPD. This has been calculated based on an assessment of the approved open space provision across the whole site which has identified a surplus of open space when compared to the approved outline requirements. This is due to an excess of open space being provided on the Strategic Gap land. As such this application proposes to re-distribute some of the open space types across the wider development by upgrading existing spaces, but also includes the provision of open space on the 'uplift' site, to ensure a sufficient open space offering is provided in accordance with the Council's standards.
- 5.24 In terms of what additional open space is needed for the 200 uplift application to meet the SPD requirements, 2.32 hectares of open space of different typologies are needed. Breaking the SPD requirement into the different types and taking into account the 'surplus' of open space, an extra 0.19 hectares of children's play space is needed; 0.14 hectares of Older children's play space and an extra 0.62 hectares of sports pitches and courts are needed.

- 5.25 To meet this need, the following is proposed:
- Upgrading the Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) in phase 4 to a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) and the creation of a play trail in the northern green corridor.
 - Creating an older children's/adult's outdoor recreation trail (trim trail) in the strategic gap.
- 5.26 In terms of sports pitches and courts, these are proposed to be delivered either as part of the new primary school sports pitch or in the event that a community use of the sports pitch at the primary school cannot be secured, to provide sports pitches in the Strategic Gap, which will be delivered through provisions in the S106.
- 5.27 Overall, having quantified the surplus and identified the amount of open space provision required for the additional new housing, I am satisfied that sufficient outdoor play facilities and recreational open space can be provided to meet the open space requirements for this application through a combination of on-site provision and upgrading of some of the open space typologies within the wider development. As such the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policy DM3.15, subject to completion of a S106.
- 5.28 With regards to landscaping, this phase will be subject to submission of details at a later stage based on the approved Design Code. As such it is considered that the proposed landscape impact is acceptable and accords with Policy DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Affordable housing

- 5.29 With regards to affordable housing, the Council currently requires major housing developments to provide at least 28% affordable housing. As indicated above, this scheme proposes to offer 50 affordable homes (28%) of 178 market dwellings. With another 22 being capable of being delivered on an additional area of land by the Local Authority as part of the original planning permission. In the event that the Local Authority do not elect to deliver the additional affordable homes (22 units), then these will revert back to market dwellings, including 28% affordable homes eg 6 affordable units and 16 market units totalling 22 dwellings.
- 5.30 The Council's Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has assessed the proposals and considers that the package of affordable homes offered would provide an acceptable mix of types and tenures to meet a range of housing needs.
- 5.31 Phase 4 is not covered by this uplift application. This is required to meet the provisions of the original S106 and is considered an acceptable way of securing this land option.
- 5.32 Overall, it is considered that the package of affordable housing being offered is acceptable, subject to completion of a S106.

Surface and foul water drainage

- 5.33 An updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with this application based on detailed site investigations carried out by the applicant. The drainage strategy within the FRA follows the principles of the approved outline FRA and Condition 7 of the outline consent which has been approved.
- 5.34 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has carried out a detailed assessment of the information submitted and has subsequently confirmed that the drainage strategy addresses their previous concerns regarding the capacity of some of the proposed attenuation features and as such will result in an acceptable discharge rate into the wider surface water network.

- 5.35 Subsequently the drainage strategy continues to follow the drainage hierarchy as set out in the Building Regulations and NPPF and proposes surface water attenuation within the site with discharge at a restricted rate into the wider watercourse.
- 5.36 It is proposed that a management company be appointed to maintain those parts of the drainage system which are not adopted by Anglian Water.
- 5.37 In summary, it is noted that the LLFA considers that the above strategy provides a sustainable approach to surface water management for the additional new units, that will limit surface water run-off in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and also result in an acceptable rate and volume of run-off to the surrounding water network.
- 5.38 Subject to conditions, to implement the surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the agreed details and to provide details of the maintenance and management regime for all aspects of the drainage scheme, the surface water drainage strategy is considered acceptable and accords with the NPPF and JCS Policy 1.
- 5.39 With regards to foul water drainage, Anglian Water have confirmed that no further upgrades to the existing foul pumping station are required beyond those already proposed as part of the wider Hethersett North proposals. Subject to entering into an agreement with Anglian Water to connect to the sewerage network, the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Ecology and Protected Species

- 5.40 An Environmental Statement addendum relating to Ecology has been submitted in support of the application which has been informed by a preliminary survey of the site. The County Ecologist has reviewed the findings and confirmed that given no evidence of great crested newts has been found then it is appropriate that further surveys for great crested newts can be conditioned if required.
- 5.41 During the survey a number of badger sett entrances were also noted. These have since been monitored in accordance with standing advice to prove if the entrances are active/not active. Following the results of the survey and subsequent checks of the area, it has been confirmed that badgers are not active at the site. However, given that badgers are known to be present in the wider South Norfolk area, and suitable habitats are present on site, a pre-construction condition is recommended requiring a badger walkover approximately 3 months prior to ground works so that if a set is discovered there is sufficient time to develop a suitable mitigation strategy.
- 5.42 The ecology addendum is also supported by surveys for bats, which sets out mitigation measures to minimise the risk of harm to protected species, as well as installing bird and bat boxes and providing details of enhancements for biodiversity for the areas of open space and existing boundary features. Subject to the imposition of the above conditions it is considered that the proposals would not result in significant harm to biodiversity.
- 5.43 Potential impacts on the Beckhithe County Wildlife Site (CWS) have been considered. The CWS, whilst not formally accessible to the public, is used by dog walkers, and this use was predicted to increase as a consequence of the outline planning application. To mitigate the impacts of the consented development and additional uplift, further measures are proposed which include the recent strengthening of the site's boundary fence; the retention and enhancement of green buffers; and the proposed onsite landscape and open space strategy to provide alternatives for walking, recreation etc. A condition is recommended requiring that the approved Ecological Management Plan as part of the outline consent is updated to include the above measures as well as consideration to providing signage, and information packs to residents regarding the provision of recreational Green Infrastructure onsite and areas that are not publicly accessible (i.e. the CWS).

- 5.44 A developer contribution towards the management of the CWS is also proposed to be secured within the S106 Agreement to further mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 5.45 With regards to comments raised regarding the potential for the additional numbers to give rise to minor increases in pollution risk and runoff on the CWS, this has been considered and will be mitigated through adoption of the same precautionary measures as set out in the original planning application, including the proposed surface water drainage strategy which will minimise water runoff, such that the residual effects would remain unchanged.

Residential amenity

- 5.46 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby resident's amenities or the amenities of new occupiers.
- 5.47 It is considered that the indicative layout of the site is adequate to safeguard amenity levels of future residents and that the proposals will not result in a significant adverse impact on resident's amenities in terms of overlooking or overshadowing and is therefore acceptable. A further assessment will be carried out as part of any future Reserved Matters application.
- 5.48 With regards to noise, a Noise Assessment has been undertaken to assess the potential noise impacts of the proposed uplift application during both the construction and operational phases. The Assessment concludes that the recommendations of the original application remain robust when taking the uplift into consideration, including taking into account the 2014 British Standards, and that the noise impact on new and existing residents from the uplift will not result in an adverse effect.
- 5.49 As such the proposals are considered acceptable and satisfy the policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.13 of the Development Management Policy Document.

Heritage Assets

- 5.50 The setting of 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. 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.
- 5.51 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 there would be no significant impact on the character or appearance of the setting of those listed buildings.
- 5.52 This particular application relates to a phase in the north-west area of the site and is separated from existing listed buildings by some distance with existing intervening features such as landscaping and built development.
- 5.53 In consideration of the Council's duties under those Acts and the planning policies it is concluded, 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 and would accord with Policy DM4.10.

Other Issues

Education

- 5.54 Should it be deemed necessary and appropriate to expand the primary school with a further form of entry and associated playing field, sufficient 'white land' (previously identified as school expansion land) next to the primary school on the original outline consent site has been identified to accommodate any necessary school expansion, including additional playing field/sports pitch (potentially available for community use when not in use by the school). This land will be secured and delivered through the Section 106 legal agreement. The construction of the extension and school playing field pitch will be delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Healthcare

- 5.55 Members should note that Healthcare is not currently contained on the District Council's Regulation 123 list, and as such mitigation would not normally be required for primary healthcare. However, in recognising the concerns raised regarding the impacts of this development on existing health facilities and services, the applicant is proposing to offer a financial contribution towards the expansion of primary health care facilities/services within Hethersett to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement.
- 5.56 This is in addition to those already agreed with regards the outline consent for 1,196 dwellings, or land in the strategic gap for a new facility, in lieu of contributions.
- 5.57 In reaching agreement on the amount of contribution required and to ensure that the amount is both fair and reasonable, the applicant has engaged with the NHS who have calculated a contribution based on evidence which underpins the suggested level of contribution. Having carefully considered this information in consultation with the developers and their independent health advisor, an amount of £147,836 has been agreed, which is considered the totality of the health contribution required to fairly, reasonably and proportionately mitigate the health impacts of the uplift application (200 units).
- 5.58 The contribution will be spent on the Humbleyard Practice which serves the Hethersett locality (as indicated/suggested in the NHS responses) and secured as part of the Uplift scheme's S106 obligations.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

- 5.59 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy could be secured by condition.

Other considerations

Environmental Impact Assessment

- 5.60 An Environmental Statement was submitted under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 for this application. I am satisfied that adequate information has been submitted in the Environmental Statement to assess the environmental impact of the proposal, and appropriate consultation and publicity has been undertaken to comply with the above Regulations.

- 5.61 As part of my assessment I have considered and assessed the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors:
- (a) population and human health;
 - (b) biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under EU Directive
 - (c) land, soil, water, air and climate;
 - (d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; and
 - (e) the interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d).
- 5.62 The operational effects of the proposed development have been considered where appropriate, and any significant effects arising from the vulnerability of the proposed development to major accidents or disasters that are relevant to that development.

Financial considerations

- 5.63 The need to support the economy as part of the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic is also a material consideration. This application will provide employment during the construction phase of the project, through the development itself and future occupiers will also contribute to the local economy e.g. when maintaining and servicing their properties and spending in the local area. This weighs in favour of the proposal.
- 5.64 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.65 The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any subsequent reserved matters consent.

Conclusion


- 5.66 The principle of development on the site is acceptable as established through the approved outline consent and Local Plan allocation HET1.
- 5.67 The submitted scheme, makes provision for the key components of the approved design code and parameter plans and is in general conformity with these in terms of Land Use; Developable Area, Movement and Access (Vehicular and Pedestrian/Cycle and bus), Landscaping; Building Heights, and Density. The scheme provides a good design in terms of the indicative layout which has appropriate regard to the wider character of the area. The scheme satisfactorily safeguards neighbour amenity.
- 5.68 It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission which continue to be applicable to this site will need to be reapplied as this application forms a new approval for this area.
- 5.69 The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan and all material planning considerations, and allocation HET1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, the Joint Core Strategy, the NPPF, the Listed Buildings Act 1990 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.
- 5.70 On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and S106 agreement.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions, subject to a S106 agreement relating Education Land for Primary School extension and additional sports pitch, Recreation/open space and maintenance, Affordable housing, Travel Plans, Health contribution, and Wildlife Site Management.

1. Outline permission time limit
2. Standard outline requiring details of Reserved Matters
3. In accordance with submitted details
4. External materials to be agreed
5. Surface water drainage scheme
6. Foul water scheme
7. Standard estate roads
8. Details of estate roads
9. Roads constructed to binder course
10. Construction traffic management, worker parking, wheel washing facilities
11. Travel Plan compliance
12. Archaeological work to be agreed
13. Site-wide monitoring relating to protected species
14. Submission and compliance with ecological mitigation strategy if necessary
15. Lighting design strategy for light-sensitive biodiversity
16. Landscaping scheme and implementation
17. Tree protection scheme
18. Details of site levels
19. Updated landscape and ecology management plan
20. Contaminated land during construction
21. Minerals Management Plan
22. Fire hydrants
23. Water efficiency
24. Renewable energy

Contact Officer	Chris Watts
Telephone Number	01508 533765
E-mail	cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk

2021/1198



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date.
Ordnance Survey License no 100019483



South Norfolk Council, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633

2 Application No : 2021/1198/H
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicant's Name: Mr C Boswell
Site Address Devonian, 3 Brickle Road, Stoke Holy Cross, NR14 8NE
Proposal Proposed one and a half storey extension and external alterations to dwelling.

Reason for reporting to committee:

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary :

Refusal

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application site consists of a double fronted, detached residential property with a single garage attached to its side. The dwelling is in the style of a chalet bungalow although it has a distinctive appearance due to the hips either side of the main ridge. The property features rooms in the roof along with a small rear extension and conservatory. The site is located within the settlement limit for Stoke Holy Cross.
- 1.2 The proposal is for a one and a half storey extension to the rear along with external alterations to the dwelling. The materials proposed are a cream/off white colour washed render to the external walls and black clay pantiles to the roof.

2. Relevant planning history

- 2.1. None

3. Planning Policies

- 3.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
- 3.2. Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
 Policy 2 : Promoting good design
- 3.3. South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies
 DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
 DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
 DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
 DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life

4. Consultations

- 4.1. Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council

07 July 2021 (Revised response): It has been brought to my attention that there is considerable concern from the neighbouring properties regarding this application. The concerns are centred round the large 1st floor window.

I would suggest either a site visit or ask for an amendment to the design before this is considered by the committee as I believe the neighbours have good reason to be concerned.

02 July 2021 (Initial response): We have no concerns with this application.

4.2. District Councillors

Cllr Vivienne Clifford-Jackson;

As discussed and based on my conversations with yourselves, the PC and applicant I am too unsure of this application to agree to approval or refusal without the opinion of the committee. The proposal is large and in close proximity to the boundary, however the shadowing diagram and lack of objection from the adjoining neighbour create a relatively close balance in terms of the overall impact. I feel it would benefit from the scrutiny of Development Management Committee. For that reason, the application is called in.

Cllr Nigel Legg and Cllr Gerry Francis

No comments received

4.3. Other Representations

5 letters of objections have been received, a summary of their concerns is as follows:

- Out of character with existing properties
- Overlooking of properties on Brickle Road, Poringland Road and Brickle Loke and impact the privacy of many residents
- The size of the proposed extension will mean noise is closer to neighbours
- It should be more in-keeping with existing building lines to respect the privacy of all properties close by.
- The large sycamore tree should remain as it is a haven for wildlife.
- The development will be well forward of the current building line.
- the extension is an overdevelopment of the site
- Concerns that the extension will overshadow neighbouring property.

5. Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1. Key considerations include the size, bulk and massing of the rear extension in relation to the impact it will have on residential amenity.

Principle

- 5.2. The principle of altering and extending an existing dwelling is provided through Development Management Policy DM3.4 of the Local Plan. The design, scale, and impact on the surrounding area is assessed against Policies DM3.8 and DM3.13.
- 5.3. Residential extensions within settlements must incorporate a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings whilst not creating an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Any proposal must provide and maintain suitable amenity and utility space as well as adequate access and parking.

Design and Impact on Street Scene

- 5.4 With regards to the design, the form and massing of the dwelling would be increased considerably through the enlargement of the footprint and the height of the extension. However, the design has been well conceived by implementing an arrangement of having rooms in the roof and a relatively simple design with traditional external facing materials, which coupled with the majority of the works being to the rear will have a limited impact on the street scene. In this regard the design of the extension is considered to be acceptable in relation to DM3.8 and criterion a of DM3.4.

Residential Amenity

- 5.5 The property is detached but is bounded by neighbours on either side and to the rear. The increase in size, height, scale, bulk, and massing is considered to cause an overbearing impact on the neighbour to the north (Number 1 Brickle Road) and subsequently considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenity. This results in the proposal not being in accordance with Policy DM3.13 and as mentioned previously, an element of Policy DM3.4.
- 5.6 There was also initial Officer concerns that the proposal would overshadow the neighbouring property too. In response, the applicant provided a daylight/shadow analysis and officers have also conducted its own analysis. These have shown that although the proposal will result in some additional overshadowing it is not considered to be so significant so as to justify a reason for refusal.
- 5.7 A number of representations have been received from neighbours objecting to the proposal including in relation to concerns surrounding the full height glazing to the first floor of the eastern elevation. I have considered the impact the glazing is likely to have on the neighbouring properties and whilst there will be an increase in outlook, it is considered that the distance between the opening and neighbouring properties is such that I do not consider a reason for refusal could be substantiated.

Highways and Parking

- 5.8 The property benefits from ample space to the front and as the proposed extension will have no impact on the access or parking for the property, I am satisfied that sufficient parking provision will be maintained so as to satisfy the requirements of Policy DM3.12.

Other Issues

- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 CIL Liability – This proposal is not liable for CIL under the Regulations.

Conclusion

- 5.11 The proposal raises significant concerns regarding the scale, massing and bulk of the proposal and the impact this will have on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. As such the proposal does not accord with the criteria set out within policies DM3.4, and DM3.13 of the local plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Recommendation: Refusal


1. Impact on residential amenity

6. Reasons for Refusal

- 1 By virtue of its significant size, height, scale, bulk and massing, the proposed rear extension when noting its relative close proximity to 1 Brickle Road it is considered that the extension would have an unacceptable overbearing issue on the occupiers of the aforementioned property and thereby be contrary to the requirements of Policies DM3.4 and DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan which seek to safeguard neighbour amenities.

Contact Officer	Daisy Sutcliffe
Telephone Number	01508 533695
E-mail	daisy.sutcliffe@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk

2021/1300



3. Application No : 2021/1300
Parish : PULHAM MARKET

Applicant's Name: Orchard Homes
Site Address Land north of Guildhall Lane, Pulham Market, Norfolk
Proposal Erection of agricultural gates and fencing

Reason for reporting to committee

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary:

Approval with conditions.

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application seeks retrospective planning permission to erect agricultural gates and fencing which encloses agricultural land along Guildhall Lane in Pulham Market. The land is sloped and the fence measured from its lowest point is 1.15 metres high, with round wooded posts measuring 1.58 metres and gates with a height 1.44 metres. The fence is erected around the perimeter of the site and set back about a metre from the highway boundary with poles spaced at intervals with wire mesh attached. The gates and access points are set back from the road. The agricultural land has been divided into three parcels separated by a 1 metre fence of similar design.
- 1.2 There are neighbouring dwellings immediately to the north which were approved as part of a development under planning application 2018/0598 and an open field to the south. To the east is a row of residential properties which form part of the residential settlement in Pulham Market and to the west is another agricultural field with a detached bungalow.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|----------|
| 2.1 | 2018/0598 | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 10 dwellings and garages, including re-positioning of existing access, provision of two affordable rented homes (plots 2 and 3) and an offsite contribution towards affordable housing | Approved |
|-----|-----------|---|----------|

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 02 : Achieving sustainable development
NPPF 04 : Decision-making
NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
- 3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies
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

4. Consultations

4.1 Pulham Market Parish Council – Objection for the following reasons;

- The agricultural land as identified on the plan is divided into 3 narrow sections with each section adjoining the gardens of the 3 new properties to the north.
- Point 8a of the application, the Agent for Orchard Homes stated that there will be no new or altered pedestrian access proposed to the highway. This response appears to contradict the drawing plan as submitted. The Parish Council seek clarification in this respect.
- Point 10.b of the application, the Agent for Orchard Homes states "No" that there are no trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. The Parish Council wish to receive confirmation/reassurance that the planning condition imposed when the planning authority originally granted consent to 2018/0598 is still current, enforceable and very relevant.
- This condition states that the definitive boundary dividing the gardens from the agricultural land must have continuous hedging/fencing planted once occupation of the houses has commenced.
- This condition did not grant any access between the garden and the agricultural land although currently there appears to be no division between the two areas with the land stretching in one continuous sweep from the back of each house to the edge of Guildhall Lane.
- Parish Council's understanding is that all development should respect, conserve and where possible enhance the landscape surrounding the development. As such they feel that the obligation for hedging and landscaping as approved for the adjoining gardens should be fulfilled.
- Furthermore, the Parish Council considers that to have 3 large gates and one small pedestrian gate, together with fencing so close to each other does not enhance the landscape and seems to be excessive. The Parish Council are concerned with the height of the gates and fencing which they believe are in fact detrimental to the landscape and out of character with the existing open aspect of Guildhall Lane, particularly as there are no other fences or gates on any of the adjacent agricultural land.
- Of grave concern to the Parish Council is the potential access from 3 individual large gates which will be used by agricultural vehicles on to a narrow single-track lane which has no turning facilities anywhere along its length. The Parish Council feel that the associated concerns for health and safety of other road users are a material planning consideration.

4.2 District Councillor - Cllr C Hudson

If officers are minded to approve this application as submitted, then I would request that it should only be determined by the Development Management Committee for the following material reasons and comments:

Highway safety and traffic - The concern being that agricultural vehicles on a very narrow single-track lane which has no turning facilities.

Effect on nearby conservation area / general character - appearance of area.

4.3 NCC Highways

I note that the application is solely for fencing and gates to provide a boundary to the land that is currently classed as agricultural. Having visited the site, the fencing and notably the gates are set well back from Guildhall Lane. As such there are no highway objections to this application.

Guildhall Lane is an unclassified road reference from the Highway Law manual states that one of the most important rights of a landowner is the right under common law to gain access to a road at any point where the land touches it. This right has been much restricted by the Town and Country Planning Act, as the formation of a new means of access to a highway ranks as an engineering operation and requires planning permission (except on unclassified roads where the General Permitted Development Order grants deemed planning permission).

Under Section 184 of the Highways Act where a person `habitually` crosses the footway or verge to gain access to the land then we can insist that the crossing be constructed to our standard, but we cannot prevent access to the land.

Although the proposal includes for the erection of gates, that does not in itself mean that vehicles will be driven onto the land. However, as the entrances are currently not formally surfaced, should a consent be granted, it is requested that a condition be imposed relating to the construction of the access.

4.4 Other representations

One objection was received from a local resident expressing concerns for;

- Future potential applications for vehicle access onto Guildhall Lane
- Guildhall Lane is used for recreational purposes such as dog walkers, walking and exercise by local residents.
- Protection of the village from adverse encroachment.

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 Impact on character of the area
Impact on residential amenity
Impact on highway safety

Impact on the character of the area

- 5.2 The site is land which has been retained for agricultural use and lies to the north of Guildhall Lane and adjacent to residential properties which are part of a development which were approved under planning application 2021/0598.

- 5.3 In terms of design, scale and form, the fencing and gates are in keeping with the intrinsic rural character and are not considered to have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. On the whole, I am satisfied that the agricultural style gates and paddock fencing complies with Policy 2 of the JCS and Policies DM3.8 of the SNLP.

Impact on residential amenity

- 5.4 An objection was raised by a local resident, stating the erected proposal will have a detriment effect on local residents and children who use Guildhall Lane for recreational purposes such as dog walkers and walking due to potential increase in agricultural traffic

which will access the agricultural land. The resident expressed a concern for future potential applications for vehicular accesses onto Guildhall Lane being approved therefore resulting in adverse village encroachment.

- 5.5 Although these concerns can also be assessed for residential amenity concerns, it is considered that the proposals do not affect residential amenity to a significant degree and any future applications will be dealt with if and when submitted. The application complies with Policy DM3.13 of the SNLP.

Impact on highway safety.

- 5.6 The Highway Authority raised no objection on highway grounds and pointed out that the proposals are set well back from Guildhall Lane which is an unclassified road.
- 5.7 It stated that the proposal includes the erection of gates but that does not in itself mean that vehicles will be driven onto the land. However, as the entrances are currently not formally surfaced, should a consent be granted, it requested that a condition be imposed that requires the access to be of a suitable standard.
- 5.8 The Parish Council pointed out that the potential access from three individual large gates which will be used by agricultural vehicles on to a narrow single track lane which has no turning facilities anywhere along its length and this would affect the health and safety of other road users. It is noted that the ground level towards the north of Guildhall Lane slopes and the average height of the erected fence when measured from its lowest point is 1.15 metres. Although not permitted development, it would be open for the applicant to erect a lower means of enclosure that would be permitted development and thus not require planning permission.

Other issues


- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Conclusion

- 5.11 The principle of development is acceptable and the scheme would neither harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area nor highway safety and in the wider sense assist with supporting the local economy therefore, recommended for granting of retrospective planning permission subject to highway condition.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
1. In accordance with submitted drawings
2. Construction of access

Contact Officer Gerald Chimbumbu
Telephone Number 01603 430644
E-mail gchimbumbu@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk



4. Application No : 2021/1365/RVC
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicant's Name: Mrs Kathryn Cross
Site Address Barnards Farm Youngmans Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0RR
Proposal Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2016/2483 to enable Sunday/bank holiday opening and extend evening opening hours.

Reason for reporting to committee

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary:

Approval with conditions

1 Proposal and site context

1.1 This application seeks to vary the opening hours of a cafe that was previously granted planning permission under application ref. 2016/2483. The building is a former farm shop and duck rearing shed at the site which accommodates a number of dog related businesses. It is located to the north of Wymondham approximately one mile to the north of Tuttles Lane West and is accessed from Barnham Broom Road to the west.

1.2 The relevant condition states:-

The cafe shall not be open to customers except between the hours of 09:00 - 18:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays. There shall be no Sunday or Bank Holidays opening.

1.3 This application seeks to vary that condition by opening from 10:00 to 16:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays and extending the evening opening hours (without dogs) from Monday to Saturday from 18:00 to 21:00 Monday to Friday and 16:00 to 21:00 on Saturday.

1.4 Of particular relevance is that in March 2019, planning permission was refused to extend opening hours to 22:00 hours from Monday to Friday as well as the extended openings hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays as identified above. The reason for refusal was:

The proposed extension of the café opening hours on Sundays and bank holidays and its use for meetings and exercise classes on weekday evenings will introduce additional activity to the site outside of the current opening hours. The parking area is close to the neighbouring properties and the reliance by visitors on the private car will cause additional noise and disturbance late in the evening when people are leaving the site. For these reasons the proposal to extend the opening hours of the café on weekdays will be harmful to residential amenity and is considered to conflict with policy DM2.1 (6) and with policy DM3.13 of the SNLP 2015.

1.5 In support of the current application, the applicant has stated that at its core, her business promotes the enjoyment of a healthy lifestyle involving pets and dogs. She has stated that many people are best able to fully enjoy time with their pets at weekends - particularly on Sundays and bank holidays - and queried whether being unable on Sundays make the continuation of the business realistic. The opportunity to open during the extended hours will also allow the business to regain momentum lost during the pandemic.

2. Relevant planning history

2.1	2008/1065	Change of use of redundant agricultural building to form annex with extension	Approved
2.2	2009/1120	Change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to form two residential dwellings	Approved
2.3	2016/1993	Change of use from agricultural to dog exercise field	Approved
2.4	2016/2483	Conversion of Existing Barns from a farm shop and a duck rearing shed to a cafe and a dog grooming parlour, with associated external works and driveway improvement	Approved
2.5	2017/0823	Change of use to dog agility training area and seasonal use of land for seating area/small play area for customers of dog friendly cafe	Approved
2.6	2017/1884	Variation of condition 2 of permission 2016/2483 (Conversion of Existing Barns from a farm shop and a duck rearing shed to a cafe and a dog grooming parlour, with associated external works and driveway improvement) - rearrangement of internal layout with minor revisions to elevations	Approved
2.7	2018/0624	Dog day care centre to include a secure fenced area and small building	Refused
2.8	2018/0833	Discharge of condition 7 from planning consent 2017/0823 - Details of hedging and trees along the north section of the site.	Refused
2.9	2018/0835	Variation of condition 6 of permission 2017/0823 (Change of use to from agriculture to dog agility and seasonal use for recreation) - amendment of opening hours to 09:00 - 20:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 to 18:00 on Saturdays.	Approved
2.10	2018/1380	Discharge of condition 6-Ecology and 9-Fume extraction of planning consent 2016/2483	Approved
2.11	2018/1929	Retrospective application for retention of two soil bunds created to form an instant sound and privacy barrier between Centre Paws Norfolk at Barnards Farm and Blackthorn Barn.	Approved

2.12	2019/0053	Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2016/2483/F - to allow for varying of opening hours (Conversion of Existing Barns from a farm shop and a duck rearing shed to a cafe and a dog grooming parlour, with associated external works and driveway improvement)	Refused
2.13	2019/0438	Discharge of condition 7 - landscaping scheme of planning permission 2017/0823.	under consideration
2.14	2019/0593	Variation of condition 5 of planning permission 2016/2483 - to revise location and increase size of the car parking area.	
2.15	2019/2016	Change of use including the erection of log cabin to provide a canine and small animal massage business	Approved
2.16	2019/2296	Retention of car park	Approved
2.17	2020/1685	Details of condition 1 of 2019/2296 - re-surfacing of vehicular access.	Approved
2.18	2020/1694	Change of use of part of building to run a small canine hydrotherapy business	Approved
2.19	2021/1366	Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 2021/0272 to enable Sunday/bank holiday opening.	Approved
2.20	2021/1367	Variation of condition 6 of planning permission 2018/0835 to enable Sunday/bank holiday opening.	under consideration

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 06 : Building a strong, competitive economy
- 3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
Policy 5 : The Economy
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside
- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
- 3.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan

No relevant policies

4. Consultations

4.1 Wymondham Town Council

Original comments:

Application should be refused due to it being an unneighbourly form of development - noise concerns during unsocial hours.

Comments following reconsultation:

Application should be approved.

4.2 District Councillor - Cllr J Hornby

Original comments

Can I request that Planning Applications 2021/1365 and 2021/1367 be determined by the Development Management Committee if you are minded to approve these two applications.

This is due to fears I have about loss of neighbouring amenity to nearby properties and the harm these variations would do to what is a very rural and tranquil area.

I also have concerns about the increase in traffic volumes if the proposed Dog Shows were to take place as I feel this would put unacceptable pressure on the highway network surround Barnards Farm.

Comments following reconsultation

To be reported if appropriate.

4.3 NCC Highways

No objections.

4.4 Other representations

Original comments:

19 comments received in support of the application with the following issues raised:-

- Centre Paws is a useful amenity
- Visitors are bemused to find that facilities are closed on Sundays and Bank Holidays
- Have never seen any issues with noise
- Allows economic development
- Provides supported activities for those with health conditions
- Promotes responsible dog ownership
- Centre Paws has enhanced the area.
- Allows people to be sensible with COVID situation
- Seems a pity that it should not be available on days the community would most like to use it. Impact on Sundays and Bank Holidays would be minor as traffic uses Barnham Broom Road rather than Youngmans Road.
- Initial concern for open evenings was allayed by visiting the applicant, seeing the size and position of the back room and obtaining agreement that opening hours be modified so closing would be no later than 9pm.

One other comment received:

- 21:00 hours would be a more suitable opening time from Monday to Friday. Do not object to cafe being open Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Comments following reconsultation:

Two letters/emails of support received.

One comment received stating that the amended times for 2021/1365 are more acceptable and we have no further comment to make on this proposal.

5. Assessment

Key considerations

5.1 Residential amenity
Highway safety

Residential amenity

5.2 In its original form, the application proposed to open on Sundays and Bank Holidays from 10:00 to 16:00 and to open in the evenings from Monday to Saturday without dogs from 18:00 to 22:00 Monday to Friday and 16:00 to 21:00 on Saturday. During the course of the application, the 22:00 proposal was reduced to 21:00.

5.3 In March 2019, an application to vary the opening hours was refused. As part of that application, permission was sought to allow the cafe to open on Sundays and Bank Holidays from 10:00 to 16:00 and to open in the evening from Monday to Friday (without dogs) from 18:00 to 22:00 and from 16:00 to 21:00 on Saturdays from meetings and quiet exercise classes. That application was refused on the grounds that these opening hours would introduce a level of activity that would result in noise and disturbance late in the evening when people are leaving the site and so be harmful to the residential amenity of nearby neighbours.

5.4 In its original form, the current application proposed the same opening hours but following the consultation process, the applicant amended the hours by reducing the Monday to Friday evening closure from 22:00 to 21:00. This appears as a relatively modest amendment but it is nevertheless significant in terms of how residents' may tolerate activity at the site. Customer activity and noise up to and including 21:00 is a rather different experience to customer activity and noise up to 22:00 where there may be a different level of expectation and tolerance. In my view, 21:00 strikes a fair balance between the needs of the business and the living conditions of those nearest neighbours and allows the proposal to comply with Policy DM3.13.

Highway safety

5.5 The proposed increased opening hours will inevitably increase visitor numbers to the cafe and associated vehicular movements to and from the site. However, the Highway Authority has not objected to the application. The application complies with Policy DM3.11 of the SNLP.

Other matters

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 The need to support the economic recovery during and following the COVID-19 pandemic is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the applications. However, they are acceptable for the reasons set out above meaning that this is not a decisive factor in its consideration.
- 5.8 This application is not liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Conclusion


- 5.9 When having regard to those matters raised and as referred to above, I consider that the application strikes a fair balance between the needs of the business and living conditions of neighbouring residential properties without resulting in adverse highway conditions. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

- 1 In accordance with submitted plans
- 2 Visibility splays
- 3 Parking
- 4 Dogs on site
- 5 Hours of opening
- 6 Plant/machinery

Contact Officer	Glen Beaumont
Telephone Number	01508 533821
E-mail	glen.beaumont@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk

2021 1848 & 1849



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date.
Ordnance Survey License no 100019483



South Norfolk Council, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633

5. **Application No :** **2021/1848/H**
 Parish : **FORNCETT**

Applicant's Name: Mr S Taylor
Site Address The Granary Northfield Road Forncett St Peter NR16 1JY
Proposal Erection of single storey and two storey extension. (retrospective application following 2018/2611)

6. **Application No :** **2021/1849/LB**
 Parish : **FORNCETT**

Applicant's Name: Mr S Taylor
Site Address The Granary Northfield Road Forncett St Peter NR16 1JY
Proposal Erection of single storey and two storey extension. (retrospective application following 2018/2612)

Reason for reporting to Committee

The Local Member has requested that the applications be determined by the Development Management Committee for reasons given in section 4 of this report.

Recommendation summary:

Approval with Conditions

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 These applications seek listed building consent and planning permission to retain a 1.5-storey extension and single storey extension to a grade II listed dwelling, The Granary. The building was formerly an agricultural cart shed and hayloft serving Lime Tree Farm. The site is situated outside of the development boundary and is set back from the road with large garden area to the east side. There are immediate neighbours to the north, Broad Barn, and to the east side, The Stables.
- 1.2 The Granary, The Stables and Barn to the north are all rendered clay lump buildings that date from the 19th century and are individually listed grade II, for group value. Lime Tree Farmhouse to the far west side is also grade II listed and is timber frame, dating from the 17th century.
- 1.3 Planning permission was granted in 1990 to convert the former cart shed to a dwelling together with conversion of the adjacent stables to the west to one dwelling, and barns to the north to three dwellings. Conversion of the outbuildings has subdivided the site into separate curtilage areas.
- 1.4 In 2018 planning permission and listed building consent were granted by the Development Management Committee for a two storey extension at the south side of The Granary and single storey extension at the rear, all to provide additional living accommodation on the ground floor and a master bedroom suite at first floor level. The walls and roof of the extensions have all been constructed but not in accordance with the approved details. The 1.5 storey extension to the south side has been built taller than the approved details, as has the single storey range to the west side where it meets the existing rear elevation.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|
| 2.1 | 1988/2987 | Conversion of farm buildings to four Residential units | Approved |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|

2.2	1990/1771	Renewal of 07/88/2987/F extension and alterations for Conversion of farm buildings to four residential dwellings	Approved
2.3	1990/1772	Renewal of 07/88/2987/F extension And alterations for Conversion of farm buildings to four residential dwellings	Approved
2.4	2015/1615	Proposed extensions and alterations.	Withdrawn
2.5	2015/1616	Proposed extensions and alterations.	Withdrawn
2.6	2016/0896	Proposed extensions and alterations (revised application)	Refused
2.7	2016/0898	Proposed extensions and alterations (revised application)	Refused
2.8	2018/2611	Erection of single storey and two storey extensions	Approved
2.9	2018/2612	Erection of single storey and two storey extensions	Approved
2.10	2019/1645	Erection of garden room	Approved
2.11	2019/1646	Erection of garden room	Withdrawn
2.12	2019/1647	Proposed extension to out-building to increase size of garage, creation of first floor and cart shed	Approved
2.13	2019/1648	Proposed extension to out-building to increase size of garage, creation of first floor and cart shed	Withdrawn
2.14	2019/2524	Details for condition 3 and 5 of 2018/2612 - (3) materials (5) rooflights	Approved
2.15	2019/2539	Discharge of conditions 3 and 5 of planning application 2018/2611 - Materials & roof light	Approved
2.16	2019/2547	Details for condition 3 of 2019/1645 - (3) materials	Approved
2.17	2019/2548	Details for condition 3 of 2019/1647 - (3) rooflights and roof tiles	Approved
2.18	2019/2550	Erection of new stable building on existing paddock and creation of new access	Approved
2.19	2019/2551	Erection of new hayloft	Approved
2.20	2020/0647	Extensions to existing garage to form additional under cover parking and workshop with first floor playroom and storage areas (revision to 2019/1647)	Approved

2.21	2020/2237	Details for condition 4 of 2018/2612 - window and door details	Approved
2.22	2020/2259	Discharge of condition 4 from 2019/1645 - Details of doors	Approved
2.23	2020/2260	Details for condition 4 of 2018/2611 - window and door details	Approved

Appeal History

2.24 None relevant

3 Planning Policies

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
NPPF 16 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document
DM3.6 : House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

3.4 **Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings and their setting:**

S16(2) and S66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission or listed building consent 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. Consultations

4.1 Fornceett Parish Council

Neither objects or supports the Planning Application - 'No objection in principle to this application but it is obviously particularly important that works on listed buildings are exactly according to approved plans.'

4.2 District Councillor - Cllr B Duffin

The proposal has been discussed with the Local Member who has requested the application should only be decided by the Planning Committee due to the potential impact on heritage assets and neighbour amenity.

4.3 Other representations

Objection received from the immediate neighbour at The Stables stating that the original application was granted on the basis that the structure was to be erected to the size and height stipulated within the submitted application which were at the limit of acceptability. The larger, unauthorised structure has been constructed in a manner that demonstrates a total disregard for the Council's authority. There are inconsistencies between the actual

height of the unauthorised constructed building and those detailed within the architect's plans for the retrospective application. Discrepancies between the actual height of the structure and those within the new plans are contradictory/misleading.

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 Principle
Design/Heritage assets
Impact on neighbour amenity

Principle

- 5.2 The principle of carrying out alterations to a listed building is acceptable under national and Local Plan policies regarding heritage assets subject to an assessment of the impact of proposals on the special interest/significance of the listed building. In this case, in view of the adjacent listed buildings, regard for the impact on the setting has also to be considered.
- 5.3 The principle of extending a dwelling in the open countryside is acceptable under policy DM3:6 of the Local Plan 2015 providing proposals are appropriate to the character of the immediate area and its wider landscape setting and will not result in unacceptable harm to neighbour amenity.

Design/Heritage assets

- 5.4 When viewing the newly constructed extensions, they are taller than the extension on the approved drawings. The submitted proposed elevation details indicate the increase at the south side is between 250mm - 300mm.
- 5.5 The highest part of the extension still remains lower than the existing house and this together with the degree of separation provided by the lower height of the link section still allows the extension to appear sufficiently subordinate to the original listed building without harming views, the overall design, detailing and material finishes being in keeping with the more agricultural character of the site and wider setting. The slight increase in the height of the single storey lean-to where it meets the existing rear elevation of the building is a relatively minor change that sits comfortably on the building. It is therefore considered that compared with the approved scheme, the increase in the height of the extensions will not result in any harm to the listed building or result in harm to views of the wider setting of the site.
- 5.6 In light of the requirements of section 16 and 66 of the Act the proposal will not result in harm to the special historic/architectural interest of the listed building and setting of other listed buildings adjacent to the site and therefore it accords with national and Local Plan policies regarding design and heritage assets.

Neighbour Amenity

- 5.7 Comments have been received from The Stables objecting to the applications for the following reasons: disregard shown to the previous decision of the Council, the extension having been built larger than the approved scheme; the previous scheme was approved on the basis that its size was at the limit of acceptability; there are discrepancies between the actual height of the structure and those within the new plans are contradictory/misleading.
- 5.8 The previous approval was granted based on the size of the building presented in the submitted drawings and therefore it should have been constructed in accordance with these details to remain authorised. The permission was not granted specifically on the

basis that it was at the limit of acceptability, although, as with any such extension scheme, any increase in height may be unacceptable. As the extension has not been built in

accordance with the approved drawings, under the planning regulations applicants can submit further retrospective applications in order to try and obtain approval for the completed works. Retrospective applications are considered under the same policy considerations as the original approval.

- 5.9 The amount by which the extension at the south side has been increased in height is given as 250mm – 300mm and whilst it is acknowledged that there may be a small margin of error in the submitted drawings of the completed extension works, having been able to view the completed works, it is considered that the submitted details reflect sufficiently the difference in size between the completed extensions and the previously approved scheme.
- 5.10 An assessment of the impact of the completed larger extension on neighbour amenity has been carried out in a site visit and it is considered that the amount by which the height of the extension has been increased compared with the approved scheme is not unacceptably overbearing or will result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy. It is therefore considered that the completed scheme of works accords with policy DM3.13 of the Local Plan 2015.

Other Issues

- 5.11 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.
- 5.12 The proposed construction phase of the development will provide employment resulting in an economic benefit that weighs in favour of the proposal.
- 5.13 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

- 5.14 This larger scheme of extension is still considered to be an appropriate design, the size of which does not result in harm heritage assets or result in an unacceptable level of harm to neighbour amenity. It is therefore recommended to the Development Management Committee that the applications be approved.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
2021/1848


- 1 In accordance with submitted drawings

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
2021/1849

- 1 In accordance with submitted details
- 2 Details of PV panels to be submitted for approval
- 3 External materials and roof lights
- 4 Window/door details

Contact Officer Philip Whitehead
Telephone Number 01508 533948
E-mail pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk

2021/2069 and 2021/2070



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date.
Ordnance Survey License no 100019483



South Norfolk Council, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633

7. **Application Nos:** **2021/2069/F**
 Parish: **DISS**
- Applicant's Name: Mr T Atkins
Site Address: 4 Denmark Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4LE
Proposal: Proposed change of use from Office to C3 Residential to two
 separate buildings No. 4 and 'The Barn' (no changes to the building
 fabric)

8. **Application Nos:** **2021/2070/LB**
 Parish: **DISS**
- Applicant's Name: Mr T Atkins
Site Address: 4 Denmark Street Diss Norfolk IP22 4LE
Proposal: Proposed change of use from Office to C3 Residential to two
 separate buildings No. 4 and 'The Barn' (no changes to the building
 fabric)

Reason for reporting to Committee

The proposal would result in the loss of employment.

Recommendation summary:

Approval with Conditions

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 These applications seek planning permission and listed building consent to change the use of 4 Denmark Street from offices to residential. The property is in two parts and comprises a two-storey building towards the front and a two-storey building (the Barn) at the rear that are separated by a courtyard area. Number 4 is accessed directly from Denmark Street; The Barn is accessed via a covered area next to number 4 that leads to the courtyard area. Both buildings have offices on both floors, kitchen areas and toilet facilities. Number 4 is proposed to be converted into a two-bed dwelling and the barn into a one-bed dwelling. No alterations are proposed internally or externally.
- 1.2 The property is Grade II listed and is part of a historic group along the eastern side of Denmark Street at its northern end. It is also within the Diss conservation area.
- 1.3 Neighbouring properties comprise a mews dwelling to the south, dwellings adjoining to the north and a mixture of commercial and residential properties on the western/opposite side of Denmark Street.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---|----------|
| 2.1 | 2016/1023 | Proposed change of use from B1 Office to C3 Residential (no changes to the building fabric) | Approved |
| 2.2 | 2016/1024 | Proposed change of use from B1 Office to C3 Residential (no changes to the building fabric) | Approved |
| 2.3 | 1983/1124 | Change of use from residential to office | Approved |
| 2.4 | 1983/1124/01 | Change of use from residential to office (listed building consent) | Approved |

3 Planning Policies

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

NPPF 02 : Achieving sustainable development

NPPF 04 : Decision-making

NPPF 05 : Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF 06 : Building a strong, competitive economy

NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places

NPPF 16 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)

Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

Policy 2 : Promoting good design

Policy 5 : The Economy

Policy 13 : Main Towns

3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) Development Management Policies Document

DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development

DM2.2 : Protection of employment sites

DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within settlements

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

DM4.10 : Heritage assets

3.4 **Statutory duties relating to listed buildings, setting of listed buildings and conservation areas:**

Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provide that in considering whether to grant planning permission or listed building consent 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.

Section 72 of the same Act provides: *“In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”*

4. Consultations

4.1 Diss Town Council

To be reported if appropriate.

4.2 District Councillors

To be reported if appropriate.

4.3 NCC Highways

No objections.

4.4 Other representations

No comments received.

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 Principle of development
Heritage
Residential amenity

Principle of development

- 5.2 By way of background, the property was previously a dwelling and was granted planning permission and listed building consent in 1983 to be converted from a dwelling into an office. In more recent times, in June 2016, consent was granted to convert number 4 back into residential use. This was not implemented but of note is that the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies that are in place today were in place at the time of those consents. That application did not include the barn though.
- 5.3 It is understood that the buildings have been vacant for some time, including before the 2016 applications and although just outside of Diss town centre (as defined by Policy DM2.5 of the SNLP), Policy DM2.2 of the SNLP is engaged. This seeks to safeguard buildings currently or last used for employment use and permits the loss of such uses where:-
 - a) the possibility of re-using or redeveloping the site/premises for a range of alternative business purposes has been fully explored and it can be demonstrated that the premises is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for an employment use;
 - or
 - b) there would be an overriding economic, environmental or community benefit from redevelopment or change to another use that outweighs the benefit of the current lawful use continuing.
- 5.4 As part of the application for planning permission, no information has been submitted from the applicant to demonstrate compliance with either of these criteria. Nevertheless, in this case I consider it appropriate to take a pragmatic approach. When dealing with the applications in 2016, the case officer was satisfied that the re-letting of the building had not been successful. For the current application, I take the view that the property has a residential appearance, it was once used for residential purposes, it has residential properties on either side, it has not been used for business purposes for a number of years and in my experience, its size, layout, appearance and location relative to the main town centre alongside the current economic climate are unlikely to make it an attractive proposition for continued business use. Having regard to these factors, I consider that the loss of these modest business premises will not have a telling impact on job opportunities and economic growth within Diss and beyond and I am satisfied that in principle, that change of use of these premises is acceptable.

Heritage

- 5.5 No changes are being proposed to the property. As such, the special historic and architectural interest of the buildings will be preserved as will the character and appearance of the conservation area. This contributes to the applications meeting the tests set by sections 16, 66(1) and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as well as complying with Policy 1 of the JCS and Policies DM3.4, DM3.8 and DM4.10 of the SNLP.

Residential amenity

- 5.6 The buildings are being retained as they are with no internal and external changes. There will not be a significant adverse impact on the neighbours. Instead, the main issue is how the buildings relate to each other. Certainly there will be some amount of mutual views of each other and overlooking of the modest amenity areas but when taking account of the townscape of the immediate area with buildings in close proximity to each other, alleyways and shared accesses, in this instance I do not consider that such an arrangement will result in such a level of harm to warrant refusal of the application. On the whole, I consider that living conditions will be acceptable for residents and allow the proposal to comply with Policies DM3.4(b) and DM3.13 of the SNLP.

Other matters

- 5.7 The Highway Authority has not objected to the application on the grounds of highway safety. In respect of parking, none is provided which is not particularly unusual for a historic property of this type in this location but it the site is nevertheless sustainable in transport terms with ready access to a range of day to day services and facilities and non-car modes of travel. Policy DM3.12 allows for regard to be given to local conditions and with that and the Highway Authority's comments in mind, the proposal complies with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the SNLP.
- 5.8 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act, the Council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.9 The need to support the economic recovery during and following the COVID-19 pandemic is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the applications. However, they are acceptable for the reasons set out above meaning that this is not a decisive factors in its consideration.
- 5.10 The application for planning permission is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy as the building does not appear to have been used for 6 out of the last 36 months.

Conclusion

- 5.11 In having regard to those matters raised, the applications represent an acceptable form of development in a sustainable location that will preserve the special interest of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area while providing suitable living conditions for residents and neighbours. The applications comply with the provisions of the development plan as a whole and are recommended for approval.

Recommendation
2021/2069 :

Approval with Conditions

- 1 Time limit - full permission
- 2 In accordance with submitted plans

Recommendation
2021/2070 :

Approval with Conditions

- 1 Time limit – listed building
- 2 In accordance with submitted plans

Contact Officer
Telephone Number
E-mail

Glen Beaumont
01508 533821
glen.beaumont@southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk

2021/1786



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date.
Ordnance Survey License no 100019483



South Norfolk Council, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633

9. Application No : 2021/1786/F
Parish : KETTERINGHAM

Applicant's Name: Mr Nathan Riches
Site Address Unit 1 Station Lane Ketteringham NR9 3AZ
Proposal Change of use from vehicle depot and storage to MOT and vehicle repair workshop, with associated renovation and front extension

Reason for reporting to committee

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary :

Approval with Conditions

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The site comprises of an existing building on land adjacent to South Norfolk Council's depot at Ketteringham which is used in conjunction with the business at NR Asphalt whose main site is close by. The building was until recently owned by South Norfolk Council and leased to NR Asphalt but is now entirely in the ownership of NR Asphalt.
- 1.2 The site has previously been used as a vehicle depot and associated workshop. The applicant now wishes to use the building to a vehicle repair and MOT workshop use. To facilitate this the building will be renovated and extended.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|----------|
| 2.1 | 2007/2700 | Siting of portakabins | Approved |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|----------|

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 02 : Achieving sustainable development
NPPF 04 : Decision-making
NPPF 06 : Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
NPPF 14 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 5 : The Economy
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside
- 3.3 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
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
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
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council

No comments received

4.2 District Councillor

To Committee

- the applicant has a relationship with the Council and therefore in the interests of openness and transparency the application should be considered by Development Management Committee

4.3 NCC Highways

No objections

4.4 Other Representations

No other representations received

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 The main issues for consideration are the principle of the development, the visual impact of the works proposed, access and parking, any impact on neighbouring properties and drainage.

Principle

- 5.2 Policy DM2.1 supports business class proposals within existing employment sites. As such, the change of use is acceptable in principle.

Visual Impact

- 5.3 The renovations to the building will modernise the building. Whilst the building is and will remain a functional building the use of new panelling will help improve the appearance of the building. The neutral grey PVC-coated steel panels have also been chosen to minimise the visual impact of the increase in roof height of the building. In regard to the front extension, this does not project as far forward as the adjoining depot buildings, whilst it's design is in keeping with the nature of the building and the surrounding context. As such it is considered that it will not have an adverse impact on the street scene.
- 5.4 The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and visual impact and accords with policy DM3.8 of the Local Plan.

Access and Parking

- 5.5 Access to the site will remain as existing, which is capable of accommodating large vehicles accessing the site for the existing use of the site and building and therefore will be acceptable for this use. The proposed use will tend to be accessed by smaller

vehicles, but these will be limited by the physical capacity of the building. Norfolk County Council's Highways Officer raises no objections to the proposals and as such it is considered to accord with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the Local Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

- 5.6 The site immediately adjoins commercial uses which the proposed use will not have an adverse impact on. There are a small number of residential properties in the wider vicinity, however there are intervening commercial uses between this site and those properties which would have more of an impact on them. In addition, the site can be accessed from the A11 without passing any residential properties. As such it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable under policy DM3.13 of the Local Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 5.7 The site is flood risk zone 1 and is therefore not at risk from fluvial flooding, nor does the site have any identified surface water flood risk.
- 5.8 Foul drainage is proposed to a new treatment plant to replace the existing septic tank. This is considered an acceptable solution and is to be secured by condition.

Other Issues

- 5.9 The need to support the economy as part of the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic is a material consideration. This application will likely provide employment during the construction phase of the project and also as a business. This weighs in favour of the proposal.
- 5.10 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.11 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the proposal does not create more than 100sqm of new floor space and the existing floor space has been in use for at least six continuous months in the last three years.

Conclusion

- 5.12 The use of the site as an MOT and vehicle repair workshop is acceptable, as the site is an existing commercial premises and the use will not have an unacceptable impact on surrounding uses or the local highway network.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 In accordance with submitted drawings
- 3 Foul drainage -sealed system/package
- 4 External lighting
- 5 Contaminated land during construction

Contact Officer Tim Barker
Telephone Number 01508 533848
E-mail tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk

2021/1896



© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date.
Ordnance Survey License no 100019483



South Norfolk Council, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633

10. Application No : 2021/1896/F
Parish : BURSTON

Applicant's Name: Mr Nigel Frankland
Site Address Bell Cottage Back Lane Burston IP22 5TT
Proposal Demolition of existing double garage and erection of proposed double garage with annexe above.

Reason for reporting to committee

The Local Member has requested that the application be determined by the Development Management Committee for appropriate planning reasons as set out below in section 4.

Recommendation summary :

Refusal

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application site consists of a residential property with a detached single storey garage located within the open countryside. The dwelling is a two storey rendered cottage style property which has had a previous first floor extension and single storey conservatory on the rear of the property.
- 1.2 The proposal is to demolish the existing garage and replace it with a double garage with an annexe/studio on the first floor level. The proposed building includes a dormer window facing across the garden of the application site. The materials to be used are proposed to match the existing.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|
| 2.1 | 2005/0447 | Proposed erection of first floor extension and conservatory to rear of dwelling with single storey extension to side | Approved |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
- 3.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies
DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
DM3.6 : House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside
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

4. Consultations

- 4.1 Burston Parish Council

No comments received

4.2 District Councillor

To go to committee. Nearest property is some 200 metres and proposal is shielded trees. All other sides of building overlooks countryside. The shape of the development is small and in keeping with the existing dwelling.

4.3 SNC Water Management Officer

No comments received

4.4 NCC Highways

No Highways comments

4.5 Other Representations

No responses received

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 Key considerations include the position of the garage and annexe and its relationship with the main dwelling, its design and the impact on residential amenity and the surrounding area.

Principle

- 5.2 The principle of the provision of annex accommodation is provided through Development Management Policy DM3.7 of the Local Plan. This policy is supportive subject to its position and relationship with the main dwelling and assessment against other relevant development management policies. The design, scale and impact on the surrounding area of the new building is assessed against Policies DM3.4 and DM3.6.

Principle of an annexe

- 5.3 In terms of relationship to the dwelling, the garage with annexe/studio above is situated close to the original property. The proposed annex/studio would be accessed from a new pedestrian door constructed in a side elevation opening on to the garden of the original dwelling. On balance, it is considered that the relationship of the annexe/studio is situated close enough to the original dwelling to be in compliance with the aims of policy DM3.7 subject to a condition the restricting use.

Design and relationship with the dwelling

- 5.4 With regard to the design, the form and mass of the garage would be increased through the enlargement of the footprint of the building and also the increase in the height and inclusion of the dormer window. The overall height of the building will be 5.89 metres.
- 5.5 It is considered that the design and increase in scale of the building will compete with the original property. When viewed from the access to the property and the approach from the south the building will no longer appear subservient to the main dwelling. The proposed building will therefore not accord with Policy DM3.4.

Impact on surrounding area

- 5.6 Although the property does benefit from mature hedging on part of the boundaries of the site the new building will be visible from the access to the dwelling and from other

viewpoints in particular from the approach to the south of the property. Due to the openness of the surrounding area the proposed building will highly visible. Therefore while the hedging is a potential mitigating feature they do not prevent harm being caused to the surrounding area or the landscape setting of the property. By virtue of the scale and position of the building the proposal will be contrary to Policy DM3.6

Residential amenity

- 5.7 The property is in an isolated location with no near neighbouring properties. Therefore there will be no impact on residential amenity and the proposal accords with Policy DM3.13

Highways and Parking

- 5.8 The Highways Officer was consulted on the application and has no highway objections to the proposal. The proposed building will have no impact on the access or parking for the property.

Other Issues

- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 CIL Liability – The annexe accommodation is liable for CIL under the Regulations

Conclusion

- 5.11 The position of the building complies with Policy DM3.7 in terms of the relationship of the main dwelling, there is sufficient parking and the proposal does not impact on residential amenity or highway safety. However, there are significant concerns regarding the scale and design of the proposal and the impact this will have on the original dwelling and the surrounding open countryside. As such the proposal does not accord with the criteria set out within policies DM3.4, DM3.6 or DM3.8 of the local plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Recommendation : Refusal

- 1 Impact on original dwelling
- 2 Impact on the Street scene

Reasons for Refusal

- 1 By virtue of its design, mass and height the proposed garage with annexe/studio above it considered to be overbearing and out of keeping with the existing dwelling and as such is detrimental to the character and appearance of the original building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM3.4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan
- 2 The proposed garage with annexe above is of a design height and scale that would not be compatible with the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the landscape setting of the property and would therefore not accord with Policy DM3.6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer Lynn Armes
Telephone Number 01508 533960
E-mail larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Item 7 Planning Appeals

Appeals received from 9th September 2021 to 7th October 2021

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision
2021/0865	Swardeston 34 The Common Swardeston NR14 8EB	Mr Reece Broomfield	Retrospective application for erection of Balcony balustrade	Development Management Committee	Refusal
2020/0333	Brooke Brooke House Brooke Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1JH	Mr Muj Malik	Extension to Brooke House to provide an additional 26 bedroom care facility (Class C2), with associated ancillary uses, highway and landscape works	Development Management Committee	Refusal
2021/0372	Chedgrave Land Adjacent to Wayside Pits Lane Chedgrave Norfolk	Miss Mirella McGee	Erection of a single storey dwelling.	Delegated	Refusal
2020/1157	Costessey Land South of Kestrel Avenue Costessey Norfolk	Mr Nnewima Nwaforizu	Erection of 2 bungalows with Associated Parking	Development Management Committee	Refusal
2021/0211	Costessey Land to the rear of 7 Longwater Lane Costessey Norfolk	Mr David Thomson	Outline application for new dwelling with access	Delegated	Refusal

Planning Appeals

Appeals received from 9th September 2021 to 7th October 2021

2021/0344	Trowse With Newton 1A And 1B The Street Trowse Norfolk NR14 8SX	Mr M Manimaran	Rise roof height to match neighbouring property	Delegated	Refusal
2020/0785	Costessey Land adjacent to Eastwood Lodge Townhouse Road Costessey Norfolk	Mr Eric Pooley	Proposed new dwelling (re-submission of 2019/2215).	Delegated	Refusal

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 9th September 2021 to 7th October 2021

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision	Appeal Decision
2011/1666	Wortwell Granary Barn Wortwell Hall Farm Low Road Wortwell	Mr T Gentleman	Repair & re-erection of collapsed barn caused by storm damage and conversion to residential use	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2011/1732	Wortwell Granary Barn Wortwell Hall Farm Low Road Wortwell	Mr T Gentleman	Repair & re-erection of collapsed barn caused by storm damage and conversion to residential use	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 9th September 2021 to 7th October 2021

2020/1006	Kirby Cane Wardley Hill Campsite Wardley Hill Road Kirby Cane NR35 2PQ	Joe, Holly and Ralph Putman	Proposed Campsite Service Building with Wardens accommodation and extension of campsite total area to South boundary	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal Allowed
2020/2001	Hingham Dogtales Daycare Attleborough Road Hingham Norfolk NR9 4NQ	Ms Dunnett	Change of use of the existing building used as a dog-care business to holiday accommodation	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2020/2074	Brandon Parva, Coston, Runhall, Welborne Land To The Rear Of Field View Welborne Common Welborne Norfolk	Mr & Mrs S Beesley	Erection of steel framed agricultural building for storage of cattle feed and straw (revised)	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed