

AGENDA ITEM 10 **SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Item.2: page 98

Location:-Chapel Street ,Shipdham

Proposal: Reserved matters application for 90 dwellings pursuant to outline permission

REFERENCE:3PL/2013/0095/O

Applicant: SH1 Consortium Reference: 3PL/2017/0757/D Recommendation: APPROVAL

Author: Brian Timmons

CONSULTATIONS

HOUSING ENABLING OFFICER

- All conversions from ft2 to m2 are correct.
- The 2B3P houses have been enlarged to 2B4P.
- The number of 1B2P flats has been reduced from 6 to 3 and 2B4P houses have been increased from 13 to 19. Changes which are welcomed.
- 24 of the 27 affordable units now meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.
- On the basis that the units listed as 2b3p are in fact 1b2p, taking the number of 1b2p units on the site to 6no, they meet need and are of an appropriate size.
- The affordable units continue to be clustered in 2 separate groups.

In context of the changes made the Housing Service support the approval of this application.

REPRESENTATIONS

Cllr Paul Hewett has commented that although there is no objection in principle re are concerns regarding the impact on the local road network and utility network, particularly in context of the BDC owned site known as the Old School Playing Field site opposite. This should not restrict development on this site but there is a need to 'future proof' the access to and from this site to meet the needs of current and future homeowners.

Failure to address this will have a negative impact on the acceptance of the whole development in the local community.

ASSESSMENT

Revised plans were received that address the concerns of the Strategic Housing Service. It has now been confirmed that there are no objections on this basis.

Concerns have been raised regarding the vehicular access serving the site. As stated in Section 4.0 of the main report issues relating to access were considered and approved at outline stage as access was a non-reserved matter. Access into this site is not before Members for consideration at this time as it has already been approved.

The development of this site would not necessarily preclude further developments on neighbouring sites but evidence would be required in any future development proposals to ensure that infrastructure requirements can be met.

Item 5: page 121

Location: Land North of Great Hockham Primary School Hockham

Proposal:- 4No detached dwellings with associated garaging Applicant: Mr T Mason and Mrs M E Powles

Reference: 3PL/2017/0903/O Recommendation: REFUSAL Author: Laura Craddock

REPRESENTATIONS

1 additional letter of support –

There is an infill estate and set back homes throughout the Village; it is not a linear village. These new homes would be welcomed by all. When the current local area plan was started this land was included and both the council and the Parish Council agreed that this was land that could be built on to allow some much needed village growth

Item:6: page 129

Location: North Lopham: Site to Rear of 29 and 31 Kings Head Lane

Proposal: Erection of 2No. one and a half storey dwellings with associated parking and amenity areas

Applicant: Mr T Atkins

Reference: 3PL/2017/0943/F Recommendation: APPROVAL Author: Lisa ‘O’Donovan

Further representation has been received raising concern in respect of foul drainage and sewer connection following historic problems. As a result, an additional condition will be added to any approval given requiring foul drainage details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of work on site.

Item:7: page 135

Location: The Old Post Office, Norwich Road, Clint Green, Yaxham

Proposal:- Residential access from Norwich Road, with associated turning area.

Applicant: Housing Ladder (Breckland) Ltd Reference: 3PL/2017/1000/F

Recommendation: APPROVAL

Author: Sandra Bunning

The applicant has raised a concern that the way the number of comments received on the application has been set out in the published report is misleading. They highlight that there have been letters of support and in objection to the application. They also feel that the Council should consider a response of 'no objections' to be supportive of the proposal.

All the Objections/Concerns/Comments received are listed below:

Jonathan Cheetham – Concerns 1.9.17

Dan, Yaxham – Request further information 6.9.17

Jackie Cook – Highway concerns; questioning the need for 4 parking spaces 8.9.17

Jackie Cook – Highway concerns 8.9.17

Jackie Cook – Highway concerns 12.9.17

Ben Mitchell – Clarify on the purpose of the access, concerned over the use of the access 12.9.17

Ben Mitchell – Concerns over applicant’s response contradictory 18.9.17

Ben Mitchell – Highway concerns, suggest traffic management plan 27.9.17

Jackie Cook – Highway and parking concerns 28.9.17

Support/No Objection received (including two letters received after publication of the report) are listed below:

Alan Cole, Diocesan House (Freehold owners of adjoining school) – Support 25.9.17
Mrs Ann Futter, Chair of Governors, Yaxham School – No objection, request for works to be undertaken – 25.9.17 (received in duplicate; one via online comment and one in letter form)
Paul Cubitt – No objections 8.10.17
Rosie Cubitt – Letter of support 11.11.17
Paul Cubitt – Letter of support 11.11.17

In summary:

9 letters received raising objections/concerns/comments 5 Letters of support/no objection

Consultation Responses:

Yaxham Parish Council – Objection 25.9.17

Yaxham Parish Council – Amendment does not address concerns 25.10.17 Public Rights of Way Officer – No objections

Highways Agency – No objections subject to conditions Environmental Health Officer – No objections

Item:8: page 144

Location: Great Ellingham: Alder Carr House

Proposal: Three dwellings and re-roof outbuilding

Applicant: Mr A Annison

Reference: 3PL/2017/1225/F Recommendation: REFUSAL

Author: Lisa O'Donovan

THE APPLICATION IS **WITHDRAWN** FROM THE AGENDA AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT

Item:9: page 159

Location: Rockland All Saints: Land at Mill Lane

Proposal: Single storey dwelling

Applicant: Mr A Annison

Reference: 3PL/2017/1225/F

Recommendation: REFUSAL

Author: Lisa O'Donovan

LETTER FROM PARISH COUNCIL AS SET OUT BELOW:



07 November 2017

For the attention of Ms. Lisa O'Donovan, Case Officer

Planning application ref. 3PL/2017/1225/F: Land at Mill Lane, Rockland All Saints NR17 1XR – Single-storey dwelling

I am writing to you in my capacity as Chairman of Rocklands Parish Council to advise that the above-referenced planning application featured on the agenda of our scheduled public meeting yesterday evening. The meeting was attended by approximately 56 parishioners together with 4 parish councillors: also present was Cllr. Bill Smith, local ward member for All Saints and Wayland and Mr Cliff Jordan, of Norfolk County Council. This application was discussed at some length after which time a show of hands indicated that a majority of residents, 40 people, present at the meeting, were overwhelmingly against it, 5 voted in favour and there were 6 abstentions.

Accordingly, I have to inform you that Rocklands Parish Council will formally oppose the submitted application to construct a single-storey dwelling on the identified plot of agricultural land situated on Mill Lane directly adjacent to a public bridleway.

This objection is made on the basis of the following issues:

- 1) The parish council considers that this is effectively a resubmission of an application lodged by the same person in October 2016 (ref. 3PL/2016/1194/F) to build on the same piece of land except that an associated cartshed and workshop have been omitted this time around so that the proposed development footprint appears smaller. That application was refused by the LPA on the grounds that the proposed site '*...is situated outside of any defined Settlement Boundary*'; that it '*...would introduce new built form and development of domestic character into an open agricultural field and open setting to the detriment of the character and openness of the site and rural setting of the village*' and that the site is '*...remote from high order services and facilities with insufficient provision in place to allow pedestrians to access such facilities, thus resulting on an over reliance on the private car*' all

of which reasons do not accord with current local planning policy. The subsequent appeal

Rocklands Parish Council

(ref. APP/F2605/W/17/3167948 dated 06 June 2017) against the LPA's refusal to grant planning permission was dismissed by HM Planning Inspectorate who concluded that '*...the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area through the encroachment of housing into the countryside. It would result in a marked change to the site and affect the rural setting of the village*' additionally commenting that '*...the conflict with Policies CP11 and DC16 is important and there would be harm to the environmental dimension of sustainable development. Thus, the weight that can be afforded to the adverse impacts is significant*'. In its essentials, I can see nothing in this new application that significantly alters the shortcomings that were identified with the original since the presence of the cartshed and workshop buildings were not specifically highlighted by the LPA in their rejection comments and mentioned only in passing by the designated Planning Inspector in his appeal report. Thus, it is the proposed site location that is the primary issue rather than the details of what structure (or structures) actually will be built on the land - and this concept is similarly endorsed in the Planning Inspector's report. Consequently, the parish council would contend that nothing has changed and that this new application still fundamentally clashes with local and national planning policies – specifically Core Strategy policies CP11 and DC16 and NPPF paragraph 17 relating to the effect the proposed development will have on the overall appearance and character of the surrounding area;

- 2) In a wider context, the parish council and local residents are concerned that a successful application will subsequently be used as a pretext by the applicant to further develop the area of land under his control – either in terms of the aforementioned outbuildings that could later be adapted for residential use or by means of a cul-de-sac-type development as was previously attempted by the applicant in 2015 (see planning application ref. 3PL/2015/0518/F). I would also record that, during the recent rural land representation process undertaken in conjunction with producing the new local plan, this same area was offered to Breckland Council for potential development purposes (which offer was not acted upon) – thus demonstrating a clear history of intent to utilise this particular parcel of land for additional development. The fact that the applicant is only prepared to commit to living in the property for three years is not consistent with the idea of a permanent 'family home' and tends to reinforce this point of view as does the fact that he is seeking to increase the width of the adjacent bridleway to 3.5m which will obviously make it more easily accessible for vehicular traffic and open it up to being used as a permanent link between The Street and Mill Lane that might be used in the future to access any additional new development on the site. A positive outcome in respect of this application also would potentially make it much more difficult for both the LPA and the parish council to resist future attempts by speculative developers to successfully progress planning applications that seek to build on similar sites outside of the defined settlement boundary (there have been a number of such attempts in recent years and these are still ongoing).
- 3) The parish council is similarly dubious about the applicants' written assurance that the proposed new dwelling will not be used for commercial purposes in view of the fact that, in conjunction with his continued residential occupation, he appears to have also established a

storage depot on site in support of his business as a self-employed builder (please refer to enforcement notice ENF/194/17/CAS that was recently served on the applicant relating to unauthorised change of use in this respect).

- 4) The Applicant has included in his submission a petition which contains signatures garnered from residents of the village. We feel we should mention that quite a few names are people who do not appear on our Electoral Register (possibly new residents or those living in rented accommodation who are not registered in this parish), some are children and there is even one signatory who resides in France! We do not accept that this represents a groundswell of support for this application as the vote from our Parish Council meeting of 6th November would appear to confirm quite the opposite.

To conclude, I would like to assure you that Rocklands Parish Council is not opposed to new development per se: Our record on submitted planning applications over the past few years demonstrates that we have consistently supported proposals that residents feel are in keeping with the existing rural character of our community. At the same time, and supported by the majority viewpoint of our residents, we have strenuously objected to those speculative proposals that seek to construct inappropriate housing on back-land or other unsuitable sites. In this respect, we are pleased that many of our recorded objections have been endorsed by the Planning Inspectorate in subsequent appeal decisions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

David Howie

Chairman, Rocklands Parish Council

Cc Councillor William Smith, Ward member for All Saints and Wayland, Breckland
Councillor Cliff Jordan, Yare and All Saints Division, Norfolk County Council