

**Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
**–12<sup>th</sup> January 2022**

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 2021/2227	<p>An additional representations has been received in relation to the application setting out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the 4<sup>th</sup> application in under 2 years.</li> <li>• 14 and 16 Brettenham Avenue were built as twins not imposing upon each other.</li> <li>• Permitting the large dormer in the current application would mean that the single story garage with retained roof has become a 2storey flat roof extension, 2m from our property which would irrefutably overlook our kitchen, sun room and rear patio, as well as the garden. This is far worse than the agreed plans, adding overbearing and unsightly to our overlooking objection.</li> <li>• Application has been subject to a number of complaint stages</li> <li>• The changes are described as relatively modest from the approved scheme. This is the fifth set of plans. The degree of change from the existing building is enormous and growing with each application.</li> </ul> <p>Separately concern has also been raised in relation to the lack of clarity on the name of the applicant and also whether the agent has visited the site.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the additional comments which have been submitted. Whilst the concerns are fully understood, the impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers has been assessed as part of the committee report. Subject to the condition securing the dormer window as obscure glazed and fixed shut, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>In relation to the applicant details, a householder application form has been completed. The agent has signed certificate A on behalf of the applicant who is the owner of the site. In this regard the relevant statutory requirements are considered to have been met.</p>	14
Item 2 2021/2352	<p>Following the publication of the committee report, amendments have been received to the application. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to the description</li> <li>• Amendment to the red-line area</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above comments have also been provided by the Council's housing team.</p> <p><u>Description</u></p> <p>The description of the report is to be amended as follows:</p>	18

	<p>Change of use of land for the retention of 5No static caravans.</p> <p>The original application sought the retention of 3 caravans with 2 additional caravans proposed. The amendment to the description does not change the overall number of caravans, it just seek to clarify the number of caravans on site.</p> <p><u>Red Line</u></p> <p>The caravans have been placed on the site in a different arrangement on site than originally proposed. Whilst they are still located within the same general area of the site, the red line for the site has needed to be expanded to incorporate the amended layout.</p> <p>The amendments to the red line is not considered to result in a difference to the application or assessment as presented . The amended red line is still entirely within the wider landownership of Tas Valley Mushrooms and does not extend the site boundary into the wider landscape.</p> <p><u>Comments from the Councils Housing team</u></p> <p>If the site obtains planning permission then the site owner will need to apply (and obtain) and caravan site licence from the council, under the <u>Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960</u>. As part of any licence granted, the council would apply conditions to the caravan site licence. In determining appropriate conditions for such site, the council would have regard to the government issues Model Standards 2008 for caravan sites in England – see <a href="#">link</a> for this document. This documents details the standards the council would be expecting for such a site. This would include standards such as adequate separation distances between caravans, which currently appears to be an issue on site.</p> <p>In addition, the <u>Mobile Homes (Requirement for Manager of Site to be Fit and Proper Person) (England) Regulations 2020</u>, also requires the owner or manager of the site to be a fit and proper person to manage the site. The owner would need to apply for themselves or an appointed manager to be included on the council fit and proper persons register for the site.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p>Following the amendments as set out above, there is a need to amend the recommendation. The recommendation is currently for refusal. It is still recommended for refusal, but having regard to the amendment of the description and the red line are there is a need for a further consultation period with the public. The recommendation is therefore proposed as follows:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Authorise the director of place to refuse the application following an additional consultation with neighbours and stakeholders.</p> <p>Should anything come out of the consultation which would alter the decision to refuse the application, the application would be returned to committee.</p> <p>It is also recommended to update reason for refusal 1 to reflect the restrictive condition on operational hours on the site. The revised wording for Reason for Refusal 1 as follows:</p> <p>The application fails to demonstrate an essential functional need for onsite agricultural worker's accommodation having regard to the fact that there is an hours of operation restriction in place in any event and also that the operations in question could not be adequately managed by alarm systems etc. Furthermore, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that workers could not be accommodated in other settlements, to meet any operational need. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM2.11 of the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Paragraph 80 of the NPPF (July 2021).</p>	
Item 3 2021/2510	No updates to provide.	<b>25</b>
Item 4 2021/2546	<p>Comments received from the Highway Authority (see below). These confirm the position set out in paragraph 5.9 of the report and the third reason for refusal:-</p> <p><i>I note that this application has been submitted following the refusal of the previous submission 2021/0651. In highway terms the same issues apply. The proposal as previously appears to be for a commercial office, rather than a home office. The application proposes that the office is for 5 full time members of staff. The site is only just within the 30mph speed limit and unfortunately the visibility from the entrance to the property is poor in both directions. In addition, the entrance is quite hidden when approaching from either direction.</i></p> <p><i>As such it is considered that the additional movements that will result from the office, particularly those exiting onto The Common will be hazardous to other road users. It is therefore recommended that this application be refused for the following reason:</i></p> <p><i>Inadequate visibility splays are provided at the junction of the access with the County highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway contrary to Development Plan policy.</i></p>	39