

<b>ITEM:</b>		<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> APPROVAL
<b>REF NO:</b>	3PL/2019/1189/F	<b>CASE OFFICER</b> Mark Simmonds
<b>LOCATION:</b>	THOMPSON Land To east of Marlpit Road & South Mill Road Thompson	<b>APPNTYPE:</b> Full <b>POLICY:</b> Out Settlemnt Bndry
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Blue Oak Developments Limited C/O Agent	<b>CONS AREA:</b> N <b>LB GRADE:</b> Adjacent Grade 2
<b>AGENT:</b>	Armstrong Rigg Planning The Exchange Colworth Science Park	<b>TPO:</b> N
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of 6 Dwellings	

#### **REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

The application is being presented to Planning Committee due to local public interest and the application is considered to warrant Committee consideration.

#### **KEY ISSUES**

- Principle of development
- Impact on Character and Appearance of area
- Ecology Impact
- Historic Environment
- Impact on Trees
- Highway Safety
- Amenity Impact
- Flood Risk
- Affordable Housing
- Contamination

#### **DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

Full planning permission is sought to construct six dwellings on land to the east of Marlpit Road and South of Mill Road, Thompson. The access is proposed from an existing access off Mill Road. The site area is 8085 Sq.m.

The house types proposed are as follows:

- 2 x House type A - 3-bed bungalow
- 1 x House type B - 2-bed affordable bungalow
- 2 x House type C - 4-bed house

1 x House type D - 5-bed house

**SITE AND LOCATION**

The application site falls outside of but immediately adjacent to the Settlement Boundary of Thompson and is an undeveloped site which was previously paddock land. The site sits south of Mill Road and east of Marlpit Road, with residential development running opposite these roads. To the east is a field then further residential development which fronts Tottington Road and to the south a large dwelling within a large plot. The site is surrounded by mature trees.

**EIA REQUIRED**

No.

**RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

3PL/2019/0155/F

Erection of 8no. dwellings comprising 1no. bungalow, 2no. affordable units and 5no. houses with associated access, parking and landscaping. Withdrawn 8th April 2019.

**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The following policies of the Breckland Local Plan, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance have also been taken into account, where appropriate

COM01	Design
COM03	Protection of Amenity
ENV02	Biodiversity protection and enhancement
ENV03	The Brecks Protected Habitats & Species
ENV05	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
ENV06	Trees, Hedgerows and Development
ENV07	Designated Heritage Assets
ENV08	Non-Designated Heritage Assets
ENV09	Flood Risk & Surface Water Drainage
GEN01	Sustainable Development in Breckland
GEN02	Promoting High Quality Design
GEN03	Settlement Hierarchy
GEN05	Settlement Boundaries
HOU02	Level and Location of Growth
HOU04	Villages with Boundaries
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
TR01	Sustainable Transport Network

TR02

Transport Requirements

**OBLIGATIONS/CIL**

Not Applicable

**CONSULTATIONS**

**NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS**

Norfolk County Council Highways Officer has raised no objections, subject to conditions.

**HOUSING ENABLING OFFICER**

It is noted that the proposal has been amended to provide 1 no proposed affordable bungalow. However, the proposed unit does not meet the NDSS space standard as required by the local plan; it is noted that this is a marginal failure (59m<sup>2</sup> viz 61m<sup>2</sup> for a 2b bungalow). Under the prior space standards which were used before the new local plan was adopted, this would have been acceptable, and the case officer may wish to consider my objection in this light. My initial comments also noted the requirement for a Â£25,000 commuted sum, I cannot find a reference to this in the new documentation. It is required as well as the affordable unit and should be included. I therefore additionally object on this point.

The most recent revision deals with the objection I made in my prior submission, which is therefore withdrawn.

**TREE AND COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT**

The proposed footpath along Mill Road will be close to trees which are either privately owned or owned by Highways. Any excavation is likely to be damaging to tree roots, potentially compromising stability and health of the trees concerned. It really makes little difference if this is undertaken by hand or machine. It would seem likely that the only option would be a no-dig solution. We will require an update to the submitted TS&AIA to specifically deal with the footpath, this must include a method statement detailing how the footpath will be constructed without damaging roots.

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER**

Based on the information provided at this time, there are no objections or further comments on the grounds of Environmental Protection, providing the development proceeds in line with the application details and subject to the following conditions to alleviate environmental concerns.

**ECOLOGICAL AND BIODIVERSITY CONSULTANT**

**Reptiles**

The Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) submitted in support of this application is broadly fit for purpose. The report states reptile surveys were carried out in June and July 2018 (paragraph 2.13), however from Table 4 the reptile surveys were carried out in July only. Natural England's standing advice is reptile surveys should be carried out in April, May and September. Avoid July to August and November to February. That being said, given the small area of suitable habitat available on the site it is unlikely that more than a low population of breeding common lizard is present on the site.

**Great crested newts**

The SES response to County Ecologists comments dated December 2019 states given the low risk of an offence, it is appropriate for works to proceed under a precautionary approach. In the unlikely event that great crested newt is encountered, work will stop and an EPSM licence will be sought from Natural England.

This contradicts the Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) the destruction of suitable habitat (semi-improved grassland, tall ruderal, scrub, ditch) will trigger the requirement of a Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML).

Population size class assessment of Ponds A and B need to be carried out. Given the indeterminate result of Pond B traditional survey methods should be used to determine presence/absence which may lead to the need for population size class assessments. The Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) highlighted that further surveys would be carried out on the ponds and these surveys will provide an opportunity to survey the ditch on site during wetter months, to determine whether great crested newt utilise the site. These further surveys need to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application. From publicly available aerial sources there appears to be a pond located east of the site and approximately 24 metres north west of Tottington Road that has not been mentioned in any of the reports. This ponds need to be assessed for its suitability to support great crested newts and this may lead to the need for further surveys on this pond. Great crested newts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) making great crested newts European Protected Species. The extant government circular on planning and biodiversity (Circular 06/2005) makes it explicit that the presence or absence of protected species, and the extent to which they could be affected by a proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted, since otherwise all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision.

#### **NATURAL ENGLAND**

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites and has no objection.

**R S P B**

No Comments Received

#### **Thompson Parish Council**

##### **Thompson Parish Council strongly object to the planning application.**

The Council objections were under five main headings;

sustainability, quantity, character of the development, transport and management of surface water. However, first and foremost the development is outside the settlement boundary. Given the scale and potential impact of this development it is considered vital that the local knowledge of the village is given due consideration in the planning decision process. Sustainability: Thompson is a small village with at present 117 houses within its settlement boundary and around 155 in the village as a whole. While it has a public house, a junior school, a post office run from a room in a private house and a community hall, it does not have any other of the facilities which are required for it to be considered a sustainable village, such as shops, bank, healthcare and secondary education. Employment opportunities in the village are limited as local businesses are agricultural (the predominant local activity, which offers few jobs in addition to the farmers themselves), the village pub and small sole trader service companies. It has little or no access to public transport. It is therefore dependent upon the local towns of Watton and Thetford and others further afield for employment and amenities and it requires a car to access them.

Quantity and Village Character: Thompson has evolved slowly over many centuries with overwhelmingly low-density housing. The proposal is completely out of keeping with this rural settlement in terms of scale and density. The proposed development would result in an incongruous and unwarranted intrusion into the rural setting of the village. The proposal would definitely not enhance the existing form and character. Thompson is an open dispersed village. The arrangement of the houses within the village is, in the main, linear, following the line of the village roads. The open area bounded by the settlement, combined with the Millennium Green and surrounding farmland contribute to the distinctive low-density open nature of the

village. Construction of a development of six houses in the proposed location would be counter to the character and appearance of the area and the historic nature of the village. The site isn't enclosed closely by the existing settlement so it doesn't represent a natural extension to the settlement. In the Planning Statement, the agent submitting the application cites evidence of an identified need for this housing. This evidence however is quoted from the 2017 Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment and has not been derived from village-based evidence. The recent Village Appraisal carried out in 2016 showed that a majority of the village was not opposed to additional housing in the village but that growth should be small scale and not exceed the modest increase experienced in recent years - that being one or two additional dwellings in any year. The proposed development of 6 additional housing units represents the growth of the village as shown in the Development Plan for the period between 2019 and 2036. If this development is agreed it would indicate that there should be no further development in the village until 2036. This is contrary to the better development pattern of additional housing units being distributed throughout the development period.

#### Transport:

In the Transport Statement, mention is made that in considering the main entry and exit to the site the Crashmap database was used to assess accident risk on roads in the vicinity of the site. It indicates one accident, classified as slight. The main exit point from the site is close to the junction of Mill Road, Marlpit Road, Pockthorpe Lane and Watton Road. Mill Road and Watton Road are considered as a through road and connect on a blind bend. While it appears that few accidents have been recorded on this database, local experience is that there have been a large number of near misses and unreported accidents. Traffic peaks in the morning and afternoon when parents from outside the village deliver and collect children from school, many approaching the school from the Watton direction. The site access point being so close to this bend is likely to give rise to many more incidents. Thompson has one footpath which runs along School Road. The assessment of the likely traffic pattern resulting from these additional houses has been carried out as a desk exercise. The locations and the character of the roads included in this assessment are not similar to the village of Thompson and its roads and therefore they cannot be considered as relevant. It is questionable that an estate of 6 houses, which the documentation indicates will house 38 people, will only generate 4 additional vehicle trips at peak times. Given that children of secondary school age will have to be taken to school outside the village and that there could be in excess of 12 people travelling to work, this seems to be a grossly conservative estimate of the number of additional journeys at peak times. As the estimates are related to survey sites in Shropshire, North Yorkshire and Cheshire it is unclear how the statistics relating to these can be applied to the village of Thompson, with its absence of public transport and employment opportunities, and few amenities. The Transport statement also refers to a turning area within the site which would allow "delivery, refuse and emergency vehicles to enter and exit the drive in forward gear". It is difficult to see how this will be achieved given the proposed layout of the drive.

#### Management of Surface Water:

The removal of surface run off water in the village of Thompson is a major concern. Localised flooding presently affects a number of properties in the vicinity of the proposed development during long, though not exceptional, periods of rain. A large-scale development (by the standards of this village) will have a severe impact on percolation and a significant increase in surface water can be anticipated, leading to more extreme and frequent flooding. Thompson does not have mains drainage and the developer proposes a private pumping station which would connect to the Thompson Water Recycling Centre (TWRC) on Tottington Road for household waste water, and an attenuation tank under the shared drive for surface run off. The Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment states that this will connect to the public foul sewerage network. There is no such 'public' network in the village. The TWRC is a private arrangement serving around 14 houses and how permission to connect to this would be granted is glossed over. It is also questionable whether the developer will be able to connect to the network given that the distance between it and the pumping station exceeds the 180 metres which is quoted in the email from the Environment Agency. The alternative solution proposed for

the foul water would be a package sewage treatment plant, which would significantly increase the volume of water discharged into the surrounding ditches. The proposal states that the attenuation tank will discharge the water in a controlled manner into the ditch running along the south of the site. The documentation states that there is "a wider downstream network of ditches". While this may have been the case in the past, over recent decades these ditches have either been filled in or have become disconnected, meaning that the network no longer exists. There is concern that the additional impermeable surfaces on the site will result in the ditches surrounding the site overflowing during periods of heavy rain as this ditch to the west is known to fill now even before development. Despite the statement in the Drainage Report that "the watercourse is understood to have flowing water all year-round" the ditches around the site do not connect to a watercourse, draining in part via a pipe to a nearby ditch which overflows onto neighbouring properties. Adding solid driveways and buildings to the site can only increase the frequency and quantity of flooding to these properties. Furthermore, the maintenance of ditches around the site would be all the more critical if the development did go ahead and it does not appear that there is any provision for plant equipment to access the site and carry out maintenance once the houses and gardens have been established. It is stated that once development of the site is complete, responsibility for the ongoing management and maintenance of foul water and surface water systems would be handed over to a management company. The continuance of this would depend on the willingness of the householders of the 6 properties to continue with the arrangement. There has been much media reporting in the recent past about the cost of these arrangements and the lack of awareness of purchasers of properties with these arrangements that they will have this ongoing annual service charge. It is of significant concern that these systems would fall into disrepair, causing flooding to nearby properties due to unwillingness of property owners to contribute to their continued upkeep.

#### Environment Agency

We have no objection to this application.

#### Contamination

The site is located above a Principal Aquifer and within Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 3. However, we do not consider this proposal to be High Risk. Therefore, we will not be providing detailed site-specific advice or comments with regards to land contamination issues for this site. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.

#### Infiltration Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

The water environment is potentially vulnerable and there is an increased potential for pollution from inappropriately located and/or designed infiltration (SuDS). We consider any infiltration (SuDS) greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. If the use of deep bore soakaways is proposed, we would wish to be re-consulted. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria in our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) position statements G1 to G13. In addition, they must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination.

#### Foul Drainage

Government guidance contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality - considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order:

1. Connection to the public sewer
2. Package sewage treatment plant (adopted in due course by the sewerage company or owned and

operated under a new appointment or variation)

### 3. Septic Tank

Foul drainage should be connected to the main sewer if the distance from the development is within 30 metres of less of a main sewer (multiplied by the number of dwellings).

Where it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that connection to the mains sewer is not possible, then under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 any discharge of sewage or trade effluent made to either surface water or groundwater will need to be registered as an exempt discharge activity or hold a permit issued by the Environment Agency, in addition to planning permission. This applies to any discharge to inland freshwaters, coastal waters or relevant territorial waters.

Please note that the granting of planning permission does not guarantee the granting of an Environmental Permit. Upon receipt of a correctly filled in application form we will carry out an assessment. It can take up to 4 months before we are in a position to decide whether to grant a permit or not.

Domestic effluent discharged from a treatment plant/septic tank at 2 cubic metres or less to ground or 5 cubic metres or less to surface water in any 24 hour period must comply with General Binding Rules provided that no public foul sewer is available to serve the development and that the site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.

A soakaway used to serve a non-mains drainage system must be sited no less than 10 metres from the nearest watercourse, not less than 10 metres from any other foul soakaway and not less than 50 metres from the nearest potable water supply, spring or borehole. Where the proposed development involves the connection of foul drainage to an existing non-mains drainage system, the applicant should ensure that it is in a good state of repair, regularly de-sludged and of sufficient capacity to deal with any potential increase in flow and loading which may occur as a result of the development.

Where the existing non-mains drainage system is covered by a permit to discharge then an application to vary the permit will need to be made to reflect the increase in volume being discharged. It can take up to 13 weeks before we decide whether to vary a permit.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

The site notice has been displayed and was erected on site on 13th November 2019.

18 Neighbours have been directly notified.

17 objections have been received, their comments are summarised below.

- Flooding risk along Marlpit Road.

- Breckland Local plan through to 2036 allows for a minimum number of 6 houses to be constructed and no significant number above this - clarity is required on what is significant as we are looking at a further 16 years on this plan with the minimum number already achieved if planning permission is granted.

- To my knowledge Thompson has already been identified as an unsustainable village - there is a community hall and a school (already full). There is a "flexi bus" arrangement that is based upon pre-booking and only runs between 0900hrs to 1430hrs. Villagers remain highly dependant upon private transport for employment, shopping, doctors, dentists etc.

- Village Character and Transport: Thompson is an open dispersed village. The arrangement of the houses within the village is, in the main, linear, following the line of the village roads. The open area bounded by the settlement, combined with the Millennium Green and surrounding farmland contribute to the distinctive low density nature of the village. This development of in the proposed location would be counter to the character and appearance of the area. The Breckland Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal - Post Adoption Statement (November 2019) does state under section 3.7 , objective 1, "minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings and encourage recycling/reuse of onsite resources to minimise the impacts on the environment and safeguard resources for the future generations".

- Wildlife Habitat

- Despite what looks improved on the plans when fully scrutinised, there is nothing that has really changed. There is certainly no benefit to the village and can only see added inconvenience to current villagers particularly those in close proximity to the proposed build. In the plans it still maintains there is an existing access opening to the area on Marlpit Road. This I would very much like to see and in the 25+ years I have lived on that road has never been seen or used!! Thompson is known for its high water table and surely if the new dwellings are going to be 'raised' where is the water going to run - uphill? I fully agree with all the objections given in the other comments and rather than simply reiterate them I fully endorse that these plans should not be passed.

- We are so angry this planning proposal has come up again as the remarks from the previous time must make you so aware this is a dangerous suggestion. We live on Pockthorpe corner and so many times when I try to drive out of our entrance I just freeze in the middle of the road as vehicles come round at such speed. The thought of more building on this already dangerous part of our village is not acceptable.

- The development would sit outside the village boundary, increase pressure on already poor infrastructure and would alter the definitive character of the village.

- It would increase damage to open spaces and natural habitats beyond what has already been inflicted.

- The increased vehicle traffic and locations of vehicle access points presents a significant safety risk.

- This development would increase the possibility of flooding in an area that is already at risk.

- Road and traffic safety issues. The site plan shows an entrance/exit onto Mill Road. There is already a serious safety issue caused by traffic on this road which is the main route through the village. At the intersection of Marlpit Lane, Pockthorpe Lane and Mill Road there have been numerous collisions of vehicles - many of these unrecorded and noticed only by local residents. In addition there are frequent "near misses" involving dog walkers, pedestrians and cyclists, especially during peak times such as school drop-off and pick-up.

- Draining and flooding risks. Thompson already has a problem with drainage from septic tanks and surface water run-off due to the high water table. This was recognised in previous planning refusals which were rejected for this reason.

- Object to the planning application due to the size and character of the development and the impact this will have on our lovely village.

- This application, along with all previous (and future) such applications should be instantly rejected on the basis that the village has 'unsustainable' status and hence is not suitable for further development. Water



pressure in the village is already woefully inadequate and would only be exacerbated by the addition of further properties. There is insufficient parking for the proposed number of properties/occupancy levels with no appropriate alternative places for cars to park, without damaging the surrounding verges.

- The site is unsuitable because of the sewerage facilities within the village; Marlpit Road houses are already notorious for overflowing into gardens and ditches. The pumping station already allows effluence into the ditches. Traffic within the village particularly near to the dangerous corner at Pockthorpe Lane and Marlpit Road, is already dangerous and cannot cope with more. The village school is already full. Village characterised as unsustainable by Breckland District Council because of the poor facilities. High water table, flooding. Outside the settlement boundary; conservation area, protected wild flower species.

- The site itself is outside the established settlement boundary and contravenes present building agreement in Thompson allowing new construction on one side only of the access roads. Highway safety is another important consideration as the crossroads of Marlpit Lane, Pockthorpe Lane, Watton Road and Mill Road is already a dangerous area for cars with multiple accidents some not reported. Road structure to and from the village presents difficulties with numerous sharp, blind corners and increasing traffic to and from the school and also very large farm vehicles and HGVs. The planning statement also mentions the proposal would result in material benefits to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development - to what end, this paragraph makes no sense.

- While this application is supported with a plethora of drawings and reports I would ask that consideration is given to the conditions on the ground. The scale of development is out of step with the size of the village, and it's character, where all of the through roads are developed on one side only. Should this unwise development be permitted I would request that for the safety and convenience of existing resident, the council directs and enforces a strict prohibition on developers and contractors, their vehicles, equipment, plant and machinery being parked, positioned, operated or working anywhere but the site itself.

- The design is inappropriate in design and scale, Thompson has evolved slowly - it was shown in the last appraisal that the wishes of the parish were that this continued to be the case. The proposed plan would serve to unbalance the rural nature of Thompson, something which is valued by residents and visitors alike. The visual impact, especially on the approach to the village, would be of predominantly modern property overwhelming the older houses and serving to affect the intrinsic character of the village.

## **ASSESSMENT NOTES**

### 1.0 Principle of Development

1.1 Full planning permission is sought to construct six residential dwellings. The access is proposed from an existing access off Mill Road.

1.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted); and any made Neighbourhood Plans. The Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.

1.3 The Council does have a published 5 year land housing supply as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, which provides national planning guidance for local planning authorities and is a strong material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

1.4 Policy GEN 01 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) (Sustainable Development in Breckland) seeks to enable development that improves the economic, social and environmental objectives of Breckland through the application of the following national and locally distinctive sustainable development principles.

1.5 Policy GEN 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) specifies that most new development needs will be met through the proposed sustainable settlement hierarchy. Thompson is classed as a village with a boundary. This hierarchy is based upon the utilisation of existing infrastructure and resources, the prioritisation of new infrastructure and allowing jobs, homes and other facilities to provide for choice.

1.6 The site in this case is situated outside the development boundary, however its location can be described as being immediately adjacent to the boundary. The policies that address development outside of the boundary within the new Local Plan is set out in: 'Development Outside of the Boundaries of Local Service Centres' (Policy HOU 03); 'Rural Settlements 'Villages with Boundaries' (Policy HOU 04); and 'Small Villages and Hamlets Outside of Settlement Boundaries' (Policy HOU 05). Policy HOU 04 is the relevant consideration as Thompson has a settlement boundary on the defined policies map.

1.7 Appropriate development will be allowed immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, subject to being supported by other policies within the Development Plan Local Plan and where all of the policy criteria are satisfied.

1.8 The application proposes the erection of six dwellings which consist of a two 3-bedroom bungalows, one 2-bedroom affordable bungalow, two 4-bedroom 2-storey dwellings and one 5-bedroom 2-storey dwelling. Each of the dwellings would have adequate car parking space and private amenity space. With regards to scale and design, the size of the dwellings are in keeping with the dwellings in the locality and the style reflects a typical rural dwelling that can be seen in this area. The layout and design has been considered to avoid any overbearing issues over future neighbours. Although located outside of the development boundary, the new dwellings would be immediately adjacent and would not create an 'isolated' development or be a discordant feature in the landscape.

1.9 As part of the determining criteria for Policy HOU 04 the proposed development should not lead to the number of dwellings in the settlement significantly increasing by more than 5% from the date of adoption of the Plan. The settlement refers to the number of dwellings inside the defined settlement boundary. Thompson has 131 dwellings within the settlement boundary, 5% growth would allow a further 7 dwellings and there have been 6 permissions in November 2019. This would result in an additional 5 dwellings if this application is approved and this is not considered to be significant or harmful to the village in this instance.

1.10 On balance and taking into account the modest scale of development and the assessment above, the principle of a development of six dwellings on this site is acceptable and in accordance with Policy GEN 03 and HOU 04 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

## 2.0 Impact on Character and Appearance of area

2.1 Policy GEN 02 requires high quality design in all development within the district which respects and is sensitive to the character of the surrounding area. Policy COM01 requires new development to be designed to the highest possible standards. All new development must achieve a specification of high architectural, urban and landscape design quality and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will promote high quality design in the District by requiring that the design of new development meets specific criteria. Policy HOU 06 sets out the principles of housing and requires the density of development to be at a level which is appropriate and justified for the locality.

2.2 Policy ENV 05 requires development proposals to contribute to and where possible enhance the local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Development should have particular regard to maintaining the aesthetic and biodiversity qualities of natural and man-made features within the landscape, including a consideration of individual or groups of natural features such as trees, hedges and woodland or rivers, streams or other topographical features.

2.3 The application proposes the erection of six detached dwellings with access off an existing access from Mill Road.

2.4 Surrounding the site, dwellings consist of large detached houses in spacious plots. All are 2- storey except from two bungalows at the end of Marlpit Road, and The Thatched House, a single storey thatched cottage on the corner of Mill Road with an attic dormer. The 2- storey houses mainly consist of lowered eaves with dormers to the upper floor. The proposed dwellings are designed to match the existing in scale and layout. They are well spaced in large plots, set well back from the new access road and the 2-storey units have their eaves lowered with dormers to match the surrounding properties.

2.5 The dwellings are proposed to be designed in a traditional form, with pitched clay pan-tiled roofs. Type A has brickwork walls, with dark-stained weatherboarding to the gable ends above window head height. Type B also has brickwork walls. Types C and D have brickwork to the ground floors, with render above the ground floor window head height. They also have some feature areas of dark-stained cladding.

2.6 Concerns with regards to intrusion into the open countryside and opening up further sites in this location are noted. It is considered that this site is well screened and has different character to that of neighbouring field which is more open and contributes to the character of the area. With the retention of boundary vegetation in this location then it is considered the character of the area will be retained.

2.7 In light of the above, the proposals comply with Policy GEN 02, COM 01 and ENV 05 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and paragraph 127 of the NPPF (2019).

### 3.0 Ecology

3.1 Policy ENV02 seeks to protect and enhance Biodiversity and requires the highest level of protection to be given to European Sites, with development only permitted where the proposal is in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Where measures to mitigate for potential adverse effects on European sites are required the proposed mitigation measures must be justified as fit for purpose with appropriate evidence, to inform the Council's Habitats Regulations Assessment. Development likely to have an adverse effect (either directly or indirectly) on a site of national, regional or local biodiversity, or geological interest, as identified on the Policies Map, will not be permitted unless:

- a. it can be clearly demonstrated that there are reasons for the proposal that outweigh the need to safeguard the special ecological / geological interest of the site, and;
- b. it has been demonstrated, where development would result in significant harm, that it cannot be reasonably located on an alternative site that would result in less or no harm, and;
- c. residual harm, after all measures to prevent and adequately mitigate have been applied, will be adequately compensated for.

### 3.2 Policy ENV03 - The Brecks Protected Habitats and Species

3.3 The Council requires that a Habitats Regulations Assessment is undertaken on all proposals for development that are likely to have a significant effect on The Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA)

which is classified for its populations of Stone Curlew, Woodlark and Nightjar, and/or Breckland Special Area of Conservation (SAC), which is designated for its heathland habitats. Development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA or the SAC.

3.4 The Natural Environment Team have been consulted and have commented as follows.

### 3.5 Reptiles

The Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) submitted in support of this application is broadly fit for purpose. The report states reptile surveys were carried out in June and July 2018 (paragraph 2.13), however from Table 4 the reptile surveys were carried out in July only. Natural England's standing advice is reptile surveys should be carried out in April, May and September. Avoid July to August and November to February. That being said, given the small area of suitable habitat available on the site it is unlikely that more than a low population of breeding common lizard is present on the site.

### 3.6 Great crested newts

The SES response to County Ecologists comments dated December 2019 states 'given the low risk of an offence, it is appropriate for works to proceed under a precautionary approach. In the unlikely event that great crested newt is encountered, work will stop and an EPSM licence will be sought from Natural England'. This contradicts the Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) the destruction of suitable habitat (semi-improved grassland, tall ruderal, scrub, ditch) will trigger the requirement of a Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML).

3.7 Population size class assessment of Ponds A and B need to be carried out. Given the indeterminate result of Pond B traditional survey methods should be used to determine presence/ absence which may lead to the need for population size class assessments. The Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment report (SES; 2019) highlighted that further surveys would be carried out on the ponds and these surveys will provide an opportunity to survey the ditch on site during wetter months, to determine whether great crested newt utilise the site'. These further surveys need to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application.

3.8 From publicly available aerial sources there appears to be a pond located east of the site and approximately 24 metres north west of Tottington Road that has not been mentioned in any of the reports. This ponds need to be assessed for its suitability to support great crested newts and this may lead to the need for further surveys on this pond.

3.9 Great crested newts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) making great crested newts European Protected Species.

3.10 The extant government circular on planning and biodiversity (Circular 06/2005) makes it explicit that "the presence or absence of protected species, and the extent to which they could be affected by a proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted, since otherwise all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision."

3.11 The applicant's ecologist has submitted further details in an email dated 16th December in support of this application. Following on from this the Ecologist has formally commented that one pond within 200 metres of the site was surveyed and great crested newts were found present. A second pond and the ditch was found to be dry at the time of the survey visit and one pond could not be accessed. Pond B was subject to eDNA survey in 2018 application number 3PL/2019/1433/O and returned a negative result. The SES response to county ecologist comments highlights that there is a low risk great crested newts could be

present on the site. A small population of common lizard was present on the site and therefore a mitigation strategy must be designed. A buffer has been agreed to retain suitable habitat on the site for reptiles. The buffer extending 1.5km from the hedgerows must not be part of private gardens and be managed and retained in perpetuity for reptiles.

3.12 In the Ecologist's opinion, from the information provided in the Habitats Regulations Assessment report (SES; July 2019) and given that the development is completely masked by development there are unlikely to be significant impacts on the qualifying features of the SPA and the Shadow HRA can be adopted by Breckland DC as the record of the screening for a need for an Appropriate Assessment.

3.13 Natural England have been consulted and consider that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impact on designated sites and therefore have no objections to the proposals.

3.14 In light of the above, the proposals comply with Policy ENV02 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

#### 4.0 Historic Environment

4.1 Policy ENV 08 says development should be expected to conserve or wherever possible enhance the historic character, appearance and setting of non-designated historic assets. Proposals that could affect previously unrecognised heritage assets will be expected, through agreement with the Council, to undergo an appropriate assessment, proportionate to the significance of the asset. The assessment must provide sufficient information for any impact to be fully assessed. In weighing applications that are likely to directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be undertaken, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

4.2 Policy ENV 07 seeks to protect any Designated Heritage Assets and their settings. Policy 16 of the NPPF and Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, seek to protect the special interest and significance of heritage assets/Listed Buildings and their settings.

4.3 Paragraph 189 of the NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected, including any contribution to their setting.

4.4 There are two Grade II Listed Buildings, to the north of Mill Road and a further Grade II Listed Building to the north west fronting Pockthorpe Lane.

4.5 The proposed development site is separated from the heritage assets by a road and there is substantial vegetation on the site boundaries, the proposals have the ability to comply with Policies ENV 07 and ENV 08 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and Paragraph 189 of the NPPF (2019), subject to conditions.

4.6 The Agent is submitting a Heritage Impact Assessment for consideration by the Historic Buildings Officer who has been consulted and their comments will be presented to Committee in a supplemental report or verbally at Committee.

#### 5.0 Impact on Trees

5.1 Policy ENV 06 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) requires the protection of trees and hedgerow and says that they should be retained as an integral part of the design of development except where their long-term survival would be compromised by their age or physical condition, or there are exceptional and overriding benefits in accepting their loss. Development requiring the loss of a protected tree or hedgerow (including preserved trees, protected hedgerows, trees in Conservation Areas, ancient trees, aged and

veteran trees and trees classified as being of categories A or B in value (BS5837:2012) will only be permitted where it would allow for a substantially improved overall approach to the design and landscaping of the development that would outweigh the loss of any tree or hedgerow. Where the loss of such features is demonstrably unavoidable, adequate replacement provision, preferably by native species will be sought. Where the loss of a tree is accepted in these circumstances, developers will be required to ensure that the loss will be suitably compensated for, taking into account the size and condition of the tree.

5.2 Mature trees surround the entire application site and a Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application.

5.3 The Tree and Countryside Consultant has been consulted and advises that the proposed footpath along Mill Road will be close to trees which are either privately owned or owned by Highways. Any excavation is likely to be damaging to tree roots, potentially compromising stability and health of the trees concerned. It really makes little difference if this is undertaken by hand or machine. It would seem likely that the only option would be a no-dig solution. An update to the submitted TS and AIA would be required to specifically deal with the footpath, this must include a method statement detailing how the footpath will be constructed without damaging any roots.

5.4 Therefore, the proposals have the ability to comply with Policy ENV 06 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and section 15 of the NPPF (2019), subject to conditions.

## 6.0 Highway safety

6.1 Policy TR 01 (Sustainable Transport Network) of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) seeks to promote a safe, efficient and convenient sustainable transport system. Development should seek to minimise the need to travel, promote opportunities for sustainable transport modes, not adversely impact on the operation or safety of the strategic road network , improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future.

6.2 Policy TR 02 (Transport Requirements) of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) seeks to ensure that developments should be of high quality, sustainable in design, construction and layout as well as offering maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes for all potential users. Proposals will be permitted that integrate satisfactorily into existing transport networks, mitigate impacts on the local or strategic highway networks arising from the development itself, or the cumulative effects of development, through the provision of, or contributions towards, any relevant transport improvement deemed to be necessary, including those secured by legal agreement, protect, and where possible enhance, access to public rights of way, provide safe, suitable and convenient access for all users, including appropriate parking and servicing provision in terms of amount, design and layout and avoid inappropriate traffic generation and do not compromise highway safety.

6.3 The Highway Authority have been consulted and have raised no objections to the proposals, subject to conditions.

6.4 Policy TR 02 sets out parking standards of two per dwelling. Each detached dwelling has a double garage, sized for 2 car parking spaces, with hardstanding space in front for 2 further spaces. The bungalows have a single garage with 1 space in front. All these also have an in-curtilage turning head which provides a further parking space. The affordable unit has 2 hardstanding parking spaces. Cycle and bin storage will be provided in the garages, or garden shed for type B. Each unit will have a 1.2x1.2m bin hard-standing at the front of the property by the shared drive.

6.5 In light of the above, the proposals comply with Policies TR 01 and TR 02 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

## 7.0 Amenity Impact

7.1 Policy COM03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) requires all new development to give consideration to general amenity impact issues, especially living conditions. Development will not be permitted which causes unacceptable effects on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, or does not provide for adequate levels of amenity for future occupants. In assessing the impact of development, especially on the living conditions of occupants, regard will be had to overlooking, overbearing impact/visual dominance, overshadowing, loss of light, odour, noise, vibration or other forms of nuisance and any forms of pollution.

7.2 The impact the development would have on the site and its surroundings is considered to fall within acceptable parameters. There would be no direct adverse effects as a result of loss of privacy, light or overbearing impact. Windows have been positioned on the proposed dwellings so as to avoid direct overlooking. It is concluded that the proposal will maintain an acceptable level of residential amenity for existing residents and future occupants of the site, consistent with Policy COM03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

7.3 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposals comply with Policy COM03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and Paragraph 127 of The NPPF (2019).

## 8.0 Flood Risk and drainage

8.1 Policy ENV 09 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) requires development to be located to minimise the risk of flooding, mitigating any such risk through design and implementing sustainable drainage (SuDS) principles. Also to incorporate appropriate surface water drainage mitigation measures to minimise its own risk of flooding and should not materially increase the flood risk to other areas. Particular care will be required in relation to habitats designated as being of international importance in the area and beyond which are water sensitive, as well as habitats designated of regional or local importance.

8.2 Paragraph 163 of the NPPF (2019) stipulates that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as appropriate) it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

8.3 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is, therefore, within an area at lowest risk of flooding from various sources including that from rivers, tidal, reservoir and canal sources. The site is also in

a very low risk zone for surface water flooding.

8.4 A drainage Strategy has been submitted with details for foul drainage, Anglian Water have confirmed the development is within the catchment of Thompson Water Recycling Centre, which currently has capacity to treat the flows from the proposed site. The nearest practicable connection is to the 150mm diameter sewer at Manhole 9400 at National Grid Reference (NGR) TL9199996494 (Tottington Road). It is proposed the development will discharge to the proposed point of connection via a private package pump station located in the south-west corner of the development. The proposed pump station enclosure will have a dedicated access off Marlpit Road and shall be sited 10m from the nearest habitable building.

8.5 The proposed surface water strategy is to collect the surface water run-off generated from all impermeable areas to a combined attenuation tank situated under the main access road. The attenuation tank has been sized to accommodate the discharge for a 100-year storm event, including an allowance for 40% climate change. The attenuation tanks will have a controlled discharge into the adjacent watercourse on the southern boundary to suit current green-field run-off rates.

8.6 The Environment Agency have been consulted and have no objections to the proposals.

8.7 In conclusion, the proposals are not in an area at risk of flooding from any sources, therefore, compliant with Policy ENV 09 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and paragraph 163 of the NPPF (2019).

#### 9.0 Affordable Housing

9.1 Policy HOU 07 states that residential development proposals capable of delivering 10 or more units, or the site has an area of 0.5 ha or more will be expected to deliver a proportion of the development as affordable housing on-site to help meet existing and future affordable housing needs of the District as set out in the current Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment (CNSHMA).

9.2 The plans include the provision of 1no affordable 2-bedroom bungalow. The plans have been amended following correspondence from the Housing Enabling Officer with regards to meeting space standards and this has now been resolved. The applicant has agreed to a commuted sum of £25,000 payable, being 50% of the standard £50,000, to discharge the fractional 0.5 unit requirement. This will be secured by a S.106 agreement.

9.3 In light of the above, the proposals comply with Policy HOU 07, subject to a S.106 agreement.

#### 10.0 Contamination

10.1 Paragraph 178 of the NPPF (2019) says that development sites need to be suitable for their proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation).

10.2 The Contaminated Land Officer has been consulted and advised that based on both the accuracy of the information provided and the current records of contaminated land issues they hold to date, have no objections providing the development proceeds in line with the application details and subject to conditions to alleviate any environmental concerns.

#### 11.0 Conclusion



11.1 The principle of a development of six dwellings on this site is acceptable and in accordance with Policy GEN 03 and HOU 04 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

11.2 The proposed scheme is acceptable in terms of design and layout and would not be detrimental to the existing character of the area. Therefore, the proposals comply with Policy HOU 06, GEN 02, COM 01, ENV 05 and ENV 07 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and paragraph 127, 189 and 199 of the NPPF (2019).

## RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for Approval subject to the conditions below and the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the affordable housing contributions and subject to no objection being received by the Council's Historic Buildings Officer.

## CONDITIONS

- 1 Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)**

The development must be begun not later than the expiration of THREE YEARS beginning with the date of this permission.  
Reason for Condition:-  
As required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2 In accordance with submitted plans NEW 2017**

The development must be carried out in strict accordance with the application form, and approved documents and drawings as set out in the table at the end of this notice.  
Reason for condition:-  
To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.
- 3 New access (over verge/ditch/watercourse/footway)**

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access crossing over the verge shall be constructed in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the highways specification TRAD 4 and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan. Arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposal of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway.  
Reason for condition:-  
To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and to avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy TR02 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).  
**This condition will require to be discharged**
- 4 Vertical clearance above the highway**

Notwithstanding the submitted details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the proposed private drive shall be maintained in perpetuity at a minimum width of 4.8 metres and shall be constructed perpendicular to the highway carriageway for a minimum length of 10 metres as measured from the near edge of the highway carriageway.  
Reason for condition:-  
In the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy TR02 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted)..

**This condition will require to be discharged**

**5 Access - one-way system**

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 43 metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway. The splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 1.05 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

Reason for condition:-

In the interests of highway safety and traffic movement and to comply with policy TR02 of the Beckland Local Plan (adopted).

**6 Non standard highway condition**

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access parking and turning area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

Reason:-

To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety and to comply with policy TR02 of the Beckland Local Plan (adopted).

**This condition will require to be discharged**

**7 Non-standard condition - Ecology Method Statement**

Prior to the commencement of any works (including any demolition or ground works or site clearance) a method statement for great crested newts and reptiles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement must include details of the buffer for reptiles that will be retained in perpetuity and extend at least 1.5 metres from the hedgerows surrounding the site, including details of long-term management. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the development is not detrimental to Protected Species and in order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy ENV 02 and ENV 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**8 Non-standard condition - In accordance with Ecology Surveys**

The development shall proceed in complete accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in Phase 2 Ecological Surveys and Assessment (SES; 2019) and extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (SES; 2019), with the exception of mitigation measures relating to reptiles and great crested newts (which will be outlined in a separate method statement).

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the development is not detrimental to Protected Species and in order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy ENV 02 and ENV 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**9 Non-standard condition - Biodiversity Enhancements**

Prior to the commencement of development, a biodiversity enhancement plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, detailing the enhancement measures for biodiversity on site. The biodiversity enhancement plan should include numbers and locations of bird boxes, bat boxes and habitat enhancements. The

measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance of the approved scheme.

Reason for condition:-

In order to protect the wildlife value of the site in accordance with Policy ENV 02 and ENV 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**10 Non-standard condition - In accordance with AIA**

Prior to the commencement of development an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Tree survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The reports need to specifically deal with the footpath, this must include a method statement detailing how the footpath will be constructed without damaging roots. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason for condition:-

The works are required to be undertaken prior to the commencement of the development in order to safeguard the protection of trees from the outset of the development, in accordance with Policy ENV06 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted) together with Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**11 Precise details of foul water disposal**

The development shall be constructed in complete accordance with the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment prepared by Frith Blake Consulting Ltd Version 3 - 31st May 2019.

Reason for condition:-

The details are required to be submitted prior to the commencement of development to minimise the possibilities of flooding from the outset of the development.

This condition is imposed in accordance with Policies COM03 and ENV09 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted), together with Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**This condition will require to be discharged**

**12 External materials and samples to be approved**

Prior to the commencement of any works above slab level details and samples of all external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indication as to these matters which have been given in the current application. Only such agreed materials shall be used in connection with this approval.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, in accordance with policies GEN2 and COM01 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted), together with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**This condition will require to be discharged**

**13 Contaminated Land - Unexpected Contamination**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition:-

To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy COM 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (adopted).

**This condition will require to be discharged**

16

**Inf 2 - Public Highway**

This development involves works within the public highway that can only be carried out by Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the Public Highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the Applicants' responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's Highway Development Management Group. Please contact (insert appropriate contact details). If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the Applicants own expense. Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

Please be aware it is the applicants responsibility to clarify the boundary with the public highway. Private structures such as fences or walls will not be permitted on highway land. The highway boundary may not match the applicants title plan. Please contact the highway research team at [highway.boundaries@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:highway.boundaries@norfolk.gov.uk) for further details.