

Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives	Liberal Democrats
Mr V Thomson (Chairman)	Ms V Clifford-Jackson
Mrs L Neal (Vice Chairman)	Mr T Laidlaw
Mr D Bills	
Mr J Easter	
Mr R Elliott	
Mrs F Ellis	
Mr G Minshull	

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

*Tuesday 25 June 2019

Time

10.00 am

Place

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

Contact

Sue Elliott: tel (01508) 533869

South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

* PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF DAY

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 24 April 2019;**
(attached – page 8)

5. **Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;**
(attached – page 16)

To consider the items as listed below:

Item No.	Planning Ref No.	Parish	Site Address	Page No.
1	2018/2699/F	DISS	22A St Nicholas Street Diss IP22 4LB	16
2	2019/0412/D	WORTWELL	Land West of 2 High Road Wortwell Norfolk	28
3	2019/0749/F	HETHERSETT	Land to the rear of 35 Lynch Green, Hethersett, Norfolk	34
4	2019/1055/F	WYMONDHAM	Wymondham Leisure Centre, Norwich Road, Wymondham, NR18 0NT	41

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 47)

8. **Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday, 24 July 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 must then withdraw from the meeting.


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

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

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.

PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF





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, 24 April 2019 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: **Councillors:** V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp and G Minshull

Apologies: **Councillors:** B Duffin and F Ellis

Substitute Members: **Councillors:** C Foulger for B Duffin (for items 1-7 only) and N Legg for F Ellis (for applications 1-3 only)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (C Raine), the Senior Planning Officers (G Beaumont and C Curtis) and the Planning Officers (T Barker and S Robertson)

60 members of the public were also in attendance

441. 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
2018/0872/O (item 1)	Mulbarton	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors
		N Legg	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant
2018/2783/D (item 2)	Cringleford	All	Other Interest Big Sky Developments Ltd is the Council's property development company
2018/2645/F (item 3)	Tacolneston	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Agent for the Applicant
		C Gould, C Kemp and D Bills	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant
2019/0561/F (item 4)	Ditchingham	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Local Member

442. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 27 March 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

443. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

It was noted that, since publication of the agenda, the Director of Growth and Business Development role had changed to Director of Place. Therefore, 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
2018/0872/O (item 1)	Mulbarton	P Leigh – Parish Council L Jones – Objector B Rejzek – Agent for the Applicant
2018/2783/D (item 2)	Cringleford	M Wagstaff – Parish Council A Andrews and M Fox – Objectors N Perryman and C Stammers – Agents for the Applicant
2018/2645/F (item 3)	Tacolneston	J Darrell – Objector E Maginn – on behalf of the Applicant
2017/0810/F (item 5)	Long Stratton	Cllr D Fulcher – Local Member Cllr A Thomas – County Councillor

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

444. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 12.45pm)

Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 24 April 2019

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 – 2018/0872	<p>Lobbying material circulated to members from Mulbarton Residents group including in regard to the deliverability of footpath upgrade</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Officer It is correct that a faculty would be needed in order to gain permission of the Diocese to carry out any works on the footpath on Church land. In my experience this has always been relatively easy to achieve as the Diocese are reluctant to take on any responsibility of the PROW on their land especially as refusing works brings into question liabilities. However, if permission was refused then simply the path would be re-surfaced up to the boundary of the Church land, this would still offer a significant improvement for users.</p> <p>I would like to clarify that the Diocese do not have any powers regarding the stile on the route. It is the Highway Authorities responsibility to authorise or request the removal of structures which cannot be authorised on PROW. A structure can usually only be authorised if livestock are present or if the structure is shown on the Definitive Map or in the Definitive Statement for the path.</p> <p>Officer Response It is noted that the Residents Group disagree with the comments made by Green Infrastructure Officer and appreciate that the lobbying information that has been sent to the members expands on this issue</p>	14
Item 2 - 2783	<p>Hethersett Parish Council: The Planning Committee decided that, following consideration, it had the following comments to make: We note Highways England comments that this application has no material effect upon the Strategic Road Network and feel that this is just another example of the lack of strategic planning and multi-agency co-operation. This application is one of a number of large-scale developments in the area and a holistic approach should be adopted to take account of the totality of the development. As previously requested, the Planning Committee would like to see a traffic management plan conducted for Cringleford, Hethersett and the surrounding villages. We support the comments made by residents that providing road access from Cantley Lane will create an additional rat run.</p> <p>Cringleford Parish Council: The Parish Council has held frequent meetings with the applicants, Big Sky Developments, in which ideas and proposals for land off Cantley Lane, Cringleford, have been discussed. The applicants have been responsive to the concerns and suggestions raised by the Parish Council and have taken steps to deal with them. In particular, they have tried</p>	43

	<p>to meet the concerns of many residents about the possible development of a 'rat-run' created by the through-road in the planned estate connecting the A11 with Cantley Lane; it borders the section of the estate for which planning permission is being sought in this application. The measures brought forward, shown on the plans accompanying the application, include speed platforms and a 20-mph speed limit. Given the constraints resulting from the approval on appeal by The Planning Inspectorate of the original planning application for the whole site, No. 2013/1494 (See officers' comments 4.18-4.22), the measures should largely alleviate the concerns of residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council is pleased that other concerns, also raised by the NCC Ecologist, NCC Highways, and the SNC Landscape Architect have been addressed. It is generally content with the proposals for retaining run-off within in the estate and thinks the risk of flooding in the dip on Cantley Lane, adjacent to the medical and veterinary centres, has been reduced. Detailed proposals for the recreational area beside the A47 are still evolving in collaboration with the Parish Council, but the Parish Council is content with the general principles proposed by the applicants in that they have taken on board our suggestions including a community orchard, allotments and community garden.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not oppose the officers' recommendation that the details of this application should be approved by the Director of Growth and Business Development. However, given the contentious nature of some elements in the proposed development, the Parish Council believes it would be prudent for all subsequent applications to be considered by the Development Management Committee and not delegated to the Director or officers.</p> <p>Officer: For information the following ecological surveys have been carried out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial Badger Walkover: Completed 3rd October 2018 2. Autumn Bat Survey: Completed 3rd October 2018 3. Breeding Bird Survey: Ongoing – First survey carried out 9th April 2019. 4. eDNA Newt Sampling Survey: 15th April 2019 Sampling completed. Samples posted 16th April 2019 and results expected by 2nd May 2019. Landowner confirmed that other recent surveys have previously confirmed absence. 5. Badger Walkover Survey: Completed 17th April 2019 6. Spring Bat Survey: Completed 17th April 2019 <p>The following remaining surveys are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tree Roost Assessment: Proposed 23rd April 2019 2. Breeding Bird Survey: Remaining two surveys in May 2019 and June 2019. 	
--	--	--

	3. Summer Bat Survey: June 2019 – No date currently proposed as weather dependent but anticipated to be early to mid-June.	
Item 3 – 2018/2645	<p>Verbal update by officer at meeting: aware that a separate email sent to members by applicant in response to this, officer confirmed that trees referred to had been lawfully removed.</p> <p>Officer also confirmed that an updated arboricultural report had not been submitted.</p> <p>separate document received – trees lawfully removed. No TPO or arboricultural report received.</p> <p>1) The applicant has submitted a response to the Committee report, which has been circulated to Members. Officers do not consider that this raises any planning issues in addition to those considered in the Committee report and do not wish to provide responses to specific points raised.</p> <p>2) Letter received via agent from Norfolk Wildlife Services regarding tree protection measures following emails with the Council's Arboriculturalist on 4 and 5 April. This letter seeks to demonstrate how the concerns raised by the Arboriculturalist in relation to the proximity of works activity around T37 (the Alder tree in the northwest corner of the site), the construction of a no-dig driveway between T13 and T18 and the position of soakaways can be addressed. The letter also explains that the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan will be updated to include these elements. However, at the time of writing, these have not been received and accordingly, the officer position on the impact of the development on trees remains as it was.</p>	61
Item 4 – 2019/0561	No updates	72
Item 5 – 2019/0810	No updates	77
Item 6 – 2017/2652	WITHDRAWN	104

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.

Major Applications

1. **Appl. No** : **2018/0872/O**
Parish : **MULBARTON**

Applicants Name : Glavenhill Strategic Land (Number 3) Limited
 Site Address : Land east of Norwich Road Mulbarton Norfolk
 Proposal : Outline Planning Application for up to 135 dwellings, public open space and associated drainage and highways infrastructure

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**

Refused

- 1 Impact on church
- 2 Impact on Paddock Farmhouse
- 3 Impact on conservation area
- 4 Impact on landscape
- 5 Loss of hedgerow
- 6 No overriding benefits
- 7 Contrary to NPPF

2. **Appl. No** : **2018/2783/D**
Parish : **CRINGLEFORD**

Applicants Name : Big Sky Developments Ltd
 Site Address : Area BS1 South of Newmarket Road Cringleford Norfolk
 Proposal : Reserved Matters details of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping following outline permission 2017/2120, for RM-APP-1 comprising 67 dwellings together with associated landscaping and infrastructure. (The outline submission included an Environmental Statement)

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

Approve with conditions

- 1 In accordance with outline consent
- 2 To accord with submitted plans
- 3 Materials to accord with submitted details

Subject to the carrying out of further ecological surveys, receipt of amended plans, arboricultural impact assessment and location of affordable housing units.

3. Appl. No : 2018/2645/F
Parish : TACOLNESTON

Decision : Members voted 5-3 for **Refusal**

- 1 Out of character
- 2 Harm to conservation area
- 3 Impact on trees
- 4 No overriding benefits

Applicants Name : Mr G Hayes
Site Address : 69 Loddon Road Ditchingham Norfolk NR35 2RA
Proposal : Change of use from builders yard and offices to 3no. two bedroom single storey dwellings.

Decision : Members voted 7-0 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Time Limit
- 2 In accordance with submitted drawings
- 3 Contaminated Land Scheme
- 4 Unexpected Contamination
- 5 Surface water drainage
- 6 Parking and Turning

Major Applications referred back to Committee**5. Appl. No : 2017/0810/F**
Parish : LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name : Orbit Homes (2020) Ltd
Site Address : Land Off St Mary's Road Long Stratton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 52 dwellings with associated car parking and amenity space, roads, public open space, landscaping and vehicular access off St Mary's Road.

Decision : Members voted 7-0 to endorse that the current appeal is only defended on the revised single reason below:

The benefits of the scheme in providing new housing, including affordable housing and the over provision of public open space does not override the landscape and character harm that would occur and consequently fails to comply with either criteria 2 c) or 2 d) of Policy DM 1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan which are directly applicable to application sites located outside of a development limit.

6. Appl. No : 2017/2652/O
Parish : PORINGLAND

Site Address : Land South of Burgate Lane Poringland Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for the erection of up to 165 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Burgate Lane. All matters reserved except for means of access.

Decision : This item was withdrawn by the Applicant prior to the meeting

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS**Report of Director of Place****Other applications**

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.

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 : Approve subject to conditions
(Summary)

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing garage/stores to the rear of 22a St Nicholas Street which lies in the centre of Diss and the erection of a terrace of three, three storey dwellings with pitched roofs. Plot 1 is also accompanied by a pitched roof garage. The site is to be accessed via Market Hill to the north which is an existing relatively narrow access point. The scheme makes provision for 11 parking spaces including 2 within the garage which accompanies unit 1. The dwellings would be constructed using a mix of timber cladding and facing brickwork with pantile roof, with aluminium windows and doors and glass balconies.
- 1.2 The application site consists of garden land associated with an existing dwelling and lies behind a mix of residential properties and commercial premises located to the north, including the Diss Town Council Offices. To the east is the wildlife garden and to the south is the Mere. The site slopes significantly downwards from north to south with trees running down the eastern and western boundaries of the site towards the Mere edge.

2. Relevant planning history

- 2.1 No recent relevant planning history

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 07 : Ensuring the vitality of town centres
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 13 : Main Towns
- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)
South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

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

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.

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 **Diss Town Council**

Object

- Massing - the scale of the buildings is far too large in an area designated as 'Important Local Open Space' with the proposed dwellings proposed to occupy 50% of the total area. The width of the dwellings is almost the full width of the site, so much so that there is little access for maintaining the remaining 'Important Local Open Space'. This over development of the site means that the eastern wall of one of the proposed dwellings comes very close to the boundary of the Heritage Wildlife gardens hemming them in and overlooking this new public amenity.
- To illustrate this point, when standing on the path leading to the boardwalk adjacent to the proposed development, the dwellings would tower around 42 feet (13m) above ground level at its highest point. The dwellings would dominate the wildlife gardens and boardwalk, shade the gardens and detract from the visitor experience.
- The design of the buildings and the modern materials proposed are not in keeping with a designated 'Important Local open Space', in the historic conservation area and overlooking the Mere and the Heritage Wildlife gardens.
- Access to the dwellings off Market Hill will directly affect 6/7 businesses. The tight right-angled bend, customer parking provision, delivery vehicles and of course pedestrians will make it a very busy private courtyard especially if there are an additional 9 or 10 vehicles coming and going from the proposed development. This very narrow access with several pinch points, will also be used by construction

traffic impacting on those using Market Hill as well as the traders' business in this courtyard. Add to this the reduced space available in the courtyard when bins are put out from the proposed dwellings for the weekly refuse collection and it creates an area that would see much more traffic, become less appealing to visitors and as a result have a detrimental effect on trade.

- There is no construction and access plan at this time - only a statement that a remote site will be used to break down deliveries to a size that can be taken through the restricted access. Nowhere is there any mention of how site spoil would be removed without causing serious disruption to traders in the vicinity of the courtyard and also on Market Hill/St Nicholas Street. With most of the sloping banking requiring removal, the amount of spoil is likely to be significant involving many lorry loads.
- Access for all emergency vehicles is totally inadequate through this very tight courtyard and this would be especially so in the case of fire.
- The dwellings would come right up to the boundary fence with the Heritage Wildlife Gardens completely overlooking and overshadowing them. The Wildlife gardens are an essential part of the regeneration of the Heritage Triangle and this proposed development would detract from visitor enjoyment and spoil of views of the Mere and the boardwalk. The Gardens were finalists in the 2018 Royal Town Planning Institute award for Planning Excellence in Heritage and Culture for place-making. This proposal works against all the values recognised by the award by reducing the 'openness' of the upper reaches and of the viewing decks of the new public garden.
- Should you be considering acceptance of the application under your delegated powers we would like you to refer the application to your Development Management (Planning) Committee for their consideration.
- Diss Town Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss a much more modest development that did not encroach so far down the slope towards the Mere, was built in a style compatible to the historic nature of buildings in the area and did not overlook and overshadow the Heritage Wildlife Garden area.

4.2 **District Councillor Cllr Minshull**

Given the public interest that this has on a designated green space I feel that if the officers are minded to approve then this should go to committee.

4.3 **NCC Highways**

No objection subject to condition

Whilst the proposal will add additional vehicle movements within the yard area between the site and the St Nicholas Street, this area is private and not public highway.

4.4 **Senior Conservation and Design Officer**

Original plans

The application is to the rear of properties that front onto St Nicholas Street and form a continuous tight back of the pavement street frontage, and will therefore have no impact on the St Nicholas streetscene within the townscape of the conservation area.

At the rear however is the Mere and the property will be very visible in views across the Mere. The Mere is a key feature of the historic settlement of Diss around which the town grew. In the conservation area appraisal (P7) refers to the important views of the town across the Mere from the publicly accessible areas to the south: "The panoramic view from

the park, over the Mere to the church tower beyond, is unparalleled in the district, but from the main streets, the Mere is rarely visible, except an occasional glimpse through a gap or archway.”

The most impact of the development will therefore be views of the rear including longer distance views from the park and at the south end of the Mere (as shown on the streetscape map on p32.) At present the sharp rise in levels has created a view of a pleasant collection of various building forms around the Mere, featuring a number of gables, although in the immediate area to the north of the site the existing buildings have relatively plain flat backs and rear sloping roof pitches.

The recent creation of the boardwalk and steps at the rear of the town council office has also created access to the rear and views of the rear of the properties along St Nicholas Street at closer quarters from the public garden/space. The development site, although identified within the green space associated with the Mere, is however not well maintained and appears untidy and ‘scruffy’ in appearance. Enhancement of the site would be desirable, although these closer views, particularly from the adjacent garden area to the east and the boardwalk, need to also be taken into account.

Although development is at the rear of a plot and not a streetscene, the proposal needs to be viewed and considered as being in a very sensitive location and setting within the conservation area. Although No 22a is not listed, a number of properties along St Nicholas Street are listed, and the setting of these buildings in terms of views of their rear, which is of significance in this case because of their contribution to the views looking across the Mere.

Because of the significance of the Mere and views across and around it, to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the recently created public access, it would be beneficial to either have a photomontage of the rear of the site showing the building’s scale and form within the context and/or a cross section showing relative building heights. The application’s design and access statement refers to 3D drawings – but only one has been submitted – of the front (north facing) elevations.

There has been some pre-application discussion regarding the building’s potential form and character. It was generally agreed that a building with broken massing comprising of a rhythm of thin gables and graduated setbacks in sympathetic materials that would assist in alleviating bulk and fitting the building within the transition between the Mere, landscaping and the rear of elevations of buildings on St Nicholas Street. This would create a building of interest but one that could still be relatively subtle and blend in.

Contemporary design materials are an option if the building remains well designed but ‘low key’ in views, considering that it needs to fit in with an existing backdrop of buildings that are quite varied in design and materials, but each individual building has a limited palette of materials. It would be better to have a limited palette of materials for this design rather than variety within the form of the building itself, so that the building is read as one coherent form. Being low down within the view amongst landscaping materials should I suggest be darker/more natural. Dark metal cladding combined with dark timber may be suitable, but render at lower levels will draw attention.

The present design breaks the building into three, but with quite wide gables at the side, and a plain link section with a flat roof between. Rather than creating an interesting rhythm, this will make the building appear larger and bulkier with the large flat roof section and giving more prominence and emphasis to the gable forms rather than being a rhythmic element of the main shape of the building. The elevation is very varied in appearance in terms of form and materials, and does not appear coherently designed.

Whereas previous discussions evolved around a simpler design with dark metal clad frame providing a frame with timber weatherboarding and internal balconies and space, the present design in contrast has a much more varied appearance in terms of materials with rendered balconies projecting out at lower levels, which are more brutalist in style. I am therefore concerned that the present design has a relatively incoherent form, and one which would appear quite bulky and 'fussy' with quite a number of changes in form, massing and articulation across the rear elevation and the use of different contemporary design details and materials. This will draw unnecessary attention to the building.

This may be more evident if a cross section (which includes existing buildings) or photomontage are submitted. If contemporary materials are used it is important that the design is coherent, crisp with minimal and simple uncluttered use of materials and architectural detailing in a 'clean' design. In this location the exterior appearance and impact is paramount to the design, and any use of the building needs to fit around blending the appearance of the building into the existing context. This may lead to a more unusual and bespoke internal plan arrangement, but can lead to a more interesting building.

I am concerned that the present design will be over large and bulky, with 'fussy' articulation and over complicated elevation of contemporary materials facing south and prominent in views from the Mere and surrounding publicly accessible areas. It will detract from and harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings to the north, potentially including the church tower, which is the main focal point within the backdrop and arrangement of buildings when seen in views across the Mere from the South.

Amended plans

No objection

4.5 SNC Water Management Officer

To be reported if appropriate.

4.6 Historic Environment Service

No objection subject to condition

4.7 Other Representations

Original scheme

18 objections received a summary of these are as follows:

- Out of character with the locality
- Development is not in keeping with the heritage of the area (Conservation Area and Listed Buildings)
- Does not offer any complimentary features to the conservation setting that has bene preserved and enhanced by the efforts of the newly developed garden and Mere walkway.
- Goes against the work undertaken by the Heritage Triangle
- External materials (steel and glass is totally out of character)
- Green space will be compromised
- This designated Important local open space (DM4.6) will be compromised
- Cramped and overdevelopment
- Disturbance and adverse impact on existing businesses
- Adverse ecological impacts
- Access concerns relating to construction machinery and vehicles, conflict with pedestrians

- Congestion caused from additional parking
- Will restrict access
- Fire safety, ability to evacuate existing dwellings will be affected
- Dwellings are too high
- Scale of development is excessive
- Not enough detail as to its appearance
- Overshadowing of neighbouring properties
- Spoil the view/outlook from across the Mere
- No reference to environmentally friendly elements within the scheme
- Overlook neighbouring properties
- Overlook users of the wildlife garden
- Previous application for a bungalow in 2003 was refused
- Adverse impact upon the community garden and boardwalk, in particular overly dominate the outlook from the community garden adverse impact on Tudor House/Dragons yard which is busy with 4 shops and a further business trading which often has children prams etc. more traffic would have an adverse impact on this.
- Vibration from construction works could destabilise adjacent buildings

Diss Heritage Triangle Trust

Object

Access to the site

All access is through Dragon House Yard, which is a narrow privately owned shopping yard with shops on both sides. The yard forms a tight 90 degree bend due to the layout of the existing buildings and this development will create significant additional vehicle traffic through a popular pedestrian shopping area.

Size and scope

The proposed development is excessive in size and the design is such that when viewed from the south or the east, the building form a monolithic lump that will completely overwhelm the wildlife garden. It should be noted that the site is designated in the local plan as “an important local open space” and together with the wildlife garden, forms a contiguous area of green space around the northern and western perimeter of the Mere. This development would significantly reduce this green space and eliminate the site from being “an important local open space” as the building extends almost half way down the site. Please refer to the enclosed satellite map of the Mere clearly showing the existing contiguous green space.

When viewed from the wildlife garden, the eastern “slab” of the building will tower over the existing upper and lower viewing decks of the wildlife garden and will significantly reduce natural sunlight reaching the viewing decks and the upper part of the garden – which is where the mown grass areas are located that currently allow families to sit on the grass and enjoy the views. Please see attachment A over which the existing wildlife garden has been superimposed – this clearly shows the disparity between the proposed development and the existing levels of the upper and lower viewing decks, and mown grass levels.

Further, the eastern side of the building incorporates a flight of steps down towards the Mere, these steps appear to be within 0.5m of the boundary which negates any ability to create screening with hedgerows or planting between the building and the wildlife garden. I note that the applicant has recently released sketch views to the local press that show the development surrounded with trees and a lush, tall green hedge between the development and the wildlife garden. Firstly the hedge (and most of the trees) do not exist, and secondly, there is no room for a hedge with the current plans. The applicant has not submitted any planting plan whatsoever so these sketches can only be regarded as conjecture, rather than proposed.

The HTT is not against development on this site, however, the existing proposals would significantly damage the wildlife garden and its amenity value for residents and visitors to Diss. The HTT has a responsibility to ensure that the goals of the wildlife garden and the vitality of the Heritage Triangle overall are maintained and therefore objects to this application.

Amended plans

7 objections received which confirm that the revised scheme has not addressed previous concerns (see below for a summary of these)

Diss Heritage Triangle Trust (HTT)

In the original letter, the key reasons for objection were firstly, access to the site, and secondly, the size and scope of the proposed buildings. The new proposals do not address the access to the site whatsoever, and with regard to the size and scope, the revised application is only very slightly smaller than the original, and still significantly overpowers both the plot itself, and the wildlife garden situation immediately to the east of the plot. So with regard to the access to the site, all the comments in the original objection still stand.

With regard to the size and scope of the application, the new application reduces the overall footprint very slightly by moving the balconies back into the building, and the overall height is very slightly reduced. However, the width of the building is unaltered, and the impression as viewed from the wildlife garden is substantially unchanged. It will tower over the garden, reducing natural light onto the garden. Further the incorporation of a new east facing 2nd floor window with new roof structure that juts out above the concrete flights of

steps will actually mean the new design overlooks the wildlife garden to a greater extent than the original proposals.

Again the developer has taken the liberty of showing a green “hedge” along the eastern boundary of the plot, alongside the concrete flight of steps. As the steps remain hard up against the boundary, this green hedge will not exist and it is disingenuous of the developer to show something that is clearly not possible. Furthermore, the original comments around a planting plan for the lower part of the plot remain, again no submission has been received regarding this so it is unknown what the developer plans are for this significant section of the plot.

Again, I would state that HTT is not against development on this site, however, the existing proposals would significantly damage the wildlife garden and its amenity value for residents and visitors to Diss.

I would suggest a proposal with just 2 dwellings, situated further away from the wildlife garden boundary, together with more detail regarding the planting plans for the lower part of the lot may be more suitable. A development that enhances the wildlife garden would be welcomed, indeed the HTT would welcome working with the developer on the lower part of the plot to enhance its value to both wildlife and the Diss community.

5 Assessment

Key considerations

The key considerations are

- Principle
- Important Local Open Spaces (DM4.4)

- Impact upon the character and appearance of the area, including heritage assets (Conservation Area and Listed Buildings)
- Amenity
- Highway safety
- Trees
- Ecology

Principle

- 5.1 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in determining planning decisions.
- 5.2 The site is inside the development boundary and as such criterion a) and b) of Policy DM1.3 apply.
- 5.3 Criterion a) is met by virtue of the site being within the development boundary and b) requires that the proposal is of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in the village and the role and function of the settlement. By virtue of it being a relatively small number of dwellings within one of the Districts main towns the proposal is considered to fulfil the requirements of criterion b).
- 5.4 On the basis of the above DM1.3 is met by the proposal and the principle of new development is acceptable.

Important Local Open Spaces (DM4.4)

- 5.5 It is evident that the site lies upon the bank of the Mere and as such Policy DM4.4 of the SNLP is applicable, and in particular the following part which states that:
- b) At the Important Local Open Spaces identified in paragraphs 4.32 - 4.44 and on Maps 4.4 (1) - (6) and on the Proposal Map, development will only be permitted where it retains the open character and appearance of the site, where it respects the contribution which the identified open site or open frontage makes to the form and character of the Settlement and where there is no significant adverse impact on the setting of any existing building. New development impacting on these designated sites will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise.*
- 5.6 With regard to the Mere and its banks the supporting text to the policy states:
- "The presence of the Mere dictated the pattern of the town and while the gardens and yards that form its boundaries on the three sides opposite the park, have deteriorated over time, the open leafy character survives."*
- 5.7 Therefore any development of the application site will need to retain the open character and appearance of the site and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of this part of Diss.
- 5.8 The scheme has evolved and been revised, to reduce the bulk of the building, its footprint and introduced revisions to the roof design, arrangement of fenestration and external facing materials to create a scheme that is now considered to site effectively on the bank of the Mere. The location of the proposed dwellings is such that lies in relatively close proximity to the other buildings to the north and as such a significant amount of the garden which forms the bank to the Mere is retained. In light of the above it is considered that the scheme does satisfy the relevant requirement of Policy DM4.4 of the SNLP in retaining the open character and appearance of the site and contributes towards retaining space around

the Mere. It is necessary to remove permitted development rights to ensure that no structures are placed on the site which would bring development closer to the Mere edge. Likewise, due to the visibility of the building, permitted development rights for any alterations to the existing building will also be removed. This can be achieved via planning condition.

Impact upon the character and appearance of the area, including heritage assets (Conservation Area and Listed Buildings)

- 5.9 In terms of the wider character and appearance of the site, it offers an important backdrop to the Mere which is presently characterised by a mix of traditional buildings which offer an interesting and attractive view across the Mere. Furthermore, the site forms part of the Conservation Area and has listed buildings within close proximity. With this in mind the scheme has to have due regard to the requirements of Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP which requires development to preserve listed buildings and their settings and the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. Likewise, the requirements of S16(2) and S66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 as referred to above in section 3 are applicable.
- 5.10 As highlighted above, the scheme has been revised insofar as the overall bulk and footprint of the dwellings have been reduced and the design and palette of external facing materials changed. The applicant has provided some visualisations to show how the scheme would integrate into its surroundings. It is considered that these offer an effective means of understanding its relationship with its surroundings.
- 5.11 It is considered that the scheme is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and what is a prominent and important view across the Mere and also preserves the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

Amenity

- 5.12 In terms of the relationship between the proposed development and neighbouring residential dwellings when noting the degree of separation, the scale of the development but taking into account the level changes means that light or outlook levels would not be significantly compromised. In terms of overlooking of neighbouring residential dwellings, it is considered that the positioning of the openings within the proposed dwellings relative to the neighbours is such that no significant overlooking would occur. It is also acknowledged that the wildlife garden to the east of the site, and it is appropriate to have regard to the potential impacts upon this in amenity terms. It is felt that it is not inappropriate to have openings looking out onto what is a public space. In terms of the impact on outlook from the wildlife garden, including the viewing platforms, it is not felt that the scale of the development (the eastern elevation of the development) when also noting the retention of a degree of space from the site boundary and the ability to retain and enhance vegetation on the boundary, is such that it would be so overly dominant so as to justify refusal.

Highway safety

- 5.13 The Highway Authority (NCC) has been consulted and confirmed that they have no objection in terms of highway safety or the level of parking provision offered. It is apparent that significant objection has been expressed at the nature of the access and associated traffic as set out in the representation section of the report. It is considered that three residential dwellings would not necessarily lead to significant volumes of traffic associated with it, furthermore, the location of the site within the town and the relatively narrow nature of the access and limited visibility will mean that vehicle speeds are likely to be very low. With this in mind it is not considered that the development would lead to significant levels of conflict between pedestrians and occupants and visitors to the proposed development.

Trees

- 5.14 A preliminary arboricultural impact assessment has been submitted and it is evident that in assessing the position of the proposed development relative to the trees that these can be kept without their health being significantly compromised. Likewise, it is considered that the remaining amenity space will still be useable in association with the three dwellings so as to avoid the need for any trees to be removed post development. It is necessary to establish a scheme of tree protection measures for the site whilst construction works are undertaken, it is considered that it is appropriate to agree these via a suitable worded planning condition.
- 5.15 A condition requiring the retention of all trees and hedging on the site is also considered appropriate given the value they add to the appearance of the site.

Ecology

- 5.16 An ecological impact assessment has been submitted and it found that that no bat roosts were identified at the buildings to be removed and their demolition is therefore not considered to have any impact upon roosting bats. Reasonable Avoidance Measures are also recommended to prevent potential negative impacts to bats, nesting birds, reptiles, common toad and hedgehog.
- 5.17 Recommendations have also been provided within this report which, if implemented, will enhance the site for local wildlife post development eg suitably designed landscaping scheme, including enhanced site boundaries. It is noted that a landscaping scheme is not presently provided, however, it is considered appropriate to agree this and associated management plan as part of a suitably worded condition.

Other issues

- 5.18 Concern has been expressed at the difficulties associated with constructing this development given the nature of the access, sloping nature of the site and close proximity of other buildings. In light of these factors it is considered appropriate to require a construction management plan to agree the parameters around the build project.
- 5.19 Associated with this, concern has been raised about vibration etc and the impacts this may have on neighbouring buildings. This matter would typically be dealt with through the provisions of the Party Wall Act.
- 5.20 Reference has been made to the impact upon an existing fire escape at no. 21. The buildings proposed as part of this scheme do not appear to directly impede no 21 when considering the current arrangement on-site and as such this could not reasonably be used as a reason for refusal.
- 5.21 The condition relating to archaeology as requested by HES is a reasonable one and will be included on any approval.
- 5.22 It is evident that a private amenity space has been provided to accompany 22a, and given the nature of the accommodation at 22a and the town centre location this is considered an acceptable arrangement.
- 5.23 Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. The Council has taken a proactive approach to this through the allocation of a range small and medium sized sites and through defining Development Boundaries for over 80 settlements to facilitate suitable windfall development. Point (c) of NPPF para 68 states that local planning authorities should *'support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing*

settlements for homes'. Although this is a material consideration in the determination of the application, it can only be afforded limited weight, given the previous supply of housing on small sites within the district.

- 5.24 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.
- 5.25 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

It is considered that the revised scheme has addressed the initial concerns that officers had and the scheme now complies with the requirements of the relevant policies identified above. On this basis, the scheme is recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions.


Recommendation : Approve subject to 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 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 tba
- 15 Provision of parking
- 16 Ecology

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail: craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk

2018/2699

Appendix 1



Scale 1:1,250

© 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. Appl. No : 2019/0412/D**
Parish : WORTWELL

Applicants Name : Mrs Riches
 Site Address : Land West Of 2 High Road Wortwell Norfolk
 Proposal : Reserved matters application following outline permission
 2018/2019 for 3 dwellings to include appearance, layout and
 landscaping.

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 : Approve with conditions
 (Summary)

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a rectangular shaped parcel of land which form part of a larger agricultural field located to the south of High Road outside of the development limit for Wortwell. To the east is a neighbouring detached single storey dwelling. To the south and west is the remainder of the field. The site frontage is vegetated and on the opposite side of the road is a residential development.
- 1.2 The application seeks reserved matter approval for the erection of three detached single storey dwellings, with plot 1 also including a detached single garage. The development would be accessed via a single access onto the High Road.
- 1.3 The application follows the granting of outline planning permission for three dwellings under 2018/2019.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|
| 2.1 | 2018/2019 | Outline planning for 3 detached self-build dwellings with all matters reserved | 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 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
- 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

- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)
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
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

4. Consultations

4.1 **Wortwell Parish Council**

Original plans

We consider the application should be approved as it generally supports the outline proposal and the designs are acceptable. The tiered bungalow, (next door to the existing bungalow at no. 2 High Road), followed by plot 2 chalet style bungalow, and plot 3 house is sensitive to the existing properties and is approved. But please see the condition and comments below.

If permission is granted, we suggest the following conditions of approval should be considered :-

We would wish to see consistency of design across all three buildings. As the designs are for self build proposals we would reserve the right to review or challenge any changes of design due to self build proposals.

We note that plot one is further forward than the original planning application. This breaks the building line of the three proposed designs. We are curious to know why this is the case.

We note that the boundaries border the flood line and wish to draw attention to this proximity. The fields are known to have heavy run off at times.

The hedging proposed at the front would appear to obscure access onto the road for not only the new builds but could impact on the property at no 2 High Road.

We do have concerns that as these are self build, design changes could occur after plots are marketed to end buyers. See condition under B above

Amended plans

We are pleased to see that that plot one has been realigned to satisfy the building line of the three properties.

We are acknowledge also that the design has been improved.

We have previously approved the build based on the reasons given in our previous email of the 28th February but would re-iterate the terms and conditions set out in that email regarding the following:

The boundaries border the flood line and we wish to draw attention to this proximity - the fields are known to have heavy run off at times the hedging proposed at the front would appear to obscure access onto the road for the new builds but also impacts on no 2 High

Road - we believe the owner of no 2 has also made this point as the proposals are self build we have concerns over any changes that could occur after the plots are marketed to end buyers and would want to see consistency of design and reserve the right to challenge any changes to the design due to self build proposals.

**4.2 District Councillor
Councillor Gray (former member)**

Original plans

A holding objection until the following issues are resolved:

1. Relationship with No.2 High Road which has been extended more or less to its western boundary. Therefore, the boundary treatment, planting and the eastern elevation of the property on plot 1 need to be very carefully assessed and controlled.
2. The frontage hedge line needs to be retained, but I have doubts whether the visibility splays can be achieved without removal of significant lengths of this existing hedging.
3. Plot 1 dwelling is also forward of the building line.

Amended plans

See previous comments which are not resolved by this revised plan.

4.3 NCC Highways

No objection subject to conditions

4.4 SNC Water Management Officer

No comments to make

4.5 Other Representations

Original objection:

Sun lounge added to increase light, this will be drastically reduced and also create overlooking and overshadowing.
the site has slow worms and shrews and they will be in danger. and landscaping above the low fence will reduce light.

1 letter received neither objecting to or supporting, but make the following observation:

Please take in to account the views expressed by the neighbour of this development at no. 2 High Road. Proximity and light levels.

This land had been previously explored years ago with the possibility of building the affordable homes that are now located on the opposite side of the road. It was decided at the time that to build next to no. 2 would be too dangerous for traffic owing to the bend in the road.

Objection to amended plan:

Yet again I draw your attention to the plan of my bungalow.... the plan before you shows my property BEFORE the sun room extension which is to the west boundary.

The submitted plan does not show this and will significantly reduce light in my property and result in overshadowing. I have 2 large windows on the west elevation of my property to allow daylight.

5 Assessment

Key Considerations

The key considerations are:

Principle; neighbour amenity; highway safety

Principle

- 5.1 The principle of residential development has been established through the granting of outline planning permission and therefore the assessment focuses on the key issues of the scheme as follows:

Character and appearance of the locality

- 5.2 The scheme continues with the linear pattern of development currently evident along High Road and the revising of the scheme to have three single storey dwellings also means that in terms of scale, mass and height, they are appropriate in their context. The external facing materials are a mix of render, red brick and pantiles which are appropriate in this edge of village location. The use of a single access point minimises the removal of the existing hedgerow, and thereby retains a mature and attractive feature of the site. In order to ensure that this is retained in perpetuity a condition has been added to require its retention in perpetuity. For these reasons the scheme complies with the requirements of Policies DM3.8 and DM4.5 of the SNLP.

Neighbour amenity

- 5.3 The proposed dwelling which lies closest to an existing neighbour is single storey with a hipped roof, which given its location relative to the neighbour means that light or outlook would not be significantly compromised. Likewise, there are no first floor windows in the proposed dwelling closest to the neighbour which could result in overlooking, with all proposed windows being within the ground floor. In acknowledgement of the location of the proposed dwelling on plot 1 relative to the position of the neighbouring property permitted development rights have been removed for this plot. All other neighbours are a significant distance away from the proposed development. For these reasons the scheme complies with the requirements of Policy DM3.13 of the SNLP.

Highway safety

- 5.4 The Highway Authority has assessed the scheme and confirmed that it has no objection subject to a condition. For this reason the requirements of Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the SNLP are met.

Other issues

- 5.5 Conditions have been added in order to agree details of slab levels, boundary treatments, surface water drainage and foul water drainage.
- 5.6 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.7 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

5.8 In summary, the scheme is consistent with the terms of the outline approval and also meets all of the requirements of the relevant planning policies identified in this report, and therefore, subject to the imposition of conditions, the scheme is recommended for approval.

Recommendation : Approve subject to conditions

- 1 Approved drawings
- 2 External materials
- 3 Boundary treatments
- 4 TRAD 4
- 5 Retention of hedge
- 6 No PD for plot 1
- 7 Surface water drainage details tba
- 8 Foul water drainage tba
- 9 Slab level tba

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail: craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk

2019/0412

Appendix 1



Scale 1:1,250

© 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

- 3. Appl. No : 2019/0749/F**
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs A & L Culling
 Site Address : Land to the rear of 35 Lynch Green, Hethersett, Norfolk
 Proposal : Proposed new 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 : Approval with Conditions
 (Summary)

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 The application seeks to subdivide 35 Lynch Green in Hethersett to provide a plot for one dwelling. The scheme includes the demolition and replacement of existing garaging for the existing dwelling, demolition of a pool building to facilitate the construction of garaging for the proposed dwelling, and the infilling of the existing swimming pool, the current scheme is the re-submission of an earlier scheme approved under reference number 2016/1467 which is an extant permission but has, as yet, not commenced.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|----------|
| 2.1 | 2016/0389 | Proposed new dwelling | Refused |
| 2.2 | 2016/1467 | Proposed new dwelling | Approved |

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 NPPF 05 : Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 NPPF 09: Promoting sustainable transport
 NPPF 10 : Supporting high quality communications
 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 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 14 : Key Service Centres
- 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (SNLP)
 DM3.5 : Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Development Boundaries
 DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
 DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
 DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
 DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
 DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management

DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

Statutory duties relating to the setting of listed buildings:

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".

4. Consultations**4.1 Parish Council**

Comments for both sets of plans:

Refuse: out of character. Support the concerns of 43 Lynch Green impact on the neighbour. Concern regarding the drainage of a tarmac driveway.

4.2 District Councillor

Cllr Dale (former member) - to be determined by Committee

Verbal agreement that if the corrected plans are a repeat of previously approved scheme, then, and only then, can the application be delegated.

Cllr Hardy - To Committee. A Heritage Statement should be submitted to assess if there is any harm to the listed building or its setting.

Cllr Dearnley - To Committee for the reasons already set out by Cllr Hardy.

4.3 NCC Highways

Subject to the provision of onsite parking and turning no objections are raised.

4.4 SNC Water Management Officer

Support subject to the details for disposal of surface water.

4.5 Other RepresentationsComments on originally submitted plans:

3 letters of objection:

- Hethersett does not have in infrastructure for the existing dwellings there should be a halt on all new dwellings.
- Loss of conifer trees to the rear of the property will destroy a pleasant view from my property.
- No trees to be planted to compensate for the loss of the trees being removed to allow for the fencing.
- Why are there three garages and three car ports for a three-bedroom property.
- Out of character with the area
- drive in close proximity to my garden and cottage, concerned about the materials to be used for the drive which appear to be gravel.
- Will the driveway be wide enough for the lorries to deliver the materials?
- Where will the construction traffic park?

Comments on amended plans:

2 letters of objection:

- Out of character, view of building is more like an industrial building.
- possibility of large air conditioning units.
- Still showing graven for the drive.

5 Assessment

Key considerations

The key considerations in assessing this application are whether the principle of development is acceptable and whether the proposal is appropriate in respect of its design and impact on heritage assets, residential amenity, highway safety and drainage.

Principle

- 5.1 The scheme is assessed against policy DM3.5 which permits the subdivision of existing plots for additional dwellings within the development boundaries subject to meeting the following criteria:

- a) Incorporates a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of existing buildings, street scene and surroundings; and
- b) Does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

- 5.2 Specifically, proposals must provide and maintain:

- c) Adequate private amenity and utility space;
- d) Adequate access and parking; and
- e) Adequate levels of amenity with reasonable access to light and privacy, free from unacceptable noise or other pollutants.

- 5.3 It should be noted the scheme being considered is a repeat of the 2016 application for which the principle, design and residential amenities were accepted. The 2016 permission is still live with all the pre-commencement conditions having been discharged and the permission could lawfully be implemented immediately, indeed the applicant has intimated that they will be making a commencement on site imminently. The application has been re-submitted to enable the applicants to have longer to commence the work should the need arise.. However, due to the comments received, I have set out below the full assessment against the above policies.

Design

- 5.4 The scheme as proposed is modern in design providing a flat roof single storey dwelling with a section to the rear of the property which is two storeys providing one bedroom and en-suite at first floor. The design includes a mono pitch roof section on the west elevation and has been designed to break the overall dwelling into sections which significantly reduces the bulk of the building. While there is an element of first floor at the rear of the property, the floor plan shows the floor to be set back from the first-floor window and therefore does not result in the loss of privacy to either the existing property, or the neighbouring property.
- 5.5 Concern has been raised by the Parish Council and local residents on the design which is considered modern/commercial and does not respect the character of the existing area. Subdivision and redevelopment is a feature in this particular area of Hethersett with new dwellings infilling plots in and around more historic properties. As previously stated, due to the development of the area, the overall character and grain of the settlement has changed

and further appropriate and sensitive infilling would not necessarily be harmful to the character of the area. I accept that the design of the proposed building is contemporary however the scale, bulk, massing and design of the proposed building in this location will preserve the setting of the adjacent listed building, and will not have any adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling or surrounding properties. The dwelling is therefore considered to be acceptable in this location.

Heritage

- 5.6 In respect of heritage impact, due consideration has been given to the neighbouring property (No 43 Lynch Green) which is a Grade II listed building. The Council's Design and Conservation Officer visited the site when the application was submitted in 2016. I have discussed the repeat application with him and he considers that given the range of other new development in the area which also subdivides various sites, together with the limited height, scale, position and with the approved boundary screening, concludes there is no harm to the setting of the listed building from the proposed development. It is noted that Cllr Hardy states there is no Heritage Statement submitted, given it has already been concluded there is no harm to the adjacent listed building from the proposed development, there is no requirement to submit a heritage statement in this instance.
- 5.7 For the above-mentioned reasons the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the setting of the listed building in accordance with both policy DM4.10 and Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 5.8 In summary, in terms of scale and design it is considered the overall scale and design is acceptable and therefore accords with criteria a) c) and e) of Policy DM3.5 and with policies DM3.8 and DM4.10 of the SNLP 2015 and s66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Residential amenity

- 5.9 Concern has been raised by neighbours about the loss of amenities. The general design of the building has no first-floor windows in the north elevation and only one door at ground floor level which serves a boiler room. Windows in the east elevation serve bedroom 3 and two en-suites. A first-floor window in the west elevation will not result in loss of privacy due to the mono pitch roof of the games/study room at ground floor. The first-floor benefits from glazing to allow natural light into this space including the stairwell. The large window has been protected with a wall panel, which allows light in from both sides and on top due to the angled glazing. There is also a void on the first floor, so it is not possible to stand by the window. This design benefits the new dwelling allowing maximum natural light but protects the privacy of the existing and neighbouring properties. As designed the proposed dwelling meet criteria b) of policy DM3.5 and the requirements of policy DM3.13 of the SNLP.
- 5.10 At present the north boundary of the site includes a conifer hedge which is in excess of 3 metres. This hedge is to be removed as part of the new development and replaced by a 1.8 panel fence. As the new dwelling is mainly single storey with no windows in the north elevation, and no amenity space in this part of the site, I consider this form of boundary treatment acceptable.
- 5.11 The remaining boundaries comprise Beech hedging which is proposed to be strengthened, infilled where there are gaps or replaced as part of the scheme. The landscaping scheme was approved as part of the 2016 application and has been resubmitted as part of this application. Subject to the plans as submitted and the conditions the scheme is considered to provide adequate boundary treatment to protect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and therefore accords with the requirements of policy DM3.13.

Access

- 5.12 The scheme as proposed provides the shared access to continue to the east of No35, removing the pool building to provide garaging and vehicle access to the plot. Concern has been raised by the neighbouring property (No43) and the Local Member regarding the type of surfacing. It was agreed as part of the 2016 application that the surface of the access should not be gravel to reduce the noise and disturbance to No43. The surface of the drive is to be tarmac which was approved as part of the discharge condition under the 2016 application and has been included as part of this repeat application. Subject to the provision of turning and parking being available on the site prior to occupation, the Highway Authority has not objected to the application. The scheme therefore accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the SNLP 2015.

Drainage

- 5.13 As submitted no details for the disposal of surface water have been provided. The Water Management Officer has requested a condition to ensure the details are submitted to ensure surface water does not result in flooding issues to the existing properties, or the proposed dwelling. The condition has been included.

Other Issues

- 5.14 Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. Although this is a material consideration, it is considered that the matters appraised above are of greater significance.
- 5.15 The NPPF also 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 this instance, and similar the matter discussed in the paragraph above, the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.16 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
- 5.17 This application is not liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Conclusion


- 5.18 The scheme has not changed since the previous approval in 2016 which remains an extant permission. The design has no adverse impact on the character of the area, or the amenities of the neighbouring properties. There has been no change to either national or local plan policies which would change the assessment of the scheme since its approval in 2016. Therefore, subject to carrying forward the previously imposed planning conditions, the scheme is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

- 1 Full planning permission time limit
- 2 In accord with submitted drawings
- 3 External materials as detailed
- 4 Provision of parking, service
- 5 Surface of driveway as detailed
- 6 New water efficiency
- 7 Retention trees and hedges
- 8 Landscaping as detailed
- 9 Implement boundary treatment
- 10 No additional windows at first floor
- 11 Slab level
- 12 Details for disposal of surface water

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

Appendix 1



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

Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

- 4. Appl. No : 2019/1055/F**
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Mark Heazle
 Site Address : Wymondham Leisure Centre, Norwich Road, Wymondham, NR18 0NT
 Proposal : Removal of an existing external 'All Weather Sport Pitch' and replacement with an extended car park and external amenity lighting

Reason for reporting to committee

The Council is the applicant.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions
 (Summary)

1 Proposal and site context

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission to remove an existing all-weather 3G sport pitch and to replace it with an extended car parking and lighting at the rear of Wymondham Leisure Centre. The application has been submitted to cater for an increase in customers using the leisure centre and improve parking provision for existing customers.
- 1.2 As a result of the works, 42 new car parking spaces are being created. Four 6m high lighting columns will be erected around the new car park and new two new lighting columns in the existing car park. Some shrubbery and semi-mature trees will be removed to provide additional car parking spaces within the existing car park.
- 1.3 Wymondham Leisure Centre is within the development boundary that has been defined for the town. It is located off Norwich Road next to the High School and its playing fields.

2. Relevant planning history

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|
| 2.1 | 2015/0581 | External - Extension to reception creating new cafe and larger reception area, extension to sports hall to create a new two storey fitness area.
Internal - General refurbishment to all areas, new spa, separation to swimming pool & new soft play. | Approved |
| 2.2 | 2015/2127 | Non-material amendment to planning permission 2015/2581 - Windows shown to entrance curtain walling, new plant shown to link building, and proposed windows removed from pool. | Approved |
| 2.3 | 2015/2244 | Removal of condition 2 following planning application 2015/0581/F - The surround to the external escape stairs which is not a general circulation stairs is to be removed due to no requirement under building regulations this will create a less intrusive | Approved |

visual elevation from neighbouring properties.
By drawing re-submittal

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|
| 2.4 | 2016/0216 | Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/0581- Fire escape stairs has been added and the fire escape door has been moved into the new cladding panel. | Approved |
|-----|-----------|--|----------|

3 Planning Policies

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy and safe communities
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 (SNLP)
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
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.16 : Improving level of community facilities
- 3.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP)
WYM12 : Protecting existing recreation or amenity land in Wymondham

4. Consultations

4.1 **Town Council**

Approve

4.2 **District Councillor Councillor Halls**

No objection but suggest that Environmental Health is consulted.

4.3 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**

No comments

4.4 **NCC Highways**

No highway objections

4.5 **Sport England**

To be reported if appropriate.

4.6 **Other Representations**

No responses received

5 Assessment

Key considerations

The key considerations in assessing this application are whether the loss of the sports pitch is acceptable and the impacts on the appearance of the area, residential amenity, highway safety and trees around the site.

Loss of sports pitch

- 5.1 Amongst other things, Policy DM3.15 of the SNLP explains that development must not result in a net quantitative or qualitative loss of existing open space unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of amenity space. Of relevance within Policy DM3.16 is that it sets out that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable walking distance to meet local needs. In addition to this, Policy WYM 12 of the WAAP seeks to protect existing recreation or amenity land and only permits the redevelopment or change of use of this land where:-

- 1) The proposed development is ancillary to the principal recreational use of the site;*
- 2) It affects only a small part of the site which cannot be used for pitch sports and does not prejudice the recreational use of the site;*
- 3) It involves the replacement of the recreational facility with another of equivalent or improved quality;*
- 4) An assessment of need shows that there is an excess of provision of the particular facility and it cannot be adapted to meet other recreational needs;*
- 5) It is part of the relocation of a sports (or similar) club which will provide an overall improvement in recreational facilities;*
- 6) It will result in recreational provisions better suited to future needs and there is no current shortage of playing fields or recreational/amenity land in the locality.*

- 5.2 In support of the application, the applicant has explained that the financial case for retaining the pitch that is the subject of this application is weak. The existing surface is over 12 years old and past its useful economic life with the surrounding fencing presenting some health and safety challenges. In a report to Cabinet on 10 June 2019, the Head of Health and Leisure Services explained that the pitch was recently inspected and requires approximately £70,000 to repair and future-proof. He also explained that on average, the pitch is hired out 14 hours a week and is a loss making facility.

- 5.3 Linked to the above is the opening of a full-size artificial grass pitch at Ketts Park in December 2018 by South Norfolk Council, which is approximately half a mile from the Leisure Centre. The applicant has explained that this facility was delivered in response to the Greater Norwich Playing Pitch Strategy which identified a need for such a facility due to the poor condition of the natural turf pitches at Ketts Park and anticipated growth in demand for artificial grass pitch access due to local housing and population growth. This was delivered with a financial contribution from the Football Foundation and support from Norfolk County FA. The facility at Ketts Park has increased capacity four-fold, and the vast majority of hirers from Wymondham Leisure Centre have moved their participation to Ketts Park. The pitch at Wymondham Leisure Centre provides one five-a-side pitch (612m²) while Ketts Park provides a mix of five, seven, nine and eleven-a-side pitches on an area of 6400m².

- 5.4 It is acknowledged that this application will result in the loss of a recreational facility at the Leisure Centre. However, this loss is off-set by the provision of a better facility approximately half a mile away at Ketts Park. Given this and when having regard to the information provided by the applicant, the loss of the pitch will not prejudice the recreational use of Wymondham Leisure Centre where a range of other facilities are available to customers. Since the refurbishment of the Leisure Centre was complete in 2016, the number of annual customer visits has increased from 360,000 to 570,000 and the provision of additional parking will contribute towards improving parking provision at peak times and increasing sport and activity levels to customers who choose to drive to the Leisure Centre. Taking account of the above, the application complies with Policies DM3.15 and DM3.16 of the SNLP and Policy WYM 12 of the WAAP.

Impact on appearance of area

- 5.5 There are existing mature trees and hedges around the site and there are existing lighting columns around the site. The slimline nature of the columns will result in them appearing relatively low key and will not have a significant additional impact on the local landscape or surrounding area. The application complies with Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy DM3.8 of the SNLP.

Residential amenity

- 5.6 As part of the application, six new 6m high lighting columns will be erected. Four of these will be erected around the new car park and two along the new car park. A lighting plan was submitted with the application and having reviewed this, the Council's Environmental Quality Officer has no comments to make. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the site are obscured by the mature hedging around the site and will not be significantly adversely affected by the proposed lighting or new car parking area. The application complies with Policy DM3.13.

Highway safety and parking

- 5.7 The number of car parking spaces being provided will increase from 118 to 160. The development will not result in a significant increase in traffic to or from the site as although the new car parking is to accommodate both existing and new customers to the Leisure Centre, the traffic connected to the 3G pitch has now been relocated to Ketts Park. The Highway Authority has not objected to the application on the grounds of highway safety and the application therefore complies with Policy DM3.11 of the SNLP.

Loss of trees

- 5.8 The provision of five new car parking spaces in the northwest corner of the car park will result in the loss of areas of semi-mature trees and shrubbery. However, the shrubbery is low key planting visible only within the car park while the semi-mature trees are not of significant amenity value within the surrounding area and other trees are present close-by.

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 the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Conclusion

- 5.11 The removal of the sports pitch that is ancillary to other activities at Wymondham Leisure Centre has been adequately justified and the provision of additional car parking and lighting columns will result in a facility which will have acceptable impacts on the appearance of the area, residential amenity and highway safety. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval as it complies with Policy 2 of the JCS, Policies DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.15 and DM3.16 of the SNLP and Policy WYM 12 of the WAAP.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions


- 1 Full planning permission time limit
- 2 In accord with submitted drawings
- 3 No further lighting

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

2019/1055

Appendix 1

Not Set



Scale 1:2,500

© 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

Planning Appeals

Appeals received from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision
2018/0974	Diss Grove House Mount Street Diss IP22 4QQ	Mr & Mrs R Bartram	Part demolition of existing boundary wall. New access including new garden walls and gates, erection of new cart lodge building	Delegated	Refusal
2018/0975	Diss Grove House Mount Street Diss IP22 4QQ	Mr & Mrs R Bartram	Part demolition of existing boundary wall. New access including new garden walls and gates.	Delegated	Refusal
2018/2062	Saxlingham Nethergate 1 Cargate Lane Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk NR15 1TS	Mr Colin Bough	Variation of condition 2 of permission 2017/2640 (extension and associated alterations) - revised design	Development Management Committee	Refusal
2017/8237	Stable Block at Land off Wood Lane Starston Norfolk	Mr V Marino	Appeal against Enforcement Notice for change of use of land and stable building to residential use	Delegated	Refusal

Planning Appeals

Appeals received from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2019/0247	Saxlingham Nethergate Land North of Gransville Ipswich Road Saxlingham Thorpe Norfolk	Mr J Jarvis And Miss M Skutela	Erection of single self build dwelling	Delegated	Refusal
2018/2368	Bawburgh Land adj to Park View New Road Bawburgh Norfolk	Mr R Greengrass	Erection of 1 No. self build dwelling with associated parking	Development Management Committee	Refusal
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
2018/2096	Morningthorpe and Fritton Land West of the Common Fritton Norfolk	Mr William Sargent	Erection of 2 detached dwellings with cart-shed and associated external works	Development Management Committee	Refusal
2017/2371	Morningthorpe and Fritton Hay Cart Barn Brick Kiln Lane Morningthorpe Norfolk NR15 2LG	Mr Alex Oram	Removal of condition 5 which restricts the occupation of the barn to holiday accommodation only.	Development Management Committee	Refusal

Planning Appeals

Appeals received from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2018/2697	Burston and Shimpling 2 Station Road Burston Norfolk IP22 5UA	Mr & Mrs Garry Armour	Two storey side extension	Delegated	Refusal
2019/0733	Hethersett 3 Whitegates Close Hethersett NR9 3JG	Mr & Mrs Stephen & Linda Taylor	Fell - Scots pine due to excessive shading and low amenity value. Replant with Rowan and/or Hawthorn.	Delegated	Refusal
2018/2698	Caistor St Edmund & Bixley Land South of Water Treatment Works Norwich Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk	Mr & Mrs D Baldwin	Erection of Eco dwelling	Delegated	Refusal
2019/0360	Burston and Shimpling Land North of Mill Green Burston Norfolk	Mr & Mrs Bloomfield	Outline application for demolition of existing outbuildings. Erection of 5 No. dwellinghouses & garage structures. New site vehicle access to Highway	Delegated	Refusal

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

Ref	Parish / Site	Appellant	Proposal	Decision Maker	Final Decision	Appeal Decision
2017/2652	Poringland Land South of Burgate Lane Poringland Norfolk	Gladman Developments	Outline application for the erection of up to 165 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from Burgate Lane. All matters reserved except for means of access.	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Withdrawn
2016/2430	Costessey Land North of Farmland Road Costessey Norfolk	Mrs Katrina Kozersky	Outline application with access and Landscaping (all other matters reserved) for 83 dwellings (including 27 affordable dwellings) with areas of public open space, sustainable drainage systems and associated infrastructure.	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2017/0420	Costessey Land North of Farmland Road Costessey Norfolk	Mrs Katrina Kozersky	Provision of two circular recreational walks, including boardwalks and associated landscaping and biodiversity enhancements (Linked with application 2016/2430)	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2018/1453	Kirby Bedon Sub-division of the Garden of the Old Stracey Kirby Road Kirby Bedon Norfolk	Mr Anthony Hammond	Proposed bungalow and double garage	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1105	Loddon Land West of Express Plastics Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk	Mr R Holmes	Full planning permission for one detached dwelling and garage with associated access and landscaping	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/2477	Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall 2 Jubilee Cottages New Road Ashwellthorpe Norfolk NR16 1HF	Mr & Mrs D And M Prior	Erection of first floor extension	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal Allowed
2018/0318	Mulbarton Land adj to 1 Birchfield Lane Mulbarton Norfolk	Mr Giuliano Korosec	Proposed new dwelling	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/0968	Bramerton Land East of Orchard House The Street Bramerton Norfolk	Mr Neil Walker	Construction of one dwelling with double garage, landscaping and access drive	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2016/1627	Poringland Land To The North of Heath Loke Poringland Norfolk	Mr S Kittle	Erection of 19 dwellings with access and all other matters reserved	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2018/0048	Poringland Land to the East of Overtons Way Poringland Norfolk	Mr Stephen Litten	Construction of 8 no. new 3 storey, 3 bedroom town houses with private gardens and parking allocation.	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/0768	Wacton Land to the rear of Washfield Lodge Wash Lane Wacton Norfolk	Mr Christopher Elsbury	Proposed erection of dwelling	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1207	Hethersett 26 St Davids Road Hethersett NR9 3DH	Mr David Poyntz	Variation of condition 2 of permission 2005/2230 - To lease annexe independently from main dwelling.	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal Allowed
2018/0694	Wymondham Land to the rear of 1 Milebridge Farm Cottage Spinks Lane Wymondham Norfolk	Mr & Mrs Patrick and Christine Boswell	Erection of dwelling for retirement home incorporating existing art studio to include access only.	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1529	Wicklewood Land adj to 69 High Street Wicklewood Norfolk	Mr John Seville	Proposed new 2-bed bungalow to the rear of 69 High Street	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2018/0681	Pulham Market Land to the North of 1 Colegate End Road Pulham Market Norfolk	Mr Philip Vincent	Outline permission (with all matters reserved) for two detached, three bedroom, self-build bungalow dwellings, with garages and gardens (revised)	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1059	Shotesham Land South of Greenhill The Common Shotesham Norfolk	Miss Linda Bacon	Demolition of an existing outbuilding previously used as storage and the construction of a new single storey 3-bed dwelling with integral garage	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/0682	Saxlingham Nethergate Former Piggery at Windy Ridge Foxhole Saxlingham Thorpe Norfolk	Mrs T R Baker	Conversion of 2 no existing concrete blockwork former piggery units into 1 no dwelling and a detached garage (QA and QB)	Delegated	Approval of details - Refused	Appeal dismissed
2018/0752	Kirstead Agricultural Building adj to High Lees Farm Kirstead Green Kirstead Norfolk	Mr G Darling	Notification for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use and associated building works of an agricultural building to two dwellinghouses (QA and QB)	Delegated	Approval of details - Approved	Appeal dismissed

Planning Appeals

Appeals decisions from 10 April 2019 to 12 June 2019

2018/1680	Kirstead Agricultural Building West of High Lees Farm Kirstead Green Kirstead Norfolk	Mr C Darling	Notification for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use and associated building works of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (QA and QB)	Delegated	Approval of details - Refused	Appeal Allowed
2018/2392	Dickleburgh and Rushall 27 Beech Way Dickleburgh Norfolk IP21 4NZ	Mr & Mrs C Jones	Erection of two storey rear extension	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/1917	Starston Agricultural Building South East of Highlands Farm Hardwick Road Starston Norfolk	Ms Sarah Willett	Notification for Prior Approval for proposed change of use of agricultural building to dwellinghouse (QA and QB).	Delegated	Approval of details - Refused	Appeal dismissed
2018/2595	Framingham Pigot Home Farm Loddon Road Framingham Pigot NR14 7PW	Mr D Harris	Detached annexe ancillary to existing dwelling	Delegated	Refusal	Appeal dismissed
2018/2062	Saxlingham Nethergate 1 Cargate Lane Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk NR15 1TS	Mr Colin Bough	Variation of condition 2 of permission 2017/2640 (extension and associated alterations) - revised design	Development Management Committee	Refusal	Appeal dismissed