

Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives

Mr V Thomson
(Chairman)
Mrs L Neal
(Vice Chairman)
Mr D Bills
Mr J Easter
Mr R Elliott
Mrs F Ellis
Mr G Minshull

Liberal Democrats

Ms V Clifford-Jackson
Mr T Laidlaw

Pool of Substitutes

Mrs Y Bendle Mr D Burrill
Mr B Duffin Mr J Halls
Mr T Holden
Mr K Hurn
Mrs A Thomas
Mr J Worley

Pre-Committee Members' Question Time
9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date

Wednesday, 13 November 2019

Time

10.00 am

Place

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

Contact

Tracy Brady: tel (01508) 535321

South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

PLEASE NOTE that any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee's attention. Please note that where you submit your views in writing to your District Councillor, this is described as "lobbying" and the District Councillor will be obliged to pass these on to the planning officer, where they will be published on the website. Please also note that if you intend to speak on an application, your name will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and kept on public record indefinitely.

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however, anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council's guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.

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

Large print version can be made available

SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Please familiarise yourself with this information if you are not in receipt of the agenda.

If the meeting room is busy, please use the upstairs public gallery until such time as your application is heard. You will need to be in the main meeting room if you wish to speak in regard to an application. Please be aware that the Committee can over-run, and if your application is later on the agenda it may be some time before your application is heard.

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.

A G E N D A

- 1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);**
- 2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972;** [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]
- 3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;**
(Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 6)
- 4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 16 October 2019;**
(attached – page 8)
- 5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;**

(attached – page 26)

To consider the items as listed below:

Item No.	Planning Ref No.	Parish	Site Address	Page No.
1	2019/1688/F	LONG STRATTON	Land Adj. 2 Poplar Barns Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk	26

- 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 33)
- 8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday, 11 December 2019**

1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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





DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday, 16 October 2019 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: **Councillors:** V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, V Clifford-Jackson, J Easter (items 2 – 6 only), F Ellis (items 1 – 6 only), G Minshull (items 2 – 8 only), L Neal (items 1 – 3 and 5 – 8 only) and T Laidlaw

Apologies: **Councillors:** R Elliott

Officers in Attendance: The Assistant Director Planning (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leaders (T Lincoln and C Raine), the Senior Planning Officers (G Beaumont, C Curtis and C Watts) and the Planning Officers (T Barker and B Skipper)

25 members of the public were also in attendance

462. 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
2018/2699/F (Item 1)	DISS	G Minshull	Other Interest As Local Member, Cllr Minshull stepped down from the Committee and took no part in the consideration of this item
		J Easter	Other Interest As the Architect is known to Cllr Easter, he stepped down from the Committee and took no part in the consideration of this item
2019/1013/F (Item 3)	GILLINGHAM	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant
2019/1653/D (Item 4)	COLNEY	L Neal	Other Interest As a Cabinet Member, Cllr Neal left the room and took no part in the consideration of this item
			Other Interest Cllr Bills is a member of the Research Committee at the Norwich Research Park

2019/1354/F (Item 5)	COLNEY	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Agent for the Applicant
2019/1542/F (Item 6)	BUNWELL	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors
2019/1552/F (Item 7)	WICKLEWOOD	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant
2019/1599/F (Item 8)	BRANDON PARVA, COSTON, RUNHALL, WELBORNE	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Applicant

463. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 18 September 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

464. 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	SPEAKER
2018/2699/F (Item 1)	DISS	E Taylor – Parish Council R Bryant – Objector K Warnes – Applicant Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member Cllr G Minshull – Local Member
2019/0428/F (Item 2)	WYMONDHAM	A Nicholls – Applicant T Doyle – Agent for the Applicant Cllr S Nuri – Local Member
2019/1013/F (Item 3)	GILLINGHAM	C Smith – Agent for the Applicant Cllr J Knight – Local Member
2019/1653/D (Item 4)	COLNEY	J Alflatt – Agent for the Applicant
2019/1354/F (Item 5)	COLNEY	J Stone – Agent for the Applicant Cllr W Kemp – Local Member
2019/1542/F (Item 6)	BUNWELL	N Garner – Objector C Papadopoulos - Applicant
2019/1552/F (Item 7)	WICKLEWOOD	J Seville - Applicant
2019/1599/F (Item 8)	BRANDON PARVA, COSTON, RUNHALL, WELBORNE	J Stone – Agent for the Applicant

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.

465. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Members noted the quarterly enforcement report.

466. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.20pm)

Chairman

**Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
–16 October 2019**

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 2018/2699	<p>SNC Env Quality Team No objection to the approach for either infiltration or attenuated drainage we would expect further details. Appropriate planning conditions are required to secure these.</p> <p>Cllr Minshull Original objection (third parties) still stands, this will need to go back to committee.</p> <p>Historic Environment Service Previous comments in respect of archaeology remain valid.</p> <p>Diss Town Council The recent amendments to this application do not alter the previously expressed view. In addition, to the original reasons we would add objections to the recent amendments as follows:</p> <p>1. The Construction Management Plan does not contain any highway assessment for construction and contractor traffic entering and leaving the shopping courtyard onto Market Hill and St Nicholas Street. In addition, there is no provision for keeping this shopping courtyard or Market Hill / St Nicholas street clean after construction traffic movements. Officer comments: The Highway Authority have not objected to the proposal, nor did they request a construction management plan on highway grounds. The most recent construction management plan highlights at section 7 that vehicles will be cleaned before leaving the site to reduce debris on footpath and the highway</p> <p>2. Site Spoil - using the applicant's own cubic figures 600 tonnes of clay and subsoil will be overlaid on the garden area to a depth of 1.1m in places. It is completely unacceptable to put substandard clay/soil over what is a protected "Important open space". Officer comments: There is no evidence to suggest that the soil will be unsuitable for re-using across the site.</p> <p>3. Site Spoil Removal - a further 800 tonnes of spoil will have to be removed from site. The figures could be even higher as they qualify them by saying that they are subject to sub-structure and foundation design. This will involve a minimum of 200 lorry movements through the shopping courtyard for spoil removal alone.</p> <p>4. When you add in the construction traffic making deliveries to site (the number of movements shown in 3 will at least double), deliveries of concrete, contractors vehicle movements and a courtyard, which is not</p>	16

	<p>cleaned regularly, it makes the Town Council very concerned about the health and safety implications for both traders and the general public.</p> <p>Officer comments: It is inevitable that a development in a town centre location will have an impact upon residents and users of the town centre and the construction management plan is seeking to understand and control how this is done but it would not be reasonable for the Council to refuse this application on the grounds of impacts resulting from the construction process. Officers would wish to point out that it is not uncommon to see large developments undertaken in town and city centres.</p> <p>As a Town Council, we would reiterate our concerns about the amendments to the application. We believe the scale of this development is far too large and that the proposal will be detrimental to the ecology of this “Important Open Space”. Furthermore, the proposals will impact on the traders’ ability to go about their normal business and drive footfall away from this private courtyard, which will seriously threaten the viability of traders in the immediate area.</p> <p>Officer comment: It is the view of the officers that the scheme complies with all of the relevant planning policies for the reason identified in the various committee reports and update sheets.</p> <p>5 local/neighbour objections received to most recent re-consultation</p> <p>Following issues raised:</p> <p>Not against development that fits in with its surroundings, but scheme is overdevelopment and conflicts with its and surroundings and cannot be reconciled with Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Site is designated as area of important local open space and dumping tonnes of soil on the site is contrary to SNLP and NPPF.</p> <p>Officer comments: It is not considered that this fundamentally changes the nature of the site or has an adverse impact on the backdrop of the Mere.</p> <p>Proposal will only have negative results, failed to demonstrate positive improvements.</p> <p>Officer comments: In heritage terms, it is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn’t harmful.</p> <p>Still too large and in the wrong place, should not be built on important local open space, revised design is worse for neighbours contrary to DM3.4 of the SNLP. Position of the dwellings in relation to neighbours and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the large windows will impact on neighbours, especially 20 St Nicholas Street.</p> <p>Officer comment: SNLP policy does not provide a blanket ban on development in an area of important local open space. The scheme does not cause significant overlooking or loss of light or outlook so as to justify refusal on amenity grounds as highlighted in the original committee report.</p> <p>Commercial neighbours will be impacted upon by increase in traffic.</p> <p>Officer comment: The Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objection on traffic grounds.</p> <p>Construction traffic is a further significant issue which has not been addressed by the construction management plan. This document focuses too much emphasis on other sites that haven't got one. Construction traffic will affect local businesses ability to trade.</p> <p>Officer comment: See response to point 4 of the Diss Town Council comments.</p> <p>The northern banks of the mere are an historic asset and anything that causes less than substantial harm requires there to be a public benefit that outweighs this in line with the requirements of the NPPF and contrary to Policy DM4.4.</p> <p>Officer comment: It is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified in relation to heritage assets, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn't considered harmful.</p> <p>Would set an unfortunate precedent.</p> <p>Officer comment: Any subsequent applications on neighbouring sites would need to be determined on their own merits.</p> <p>Set a poor standard of design for the conservation area. The application threatens the qualities that led to the award obtained by the wildlife garden in the RIBA excellence in planning for heritage and culture awards.</p> <p>Officer comment: It is considered the scheme is an acceptable design.</p> <p>Policy 4.10 requires development affecting Heritage Assets and Environment to enhance or better reveal their significance. This development does neither.</p> <p>Officer comment: Committee report sets out why officers, including Council's Senior Conservation and Design Officer, consider the scheme complies with this policy The design of the houses in their form of a Victorian pastiche will alter and harm the vista across the Mere, particularly in winter.</p> <p>Officer comment:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>It is considered the scheme is an acceptable design.</p> <p>Resulting garden to Dragon House is too small. Officer comment: The garden provided is sufficient in terms of size and shape to accompany 22a.</p> <p>Sole entrance is through the kitchen, these are potential fire traps with no direct fire fighting access and too far from the street when having regard to building regulations (Fail Fire safety regulations B1 and B5). Officer comment: Building Regs matter.</p> <p>The new dwellings have no outside space provided or easily accessible. Officer comment: They have both a private space and communal garden.</p> <p>No provision made for getting garden machinery to the lower garden area apart from taking it down ramps and steps. Officer comment: The garden is to be laid to lawn and it would not seem unmanageable.</p> <p>The access space will be cluttered with cars and waste bins which will be unsightly and has insufficient area for service, emergency or delivery vehicles. Entry and exit to the site will remain a hazard. Officer comments: The area will not be unsightly and the access and parking and turning space within the site is not highly visible from public vantage points. There is no highway objection.</p> <p>Inability for construction traffic to enter and leave the site in a forward gear contravenes G1.7 of "safe sustainable development the aims and guidance notes for local authority requirements in Highway department". Officer comment: G1.7 deals with damage caused to the highway or utility apparatus and as such and the ability of the Highway Authority to enter into an agreement under the Highways Act to make good any damage via legal agreement. This is not something that the Highway Authority has indicated that it wants to proceed with here.</p> <p>Reference made to most recent SNC Env Quality Team comments. Officer comment: They do not object, condition can be used (see their comments above).</p> <p>Objection from The Diss Heritage Triangle Trust (HTT):</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Previous concerns not addressed, indeed some of the amendments have made matters worse.</p> <p>It is significantly oversized for the site, the building design is not sympathetic to the surroundings. It would block views from the wildlife garden. Using spoil on the lower area of garden is environmentally unsound and the case officer is incorrect stating that 'the works would not compromise the immediate locality'</p> <p>Officer comment These have all been covered no the committee reports, update sheet and above.</p> <p>The planting plan proposed is frankly pathetic for such a public and sensitive location.</p> <p>Officer comment: It is a simple approach to what is a private domestic garden which is entirely appropriate to its context.</p> <p>The application is speculative, does not provide Diss with a quality building, nor addresses the issues that the site raises when considered with the significant amount of public money and effort that has been committed by DTC, SNDC and the Heritage Lottery Fund on improving the historic shopping and leisure areas around the Mere.</p> <p>Officer comment: The scheme is acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>Invalid application by way of incorrect certificate B of the application form.</p> <p>Officer comment: Firstly, the application is accompanied by a certificate B and this available to view on the Council's website. Secondly, it should be noted that the purpose of Certificate B is to make those people who would have a interest in a scheme aware of the proposal, I am not aware that any such relevant parties are not aware of the proposal. There is also reference to that this may cause the Council to be open to financial penalty, but does not specify what.</p> <p>Incorrect site plan</p> <p>Officer comment: Officers are satisfied that the scheme can be built in the form indicated.</p> <p>No justification for development impacting on historic assets as weighed against public benefits as required by the NPPF</p> <p>Officer comment: It is accepted that there is a requirement for public benefits where harm is identified, however, in this case the officers are saying it isn't harmful.</p> <p>There is no list of these public benefits</p> <p>Officer comment: Please see above, point insofar as the scheme isn't considered harmful.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Recommendation conflicts with SNLP policies 1.4, 3.13, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9</p> <p>Officer comment: Officers consider the scheme complies with all relevant SNLP policies as set out in the original committee report.</p> <p>No provision for 2 extra parking spaces for 22 St Nicholas St as required by a change on the land in title of Dragon Yard House</p> <p>Officer comment: Firstly, the extent of the red line on the layout plan and the that on the title plan do not appear different. Secondly, the proposed scheme does not in any event propose any change to the northern part of the site in question.</p> <p>Report omits enlarged balconies with privacy screens</p> <p>Officer comment: The balconies do not project any further than previous plans show, and are consistent in width with those previously shown. The private screened areas in question are no greater than 5m and would cause no significant adverse visual impact.</p> <p>No specialist independent advice on impacts of changing levels of site through root compaction</p> <p>Officer comment: The section provided shows that the greatest degree of soil will deposited down the centre of the site with the infill tapering down to both side boundary so as to specifically avoid any significant fill on the root system of the tree.</p> <p>No police direction has been sought on safety issues of turning right into the yard from St Nicholas Street</p> <p>Officer comment: A view has bene sought and a response awaited, the Highway Authority has looked into the matter further and it is believed that a right hand turn could be made. However, it is important to stress that such a manoeuvre is not fundamental to whether the scheme is acceptable or not as the Highway Authority has confirmed that the alternative route not using the right hand turn is acceptable in any event.</p> <p>Committee report omits the overwhelming public response to see it refused and why a development on important open space that will cause considerable heritage harm which conflicts with important recent comparative appeals is recommended for approval.</p> <p>Officer comment: It is considered that the Committee reports and update sheets to date have made clear the objections the Council has received. Whilst there is reference by the objector to important recent comparative appeals it does not specifically refer to any.</p> <p>Object, the yard is unique due to right angled corner which will cause issues with manoeuvring of vehicles.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Officer comment: As highlighted in the committee report and above there is no objection from the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Dragon House Metal gate and associated fence are owned by the neighbouring property no. 22.</p> <p>Officer comment: The submitted plan makes it clear the metal gate is to stay in place and it is not necessary to remove the fence, nor does a planning approval authorise approval, this is a civil ownership matter.</p> <p>Suggest will request review by appropriate regulatory body.</p> <p>Officer comment: Does not specify who they consider this to be, officers are satisfied that it has followed the requisite process, and no-one has been prejudiced by how the process has been conducted. Furthermore, the various committee reports and update sheets set out that the relevant policies have been given due regard to and the recommendation is a sound one.</p>	
Item 2 2019/0428	<p>There is an error in para 5.24 of the report which states that renewable energy will be provided through a biomass boiler. This is not correct; there is no proposal for a biomass boiler. The paragraph should read to state that the requirement for 10% of the scheme's energy to be renewable will be secured through condition (e.g. from solar panels or air source heat pumps).</p>	36
Item 3 2019/1013	<p>Additional letter of objection raising the same concerns as set out in the report re Traffic; highway safety concerns; capacity of Local services etc.</p> <p>Lobbying letter from the applicant sent to all members</p> <p>Officer Comment: Para 5.47 should read NCC Planning Obligations Team has requested rather Highways Authority require.</p>	46
Item 4 2019/1653	<p>NCC Highways –</p> <p>No objection subject to condition requiring Construction Traffic Management Plan to include construction workers parking.</p>	59
Item 5 2019/1354	<p>An email has been received from the agent confirming that his client is willing to enter into a legal agreement to secure this application as a self-build proposal.</p> <p>The agent does not consider that the self-build plots that the Council has on its register have anything attached to them to secures them as self build.</p> <p>He also attached two appeal decisions, one in South Cambridgeshire District Council's area and the other in North West Leicestershire District Council's area, where self-build proposals were allowed and it is understood that these have been circulated to members.</p>	68

	<p>Officer comment: The report has given appropriate consideration to the fact that the application is for a self-build dwelling and notes in the conclusion that this weighs in its favour. However, the conclusion also notes that it is not considered that there are material considerations of sufficient weight to warrant granting planning permission in this case.</p>	
Item 6 2019/1542	<p>Lobbying letter received from no. 141 Bunwell Street emailed to all members.</p> <p>Additional letter of objection received from Parish Council, summarised as follows:</p> <p>Concerns that the Anglian Water sewerage and drainage system will not be able to cope with another nine properties, despite their assurances. There have been many occasions in recent months when Anglian Water have had to bring bowsers into the village to empty the system.</p> <p>The properties will not have sufficient off-road parking for their residents and/or visitors without parking on Bunwell Street. This is unacceptable as the road is not wide enough for a parked vehicle and larger vehicles to pass, particularly as visibility is restricted by a bend.</p> <p>Officer comment: The report has given appropriate consideration of the above matters. Anglian Water has confirmed that the upgraded system has available capacity for the proposed flows.</p>	75
Item 7 2019/1552		87
Item 8 2019/1599	<p>1) The agent has sent a lobbying email to members raising a number of issues. To a large extent, the officer response on self-build is the same as for item 4 above.</p> <p>In addition, officers can confirm that in September 2014, the Council was one of 11 areas across the country that was selected to benefit from the government backed Right to Build Scheme. opportunity to help custom or self-builders (Right to Build Vanguard Council). In any event, the Council is required to keep a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the Council's area in order to build houses for those individuals to occupy as homes. The Council is satisfied that it is accurately counting those plots that are capable of being serviced plots.</p> <p>2) The agent has also referred the sections of the Planning Practice Guidance on housing or older and disabled people. The Planning Practice Guidance is a material consideration and as</p>	97

	<p>members will have seen from the lobbying material sent by the agent, there are a range of needs to be catered for. Officers have taken account of the circumstances of the applicants' children and considered their needs and also noted that Policy DM3.1 of the Development Management Policies Document sets out that all housing proposals should help contribute to a range of dwelling types. However, in the round, it is not considered that the applicants' personal circumstances justify setting aside the provisions of the development plan.</p>	
--	---	--

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.

Applications referred back to Committee

1. **Appl. No** : **2018/2699/F**
 Parish : **Diss**

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs A Warnes
 Site Address : 22A St Nicholas Street Diss IP22 4LB
 Proposal : Demolition of existing garage/stores. Erection of 3 dwellings,
 single garage and associated hard-standing parking/turning area.

Decision : Members voted 5-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Full planning permission time limit
- 2 In accordance with amendments
- 3 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 4 Archaeological work to be agreed
- 5 New water efficiency
- 6 Foul drainage to main sewer
- 7 Surface water
- 8 Slab level to be agreed
- 9 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
- 10 Retention trees and hedges
- 11 External materials to be agreed
- 12 No PD for classes ABCDE & G
- 13 No PD for fences, walls etc
- 14 Construction management plan
- 15 Provision of parking
- 16 Ecology
- 17 Sectional drawings for proposed re-profiling to be agreed

Major Applications

2. **Appl. No** : **2019/0428/F**
 Parish : **Wymondham**

Applicants Name : Mr Ragan
Site Address : Land at Industrial Site west of Stanleys Lane Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Full planning permission for demolition of commercial building and replacement with 4 blocks of flats (total 21 dwelling units), demolition of Unit 13 and part Unit 12 and construction of an industrial unit (B2/B8). Outline planning permission for demolition of existing commercial units and erection of four industrial units (B2/B8) and 1 office unit (B1).

Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Place to **Approve.**

Approved with conditions

Full planning permission for residential element of scheme

- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
- 2 Flats in accord with submitted drawings
- 3 Provision of parking area
- 4 Highway Improvements - Offsite
- 5 Traffic Regulation Orders
- 6 Surface water drainage scheme
- 7 Construction Management Scheme
- 8 Noise attenuation (residential units)
- 9 Air source heat pumps
- 10 Full details of external lighting
- 11 Contaminated land - submit scheme
- 12 Implement of approved remediation
- 13 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 14 Details of demolition
- 15 Implementation of landscaping
- 16 Renewable energy
- 17 Water efficiency
- 18 Fire hydrants
- 19 Ecological mitigation

Outline planning permission for commercial element of scheme

- 20 Outline Permission Time Limit
- 21 Reserved matters to be submitted
- 22 Limited Hours of Use
- 23 Noise attenuation (commercial units)

Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and open space contribution (open space contribution subject to viability).

3. **Appl. No** : **2019/1013/F**
 Parish : **Gillingham**
- Applicants Name : Mr Chris Smith
Site Address : Land south of The Street Gillingham Norfolk
Proposal : Residential development of 22 dwellings, together with associated public open space, access roads, garaging and car parking.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Place to **Approve.**

Approved with conditions.

- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
- 2 In accordance with amendments
- 3 No first-floor windows plots 2 and 3
- 4 No PD for Classes ABCD and E
- 5 Air Source Heat Pumps
- 6 Landscaping scheme to submitted
- 7 Tree protection
- 8 Retention trees and hedges
- 9 Boundary treatment to be agreed
- 10 Drainage strategy
- 11 Foul drainage to main sewer
- 12 Renewable Energy
- 13 New Water Efficiency
- 14 Fire Hydrants
- 15 Gas Protection Measures and Verification
- 16 Construction management plan
- 17 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 18 Mitigation as per submitted PEA report
- 19 Habitat Management Plan to be submitted
- 20 Visibility splay, approved plan
- 21 Provision of parking, turning
- 22 Construction Traffic Management
- 23 Highway Improvements - Offsite
- 24 Highway Improvements completed
- 25 Materials to be agreed

Subject to a S106 agreement for affordable housing and open space.

4. **Appl. No** : **2019/1653/D**
 Parish : **Colney**
- Applicants Name : Big Sky Developments & Bullen Developments Ltd
 Site Address : Land adj to Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (off James
 Watson Road) Colney Lane Colney Norfolk NR4 7UY
- Proposal : Reserved Matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout
 and scale following outline permission 2012/1880 (in respect of this
 phase only) - Proposed Research and Development Centre,
 associated car parking, internal access road, site infrastructure and
 landscaping.
- Decision : Members voted 7-0 for **Approval**.
- Approved with conditions
- 1 In accordance with plans
 2 Provision of car and cycle parking
 3 Construction traffic management plan
 4 Landscaping - implementation

Other Applications

5. **Appl. No** : **2019/1354/F**
 Parish : **Colney**
- Applicants Name : Mr Nigel Willgrass
 Site Address : Land west of The Old Hall, Watton Road, Colney
 Proposal : Erection of self-build two-storey dwelling and associated garages
- Decision : Members voted 5-4 for **Refusal** (the Chairman used his casting vote after
 the vote was tied 4-4)
- Refused
- 1 Harm to significance of heritage asset
 2 No overriding benefits

6. **Appl. No** : **2019/1542/F**
 Parish : **Bunwell**

Applicants Name : Mr Costa Papadopoulos
Site Address : Land adj to 141 Bunwell Street Bunwell Norfolk
Proposal : Proposed residential development of 9 dwellings

Decision : Members voted 7-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions
1. Time limit full permission
2. In accordance with plans
3. Access in accordance with highways specification
4. Details of highway works for pedestrian refuge
5. Visibility splays to be provided
6. On-site car parking and turning to be provided
7. Construction traffic management plan and worker parking
8. Materials to be agreed
9. Surface water drainage scheme
10 .Foul water drainage scheme
11 .Finished floor levels to be agreed
12. Fire hydrants to be provided
13. Landscaping and management plan to be submitted
14. Tree protection measures
15. Ecology enhancement to be agreed
16. Contaminated land scheme
17. Full details of external lighting

7. **Appl. No** : **2019/1552/F**
 Parish : **Wicklewood**

Applicants Name : Mr John Seville
Site Address : Land adjacent to 69 High Street, Wicklewood, Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 2 bed bungalow

Decision : Members voted 6-0 for **Refusal**

Refused
Cramped form of development

8. **Appl. No** : **2019/1599/F**
 Parish : **Brandon Parva, Coston, Runhall, Welborne**
- Applicants Name : Mr Carl and Mrs Angie Hannant
Site Address : Land to the rear of Linden Cottage, Welborne Common, Welborne
Proposal : Self-build detached bungalow
- Decision : Members voted 6-0 for **Approval** (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 2-4)

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. External materials and boundary treatments
4. Surface water drainage
5. Foul water drainage
6. Visibility splays
7. Provision of parking and turning area
8. Water efficiency

Reason for overturning officer recommendation

Members of the Development Management Committee considered that the specific personal circumstances of the applicants, which included:

- their long standing local connection;
- the specific care needs of their children;
- the full, but ultimately unsuccessful, exploration of all other potential avenues to meet their needs.

justifies the provision of specialist, bespoke accommodation on land that they have owned for a considerable period of time, and collectively are of sufficient weight as material considerations to justify approving a development that is contrary to Policies DM1.3 and DM3.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document.


PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Place

Major Applications

Application 1

2019/1688



© 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

1. Application No: 2019/1688/F
Parish: LONG STRATTON

Applicant's Name: Mr B Thornburrow
 Site Address: Land Adj. 2 Poplar Barns Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk
 Proposal: Erection of a detached three bedroomed 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 is located within the curtilage of 2 Poplar Barns, Ipswich Road Long Stratton. The proposal site is accessed from a private drive leading to the A140 and is located within the development boundary of Long Stratton. The garden area is enclosed and on the edge of a cluster of dwellings, most in converted outbuildings, next to the former farmhouse.
- 1.2 The proposal is for a new two storey, three-bedroom self-build dwelling. The proposed materials are cement board cladding on a brick plinth, Norfolk pan-tiled roofing and uPVC Double glazed windows. The dwelling includes a carport for vehicle parking.

2. Relevant planning history

- 2.1 None

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 NPPF 02: Achieving sustainable development
 NPPF 05: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 NPPF 06: Building a strong, competitive economy
 NPPF 09: Promoting sustainable transport
 NPPF 11: Making effective use of land
 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
 Policy 3: Energy and water
 Policy 4: Housing delivery
 Policy 5: The Economy
 Policy 6: Access and Transportation
 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
 DM1.3: Sustainable Location of New Development
 DM3.1: Meeting Housing Requirements and Needs
 DM3.5: Replacement Dwellings and Additional dwellings on Sub-divided Plots within settlements
 DM3.8: Design Principles
 DM3.11: Road Safety and Free Flow of Traffic
 DM3.12: Provision of Vehicle Parking

DM3.13: Amenity, Noise and Quality of Life
DM4.2: Sustainable Drainage and Water Management
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

3.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
Long Stratton Area Action Plan

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

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: "In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

4. Consultations

4.1 Long Stratton Town Council

The council comments that they approve the design of this proposed development however they object to the application on the grounds of loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

4.2 District Councillor
Cllr Alison Thomas

Please be advised that due to the highway objection for this application I would request that if you are minded to refuse I ask that this comes to DMC so that given the site is within the development boundary the full impact on highway movements can be assessed by members.

4.3 SNC Conservation and Design

No comments received

4.4 SNC Water Management Officer

No objection in principle, requests conditions for details of foul and surface water drainage if approved.

4.5 NHSCCG

No comments received

4.6 NCC Highways

The highways comment highlights that the A140 has recently been enhanced in its status to that of part of the national Major Road Network (MRN). By definition the MRN has a 'movement corridor' function and additional junctions should be minimised or rationalised wherever possible to minimise turning movements and vehicular conflict.

It also highlights that the application as submitted is for an additional dwelling. Extrapolation of statistical data from TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) shows that a residential dwelling is likely to generate some 6 vehicular movements per weekday. The proposed development would increase the use of a narrow access onto the A140, a stretch of classified highway carrying significant traffic movements usually at speed. The vehicle slowing, stopping and turning movements resulting from this development would interfere with the primary function of the A140 to carry traffic freely and safely between centres of population without undue hindrance.

Therefore this application is recommended for refusal for the following reason:

The proposed development, if permitted, would lead to an intensification in the use of an access onto the A140. Leading to an increase in vehicles slowing, stopping and potentially hazardous right-hand turning movements across the opposing traffic stream of a busy principal route. Such movements would interfere with the free and safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users. Resulting in the deterioration in the efficiency of the A140 as a traffic carrier. Contrary to Development Plan Policy DM 3.11

4.7 Other Representations

2 Comments from two addresses split as follows;

1 Objection Comment from 1 Address:

- The rear balcony will overlook the garden to the southwest of the property
- This could be resolved by planting trees to obstruct views
- Inadequate provision for parking

1 Additional Comment From 1 Address:

- No Objection

5 Assessment

Key considerations

- 5.1 The key considerations for this proposal are the compliance with the development plan (DM1.3), design (DM3.8), heritage impact (DM4.10), residential amenity (DM3.13), parking (DM3.12) and access (DM3.11).

Principle

- 5.2 The proposal site is located within the Development Boundary of Long Stratton and therefore a new dwelling is acceptable in principle in accordance with Policy DM1.3 of the Local Plan subject to assessment of other relevant development management policies and consultation responses.
- 5.3 The proposal is for a new dwelling as a plot subdivision and therefore it has been assessed primarily with regard to policy DM3.5 of the local plan.

Assessment

- 5.4 Design and Heritage:
Part a of policy DM3.5 (and policies DM3.8 and DM4.10) require proposals to incorporate good design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of existing buildings, street scene and surroundings.
- 5.5 The application site is within the curtilage of a replica 2.5 storey 'barn conversion' originally built from new to replace a previous barn. There are two other (original) single storey barn conversions to the south and southeast. Poplar Farmhouse is grade II listed and situated to the south separated from the proposal site by one of the converted barns. The application site and its immediate setting are not within the curtilage of the listed building. The materials of the existing dwelling are render, black painted weatherboarding and concrete tiles, while the original barn conversions are red brick and pantile. The plot borders the open countryside to the north and west.

- 5.6 The proposal is for a 1.5 storey dwelling clad in cement weatherboarding with pan-tiled roofing and uPVC windows. The overall style is sympathetic to its surroundings with a barn-like design. In terms of settlement pattern, it sits with the surrounding former agricultural buildings within the cluster and separated from the main farmhouse. The proposal does not encroach on the open countryside character to the north and west.
- 5.7 With regard to heritage, Policy 16 of the NPPF and Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP requires Local Planning Authorities to assess the impact of any development on the significance of heritage assets and Sections 16 and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that local planning authorities must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This application is for a new dwelling within the wider setting of a grade II listed building. Taking into consideration the significance of the listed building and its setting the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the significance of the listed building or its the setting by virtue of separation, including the position of the other dwellings, and the design of the proposal. As such, it is considered that the proposal would accord with Policy 16 of the NPPF, Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP and Sections 16 and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 5.8 As such therefore, the design and appearance are considered to conform to the requirements of policies DM3.5 (a) and policy DM3.8.
- 5.9 Residential Amenity:
Policy DM3.5b (and Policy DM3.13) requires proposals not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, DM3.5c and e requires the proposed new dwelling itself to have adequate private amenity and utility space.
- 5.10 With regard to the neighbouring properties, an objection comment was received from Poplar Farm with regard to the potential overlooking from the proposed balcony on their amenity space. This concern was also highlighted by the Town Council. Poplar Farm is located to the south of the proposal, separated by a single storey dwelling; however, it's amenity space is extensive and wraps around this other dwelling to its west. As such, the balcony and first floor windows on the west side of the proposal have some potential for views into the northernmost portion of Poplar Farm's curtilage. While there is likely to be some degree of overlooking into this space, the angle between the proposed balcony and the amenity space is acute, restricting the scope and magnitude of these views. In addition, the proportion of the amenity space with potential for impact is small in relation to the property's overall available space. On balance, it is therefore considered that the impact of this interaction is not considered to be significant enough to warrant a reason for refusal.
- 5.11 With regard to the other neighbouring dwellings, the first-floor windows on the south side of the proposed dwelling will have views onto the southern neighbour's driveway and are therefore considered acceptable. A comment submitted by this neighbour confirms no objection to the application. With regard to the existing dwelling on the proposal site, the new dwelling is in relatively close proximity. However, the design is subservient in height, there are no directly overlooking first floor windows. The orientation limits the potential for overshadowing due to dominant sun angles. The main dwelling retains private amenity space to its north and south. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.
- 5.12 With regard to the proposed dwelling itself, it incorporates small but well contained private amenity space. While there are windows on the western side of the existing dwelling, these do not serve habitable rooms so do not provide unacceptable overlooking. The amenity space is therefore considered to be adequate for the size and style of dwelling proposed.
- 5.13 Overall therefore the proposal is considered to accord with policies DM3.5b, c and e, and DM3.13 of the Local Plan.

- 5.14 Highways:
Policy DM3.5d along with DM policies 3.11 and 3.12 require new dwellings to have adequate access and parking.
- 5.15 With regard to parking, concern has been raised by a neighbouring property that insufficient parking has been shown. The application has been considered with regards to parking and sufficient space is provided for a dwelling with this level of accommodation, although a condition would be required in the event of an approval to remove permitted development rights for the car port to be converted so that it remains available in perpetuity. The dwelling is accessed off a private drive that serves 3 other dwellings and has adequate turning space. As such there is no risk of parking spilling onto the A140 and the proposal accords with policy DM3.12 of the local plan.
- 5.16 With regard to access, an objection has been received from the highways authority on highway safety grounds relating to the intensification of access onto the A140. The proposal would increase the number of dwellings on the existing access from 3 to 4. The A140 has recently been enhanced in its status to that of part of the national Major Road Network (MRN). By definition the MRN has a 'movement corridor' function and additional junctions should be minimised or rationalised wherever possible to minimise turning movements and vehicular conflict.
- 5.17 Whilst the application site is within the development boundary, it would appear that this largely as a consequence of the housing and bypass allocation area within the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, which if/when, the proposal site would be bypassed and would no longer be accessed from a corridor of movement. Whilst at this time there is an active application for the housing and bypass, it is not yet determined. On this basis the highways authority consider that this proposal is "premature".
- 5.18 I have considered this position, and I find it difficult to disagree with the Highway Authority's view that the proposed access will intensify the use of an access out onto the A140 which is characterised as part of the major road network for a number of years to come.
- 5.19 Having spoken to the Highway Authority with regard to their comments it should be stressed that their objection to this proposal takes into account the fact that the access that would serve this proposed dwelling is outside of the 30mph speed restriction zone which covers most of Long Stratton and inside the 50mph speed restriction zone where drivers do not generally expect to encounter slowing, stopping and turning of vehicles onto or off the carriageway.
- 5.20 In summary, I agree with the views of the Highway Authority that the proposal is "premature" and contrary to policy DM3.11 of the development plan (and also therefore contrary to DM3.5d) due to the impact on highways safety in relation to the unacceptable intensification of an existing access for an unknown and potentially significant period of time.

Other Issues:

- 5.21 Under paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.22 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.

5.23 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion:

- 5.24 The proposal is for a new dwelling located within the development boundary of Long Stratton. The design, impact on heritage and impact on residential amenity and parking provision are all considered acceptable for this proposal. However, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the aims of Policy DM3.11 and DM3.5(d) due to the unacceptable intensification of the access onto the A140 and the associated impact on highway safety and the free flow of traffic for what would be unknown and potentially significant period of time given the current status of the planning applications relating to the delivery of the Long Stratton bypass.

Recommendation: Refusal

1 - Impact on Highways

Reasons for Refusal

- 1 The proposed development, if permitted, would lead to an intensification in the use of an access onto the A140, where the speed restriction is 50mph, leading to an increase in vehicles slowing, stopping and potentially hazardous right-hand turning movements across the opposing traffic stream of a busy principal route. Such movements would interfere with the free and safe flow of traffic and cause danger and inconvenience to highway users resulting in the deterioration in the efficiency of the A140 as a traffic carrier contrary to Development Plan Policy DM 3.11.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Peter Kerrison 01508 533793
and E-mail: pkerrison@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Planning Appeals**Appeals received from 5 October 2019 to 30 October 2019**

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision
2019/0893	Tasburgh 8 Curson Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1NH	Mr William Fisher	Extensions and associated alterations.	Delegated	Refusal

Planning Appeals**Appeals decisions from 5 October 2019 to 30 October 2019**

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision	Appeal Decision
2018/1297	Geldeston Land East of Geldeston Hill Geldeston Norfolk	Mr Nick & Mrs Gi Flowers	3 bedroom bungalow and detached double garage in part garden of The Knowle with new vehicular entrance	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2019/0093	Alpington Land North of 2 Gilbert Close Church Road Alpington Norfolk	Mr Raymond Lincoln	Demolition of garage and erection of a 2 storey affordable dwelling (revised)	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1884	Dickleburgh and Rushall Land Adjacent to Moorlands Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk	Mr Derek Lock	Proposed new Passivhaus / carbon negative dwelling	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals**Appeals decisions from 5 October 2019 to 30 October 2019**

2018/2864	Tharston and Hapton Land opposite Old Forge Picton Road Tharston Norfolk	Mr Peter Hubbard	Erection of one dwelling	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2019/0389	Redenhall with Harleston 15 Needham Road Harleston IP20 9JY	Mr George Sekulla	Construction of a front garden/drive wall	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2019/0483	Wymondham Land East School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk	Mr Danny Grimmer	Erection of 5 dwellings	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed