

# Development Management Committee

## Members of the Development Management Committee:

### Conservatives      Liberal Democrat

Mr V Thomson      Mr T Laidlaw  
(Chairman)  
Mrs L Neal  
(Vice Chairman)  
Mr D Bills  
Mr G Minshull

#### **PUBLIC ATTENDANCE**

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

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

#### **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

You may register to speak by emailing us at [democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk), no later than 3.00pm on Monday, 30 November 2020.

## Agenda

### **Date**

Thursday 3 December 2020

### **Time**

10.00 am

### **Place**

**To be hosted remotely at**

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

### **Contact**

Leah Arthurton: tel (01508) 533610

South Norfolk House  
Cygnet Court  
Long Stratton Norwich  
NR15 2XE

Email: [democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.south-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk)

**PLEASE NOTE** that any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee's attention.

Please note that where you submit your views in writing to your District Councillor, this is described as "lobbying" and the District Councillor will be obliged to pass these on to the planning officer, where they will be published on the website. Please also note that if you intend to speak on an application, your name will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and kept on public record indefinitely.

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**

### **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 Thursday, 18 November 2020;** (attached – page 8)
5. **Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;** (attached – page 15)  
To consider the items as listed below:

Item No.	Planning Ref No.	Parish	Site Address	Page No.
1	2020/1775/RV C	<b>BRACON ASH AND HETHEL</b>	Land east of Lodge Farm House, Hawkes Lane, Bracon Ash, NR14 8EW	15

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. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday, 16 December 2020

## GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

## 2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

### Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

CNDP	Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan
J.C.S	Joint Core Strategy
LSAAP	Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre-Submission
N.P.P.F	National Planning Policy Framework
P.D.	Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified)
S.N.L.P	South Norfolk Local Plan 2015
	Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document
	Development Management Policies Document
WAAP	Wymondham Area Action Plan



## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

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

Does the interest directly:

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

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

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

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

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but you should not partake in general discussion or vote.


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

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

**FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.**

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

## DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF





## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held remotely on Wednesday, 18 November 2020 at 10.00 am.**

**Committee Members Present:** **Councillors:** V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, T Laidlaw, L Neal (Items 2-7) and G Minshull (Items 2-7)

**Officers in Attendance:** The Assistant Director of Planning (H Mellors), the Area Planning Manager (C Raine), the Principal Planning Officer (C Curtis), the Senior Planning Officer (S Everard) and the Heritage Officer (P Whitehead)

### 529. 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
<b>2018/2785 (Item 1)</b>	<b>CRINGLEFORD</b>	L Neal	Local Planning Code of Practice As a Cabinet Member, Cllr Neal left the meeting while this item was considered.
<b>2020/0333 (Item 4)</b>	<b>BROOKE</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Agent for the Applicant
		All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector
<b>2020/1890 (Item 7)</b>	<b>BROOKE</b>	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Developer

### 530. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 21 October 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 531. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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



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

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>PARISH</b>	<b>SPEAKERS</b>
<b>2018/2785</b> <b>(item 1)</b>	<b>CRINGLEFORD</b>	N Perryman – Agent for the Applicant
<b>2020/0333</b> <b>(Item 4)</b>	<b>BROOKE</b>	J Spinks – Parish Council M Banks – Objector I Hill – Agent for the Applicant Cllr J Fuller – Local Member
<b>2020/1495</b> <b>(Item 5)</b>	<b>CRINGLEFORD</b>	T Wang – Parish Council N Holmes - Applicant
<b>2020/1680</b> <b>(item 6)</b>	<b>PULHAM MARKET</b>	J Barber – Agent for the Applicant Cllr C Hudson – Local Member
<b>2020/1890</b> <b>(Item 7)</b>	<b>BROOKE</b>	S Spurgeon – Applicant Cllr J Fuller – Local Member

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

## **532. PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 1.50pm)

---

Chairman

**Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
**– 18 November 2020**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Updates</b>	<b>Page No</b>
Item 1	None received	16
Items 2 and 3	<p><b>DEFERRED</b></p> <p>Additional information relating to viability has been received by officers which needs to be given due consideration and their views reported to the Development Management Committee.</p>	34
Item 4	<p>Para 4.17 – NCC Highways raise no objections subject to conditions – Para 5.12 to 5.14 sets out NCC Highways view and requirements and their conditions are included in the list of recommended conditions.</p> <p>Lobbying letters have been received and circulated to all members from the applicant's agent and from the neighbour at 2 The Coach House.</p> <p>Officers would wish to confirm that the back track running alongside and to the rear of the Coach House will not be used for construction traffic and would be controlled by the tree protection and method statement (recommended condition no. 4 in the cttee report) and this will be submitted and agreed in full as a pre-commencement condition.</p>	55
Item 5	None received	74
Item 6	<p>A revised elevation plan has been submitted. This has resulted in amendments to the design of the garage as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Pitch lowered by 2.5 degrees</li> <li>– Eaves lowered by 75mm</li> <li>– Garage lowered into the ground – the application site sits lower than Guildhall Lane/</li> </ul> <p>The revised site section also shows that the garage has been lowered in the ground by 1.2m. This results in the garage slab level being 290mm below the new dwelling,</p> <p>Representation from Cllr M Wilby</p> <p>To the committee, as one of the local members for this application. I object to this application 2020/1680 because of the overbearing appearance of this proposal and the size of it in such a rural part of the village, it is also outside of the development boundary. I support the comments of the other district councillor and the parish council, especially regarding</p>	84

	overdevelopment of the site. I ask the committee to refuse this application	
Item 7	None received	89

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**                 :     **2018/2785/D**  
        **Parish**                 :     **CRINGLEFORD**  
  
        Applicant's Name     :     Big Sky Developments Ltd  
        Site Address         :     Area BS3 South of Newmarket Road Cringleford Norfolk  
        Proposal             :     Reserved Matters details of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping following outline permission 2017/2120, for RM-APP-3 comprising 62 dwellings together with associated landscaping and infrastructure. (The outline submission included an Environmental Statement)  
  
        Decision             :     Members voted unanimously for **Approval** to authorise the Director of Place to approve, subject to amendments  
  
                                       Approved with conditions  
  
                                       1 In accordance with outline consent  
                                       2 To accord with submitted plans  
                                       3 Materials to accord with submitted details  
                                       4 Lighting design strategy  
                                       5 Ecological mitigation
  
2.     **Appl. No**                 :     **2019/2252/O**  
        **Parish**                 :     **ASHWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL**  
  
        Applicant's Name     :     Saffron Housing Trust & P. Muskett  
        Site Address         :     Land To Rear of Wood Farm The Street Ashwellthorpe Norfolk  
        Proposal             :     Erection of 12 affordable dwellings with associated access and parking
  
3.     **Appl. No**                 :     **2019/2253/O**  
        **Parish**                 :     **ASHWELLTHORPE AND FUNDENHALL**  
  
        Applicant's Name     :     Saffron Housing Trust & P. Muskett  
        Site Address         :     Land To Rear of Wood Farm The Street Ashwellthorpe Norfolk  
        Proposal             :     Erection of 5 affordable dwellings and 7 market dwellings with associated access, garaging and parking. Pond and wetland area.  
  
                                       Items 2 and 3 were deferred by the Applicant prior to the meeting

4. **Appl. No** : **2020/0333/F**  
**Parish** : **BROOKE**
- Applicant's Name : Mr Muj Malik  
Site Address : Brooke House Brooke Gardens Brooke Norfolk NR15 1JH  
Proposal : Extension to Brooke House to provide an additional 26 bedroom care facility (Class C2), with associated ancillary uses, highway and landscape works.
- Decision : Members voted 3-2 for **Refusal** (against officer recommendation, which was lost 2-3)
- Refused
- Reasons for refusal
- 1 The proposal by virtue of its size, scale, form and specific design, would significantly harm Brooke Conservation Area and the Historic Parkland setting, contrary to Policies DM2.1, DM3.8 and DM4.10.
  - 2 The proposed off-site highway works, which include the loss of the grass island, will change the natural character of the Conservation Area, in particular the setting to the Meres, which will adversely impact on the exiting street scene and would significantly harm Brooke Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DM2.1 and DM4.10.
  - 3 The Intensification/increase in traffic and the location of service area would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, contrary to DM2.1 and DM3.13.

#### Other Applications

5. **Appl. No** : **2020/1495/H**  
**Parish** : **CRINGLEFORD**
- Applicant's Name : Mr & Ms Neil And Mary Holmes  
Site Address : 1 Newmarket Road Cringleford Norfolk NR4 6UE  
Proposal : Demolition of existing porch, roof to single storey front extension, garage and single storey rear extension and erection of 2 storey extension, detached double garage / study, replacement porch and roof to single storey front extension.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
  - 2 In accordance with submitted drawings
  - 3 External materials
  - 4 Window/external door/glazing details
  - 5 Ecological enhancements
  - 6 Surface Water
  - 7 Tree protection
  - 8 Boundary treatment
  - 9 Replacement trees to be planted


6. **Appl. No** : **2020/1680/F**  
**Parish** : **PULHAM MARKET**
- Applicant's Name : Manor Lake Properties  
Site Address : Agricultural Building South of Guildhall Lane Pulham Market  
Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of new triple garage and home office.  
Decision : Members voted 4-1 for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Time Limit
  - 2 Submitted Drawings
  - 3 Boundary Treatments
  - 4 Surface water drainage
7. **Appl. No** : **2020/1890/RVC**  
**Parish** : **BROOKE**
- Applicant's Name : C/o Agent  
Site Address : The Bungalow Howe Lane Brooke NR15 1HH  
Proposal : Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2018/2290 - to clad existing brickwork, reduce size of garage door and changes to fenestration.  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal** (contrary to officer recommendation, which was unanimously lost)
- Refused
- Reason for Refusal  
Members felt that the design and appearance of the roof tiles and the cladding were out of keeping and contrary to the Council's Design Policy.
- Members then voted unanimously to pursue enforcement action on the Applicant for the reasons set out above.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

**Report of Director of Place**

**Other Applications**

**Application 1**



## Other Applications

1.     **Application No:**         **2020/1775/RVC**  
       **Parish:**               **BRACON ASH AND HETHEL**
- Applicant's Name:     Orchard Homes Ltd  
Site Address            Land east of Lodge Farm House, Hawkes Lane, Bracon Ash, NR14 8EW  
Proposal                Variation of condition 2 of 2011/1429 - to revise site layout, house types and garaging.

### Reason for reporting to committee

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

Recommendation summary: Approval with Conditions

### 1     Proposal and site context

- 1.1     The application site is located on land to the East of Lodge Farm, Hawkes Lane, Bracon Ash. There are existing dwellings to the south and west with open countryside to the north and east. The site is part outside and part inside the development limits. An active planning permission (reference 2011/1429) for two dwellings and garages has been commenced and therefore remains extant on the site. This permission was a renewal, having originally being approved in 1998 and then subsequently renewed multiple times.
- 1.2     The proposal is to revise condition 2 of 2011/1429 to alter the design, increase the size and alter the layout of the two dwellings. The access location remains the same, as does the red line of the application site.

### 2.    Relevant planning history

- |     |           |   |          |
|-----|-----------|---|----------|
| 2.1 | 2014/1736 | Discharge of conditions 3 & 7 of planning permission 2011/1429/F - Materials and boundary treatment   | Approved |
| 2.2 | 2012/1785 | Proposed development of 4 no 3 bed houses and garages   | Refused  |
| 2.3 | 2011/1429 | Extension of time limit application to planning permission 2008/1818/F - for the erection of two detached two storey dwellings with associated double garages | Approved |
| 2.4 | 2008/1818 | Renewal of unimplemented permission 2003/1837/F for the erection of two detached two storey dwellings with associated double garages                          | Approved |
| 2.5 | 2003/1837 | Renewal of unimplemented permission NW07/98/1564/F for the erection of two detached dwellings with associated double garages                                  | Approved |
| 2.6 | 1998/1564 | Erection of two dwellings   | Approved |



### 3 Planning Policies

#### 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

NPPF 02: Achieving sustainable development

NPPF 04: Decision-making

NPPF 05: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF 06: Building a strong, competitive economy

NPPF 08: Promoting healthy and safe communities

NPPF 09: Promoting sustainable transport

NPPF 11: Making effective use of land

NPPF 12: Achieving well-designed places

NPPF 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

#### 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 5: The Economy

Policy 6: Access and Transportation

Policy 15: Service Villages

#### 3.3 South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies

DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development

DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs

DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development

DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic

DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking

DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety

DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management

DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design

### 4. Consultations

#### 4.1 Bracon Ash Parish Council

Consultation 1:

The changes to the original plan would mean that the 2 houses would go outside of the development boundary and this should not be allowed. The size of the properties also raised concerns that the number of vehicle movements was likely to be much higher than for the original proposals. The egress is on a bend in a narrow lane and traffic has always been a concern, but the size of these houses has increased concern.

Consultation 2:

None Received

#### 4.2 District Councillors

First Consultation:

Cllr. Nigel Legg:

Can be delegated. The current proposal does not indicate the situation of the development boundary. My understanding is that part of the site lies outside the development boundary and while it can be used as garden cartilage, it should not be built on

Cllr. Vivienne Clifford Jackson:  
No Comment Received

Cllr. Gerald Francis:  
No Comment Received

Second Consultation:

Cllr. Nigel Legg:  
Request Clarification of Development boundary Location

Cllr. Vivienne Clifford Jackson:  
I can't really see how this is an improvement. I strongly object to this style of house with no imagination or design, just size, being imposed on the countryside. I believe it is still questionable how it lies with regard to the development boundary of the village. It will also increase the traffic up a very narrow lane and I cannot see how this fulfils the sustainability criteria. if you intend to approve I would like it to go to committee.

Cllr. Gerald Francis:  
No Comment Received

#### 4.3 NCC Highways

First Consultation:  
The details submitted for the revised site layout are acceptable.

Second Consultation:  
No Comment Received

#### 4.4 Other Representations

First Consultation:

None Received

Second Consultation:

1 Comment in Support:

- Closest neighbour: communicated with developer who has explained the proposals
- Site is currently overgrown, populated by rabbits and rats
- The company has a reputation for high quality builds
- The site plan has been amended -no objection to the revised plan
- The site egress has been widened to enable safer traffic access on to Hawkes Lane

### 5 Assessment

#### **Key considerations**

- 5.1 The key considerations are the principle of the proposal, the design and layout of the scheme and the impact on residential amenity in relation to the differences between the revisions and original permission only.

## **Principle**

- 5.2 The proposal site is part inside and part outside of the development boundary and ordinarily in line with the aims of Policy DM1.3 of the SNLP, justification could need to be provided for locating a residential dwelling outside of the development limit. However, in this case the extant planning permission as referred to in section 1 of this report forms a significant material consideration insofar as it is inevitable that two new dwellings will in any event appear on the site in any event. With this in mind it is not considered necessary to undertake a detailed assessment of the scheme under Policy DM1.3 and therefore the assessment will focus on what difference, if any, the current scheme would have on issues of the character and appearance of the locality, design and neighbour amenity.
- 5.3 Notwithstanding this, it is evident that the new proposal also includes two dwellings, with one mostly inside the development boundary (southernmost) and one mostly outside (northernmost) as was the case on the extant permission.

## **Design and Layout**

- 5.4 Policy DM3.8 considers the design of the proposal while policy DM4.9 requires proposals to relate well to the local landscape.
- 5.5 The proposal site sits on the corner of Hawkes Lane and is therefore set back from the Highway. The site is bounded to the west by 2 ½ storey Lodge Farmhouse and its outbuildings and to the south by a 1 ½ storey dwelling called “The Vinyard”. A Third close property, named “The Nurseries” sits to the northwest, behind Lodge Farmhouse. The closest dwellings on the opposite side of Hawkes lane are two storey detached properties. Most dwellings in the immediate area are set back with vegetation to the highway edge.
- 5.6 The proposal retains the character of being set back from the road. While the size is increased from that in the extant permission, this remains in character with the immediate surroundings which have properties of differing size (smaller than the adjacent “lodge farmhouse” and larger than “The Vinyard” and “The Nurseries”). Likewise, the relatively large plot sizes and the use of existing field boundaries reduce the impact on the wider open countryside to the north and east. The open countryside would be further protected by rolling over the condition to remove permitted development rights for outbuildings and to agree specific details of boundary treatments for the development. The increased size of the properties in no way lead to any additional significant impacts when compared to the approved scheme.
- 5.7 The layout is altered from the original through moving the southernmost plot to the west, and rotating the northernmost property to face west rather than south resulting in a position further north than previously proposed. The site access includes a right of access to “the Nurseries” that runs north to south along the western boundary of the site. The detached garage for the northernmost plot faces south and located so as to create a pattern of development that “rounds off” the arrangement with the adjacent farmhouse and thereby reflecting the edge of settlement position. It is considered that this is an effective arrangement that has no negative impacts on the locality when compared to that approved previously.
- 5.8 The designs of the proposed dwellings are significantly different from the original, in some ways reflecting the passage of 22 years between designs. The proposals retain some traditional features and the use of brick to the visible front elevations; with more glazing and some render to the rear. Internal layouts have also been altered in line with modern demands. The simple appearance does not conflict with the existing mixed street scene and, on balance, would not cause any additional harm when compared to the extant scheme in design terms.

- 5.9 Overall, therefore, I consider the proposal to accord with the aims of policy DM3.8 of the Local Plan through providing an acceptable layout and dwelling design within the context of the application site.

**Residential Amenity:**

- 5.10 Policy DM3.13 considers the impact of proposals on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 5.11 I have considered this in relation to the three closest properties, which are the only ones to have the potential of direct impact.
- 5.12 With regard to “The Nurseries”, the position of the northernmost dwelling is closer than previous proposals, but the orientation of the property and position of the proposed garage prevents direct overlooking. The distances are sufficiently great so as to avoid overshadowing.
- 5.13 With regard to Lodge Farmhouse, there will be views from the front of the new dwellings to the side of this property; although relatively long distance. This will not impact on any sensitive amenity space because it faces onto the side of the garage and driveway. As such, the impact of these views is not considered significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. There will be no overshadowing due to the degree of separation.
- 5.14 With regard to “The Vinyard”, I note a letter of support for the application on the file. The southernmost plot has been moved west to make any views into the amenity space of this dwelling acute and minimal. The separation distance involved is sufficiently long so as to avoid overshadowing.
- 5.15 Overall, therefore the proposal accords with policy DM3.13 of the Local Plan.

**Highways**

- 5.16 Policy DM3.11 relates to Highway Safety and Policy DM3.12 to the provision of parking and turning. Concern has been raised with regard to the impact of the development on traffic.
- 5.17 The Highway Authority have assessed the proposal and have no objection to the revised plans. With the number of dwellings remaining the same as previously approved, I do not consider the potential impact on traffic movements resulting from the changes to the design and site layout would alter significantly from those that would occur from the approved scheme and therefore would not be significant enough to warrant reason to refuse the application at this time.
- 5.18 Sufficient parking and turning spaces are provided for vehicles to park and turn clear of the highway for each plot in accordance with County Parking Standards; thereby entering the highway in a forward gear.
- 5.19 Overall, the proposal accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the Local Plan.

**Conditions**

- 5.20 I have reviewed the conditions on 2011/1429 and recommended the following updates to reflect the change in design:
- 5.21 I have not carried over the time limit condition in reflection of the construction start on the previous plans.

- 5.22 Notwithstanding the previous discharge of conditions, I have reinstated the requirement for external materials to be agreed to reflect the change in design. The same is applicable for the boundary treatments due to the altered layout.
- 5.23 I have considered the lack of surface water condition in the previous application and on balance, proposed to include one in this permission justified by the need to adhere to sustainable drainage legislation for the additional footprint created by the new designs.
- 5.24 I have retained the removal of PD rights for outbuildings and boundary treatments and extended this to alterations and extensions to the dwellings as a result of the larger footprint. This will enable any additional increase in size to be considered by the council in relation to impacts on landscape, settlement character and residential amenity.

### **Other Issues**

- 5.25 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.
- 5.26 All development has the potential to assist the recovery of the economy from the impact of COVID. This is a material consideration in this instance. The scheme would make a positive contribution to the local economy by virtue of the construction process and by spending derived from future occupants. This weighs in favour of the application.
- 5.27 **This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).** The previous development was approved prior to CIL requirements being established; however this proposal increases the floorspace and is therefore liable for CIL on the additional area only.

### **Conclusion**

- 5.28 I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle, giving weight to the outstanding permission on the site and its relationship with the development limits. The revised designs are acceptable in terms of layout, design details, highways, parking and residential amenity. The recommended conditions have been updated to reflect the proposal. Therefore it is recommended the application is approved subject to the conditions proposed.

Recommendation: Approval Conditions

- 1 In accordance with submitted drawings
- 2 External materials to be agreed
- 3 Boundary treatment to be agreed
- 4 Surface water
- 5 Provision of parking/turning
- 6 No PD for Classes ABCD&E
- 7 No PD for fences, walls etc
- 8 New Water efficiency

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