



AGENDA

NOTE: In the case of non-members, this agenda is for information only

- Committee** - **PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- Date & Time** - MONDAY, 9TH JULY, 2012 AT 9.30 am
- Venue** - ANGLIA ROOM, THE CONFERENCE SUITE,
ELIZABETH HOUSE, DEREHAM

Members of the Committee requiring further information, or with specific questions, are asked to raise these with the appropriate officer at least two working days before the meeting. If the information requested is available, this will be provided, and reported to Committee.

NOTE

Ward Representatives wishing to speak on a particular application are asked to inform the Usher, Mrs H. Burlingham, well in advance and arrive at the meeting by **9.30am** as the items on which the public wish to speak will be taken first in order of the agenda.

IN THE EVENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS APPEARING ON THE AGENDA, WARD REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE NOTIFIED ACCORDINGLY IN ADVANCE.

THE ORDER OF THE MEETING WILL VARY TO ALLOW FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING AND WILL NOT FOLLOW THAT OF THIS AGENDA

PERSONS ATTENDING THE MEETING ARE REQUESTED TO TURN OFF MOBILE PHONES

VOTING:

If the first vote is lost in considering an application, a new proposal will be requested (eg a vote for approval, if lost, does not automatically mean "refused"). On a tied vote, the Chairman has a casting vote, if he/she wishes to use it. It is necessary for summary reasons for approvals or refusals to be identified in each case.

Member Services
Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke,
Dereham Norfolk, NR19 1EE
Date: Thursday, 28 June 2012

PLANNING POLICY NOTE

THE STRENGTH OF PLANNING POLICY IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Planning process is set up, **IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST**, to protect the public from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies. Planning is primarily concerned to deal with issues of land use and the way they affect the environment.

The Council has a DUTY, through the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to prepare **Local Development Documents (DPDs)** to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The **Development Plan** for Breckland **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 Core Strategy and Development Control Policies document. This was adopted by Breckland Council on 17th December 2009 and is the local starting point in the determination of planning applications. Breckland Council has also adopted its Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, on 19th January 2012. The document allocates specific areas of land for development and revised settlement boundaries.

Breckland's Plan contains the Council's planning policies, which must be consistent with Government policy which is currently the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance.

The full public scrutiny of the Council's proposals will give the Plan an exceptional weight when dealing with planning applications.

This shift towards a "Plan-led" planning system is a major feature of planning legislation. The Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, states that ***planning applications should be determined in accordance with the policies of the Plan, unless material considerations which are relevant to planning indicate otherwise.***

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. The core planning principles contained within the NPPF are summarised as:

- To be genuinely plan led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets

Unless there are special reasons to do otherwise, planning permissions "run with the land", and are NOT personal licences.

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,**
- **be consistent in the application of our policy, and**
- **if we need to adapt our policy, we should do it through the LDF process.**

Decisions which are finely balanced, and which contradict policy will be recorded in detail, to explain and justify the decision, and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.

LOCAL COUNCILS

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 comments received 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.

PART A
ITEMS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>
1. <u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2012.	1 - 10
2. <u>APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
3. <u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED</u> Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Members' Code of Conduct requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is personal or prejudicial.	
4. <u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
5. <u>REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA</u> To consider any requests from Ward Members, officers or applicants to defer an application included in this agenda, so as to save any unnecessary waiting by members of the public attending for such applications.	
6. <u>URGENT BUSINESS</u> To note whether the Chairman proposes to accept any item as urgent business, pursuant to Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
7. <u>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)</u> To receive an update.	
8. <u>FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY STATEMENT 2012</u> Report of the Director of Commissioning.	11 - 32
9. <u>DEFERRED APPLICATIONS</u> To consider applications deferred at previous meetings including some, but not all, of those shown on the attached Schedule of Deferred Applications.	33

10. SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Page(s)
herewith

34 - 79

To consider the Schedule of Planning Applications:

<u>Item</u> <u>No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Parish</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>No</u>
1	Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd PLEASE NOTE THIS ITEM WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 1.30 PM	Bradenham	35-45
2	David Alston (Norfolk) Ltd	Old Buckenham	46-52
3	Millngate Swaffham Ltd	Swaffham	53-59
4	Taylor Wimpey East Anglia	Carbrooke	60-63
5	Richard Johnston Ltd	Quidenham	64-67
6	Richard Johnston Ltd	Quidenham	68-71
7	Breckland Council	Swaffham	72-76
8	Mr & Mrs R Wragg	Yaxham	77-79

11. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING

80 - 92

Report of the Director of Commissioning

Members are requested to raise any questions at least two working days before the meeting to allow information to be provided to the Committee.

12. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)

93

13. APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

APP/F2605/A/11/2167567 : Old Ashill Garage, Swaffham Road, Ashill, Norfolk, IP25 7BT : Appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for a dwelling on brown field commercial land : Reference : 3PL/2011/0232/F
Decision : Appeal Dismissed

APP/F2605/A/12/2169541 : Land adjacent Gay-Dene, Lower Stow Bedon, Attleborough, Norfolk, NR17 1EN : Appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of agricultural worker's dwelling : Reference : 3PL/2011/0140/F
Decision : Appeal Dismissed

APP/F2605/A/12/2170709 : Spring Studio, Hoe, Dereham, NR20 4BD : Appeal against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for the change of use of an existing building from artist's studio with ancillary residential accommodation to single dwellinghouse : Reference : 3PL/2011/0807/CU
Decision : Appeal Dismissed

APP/F2605/A/12/2170708 : Spring Studio, Hoe, Dereham, NR20
4BD : Appeal against a failure to give notice within the prescribed
period of a decision on an application for a certificate of lawful use of
development (LDC) for use class C3 : Reference 3PL/2011/0806/LU
Decision : Appeal Dismissed

APP/F2605/A/12/2169344 : 159 Shipdham Road, Dereham, NR19
1NP : Appeal against a refusal to grant outline planning permission
for residential development : Reference : 3PL/2011/05/02/O
Decision : Appeal Dismissed

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 11 June 2012 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr S.G. Bambridge
Councillor C Bowes
Mr T R Carter
Mr C. S. Clark
Mr P.D. Claussen
Mr T.J. Lamb

Mrs J A North (Vice-Chairman)
Mr W. R. J. Richmond
Mr M. S. Robinson
Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)

Also Present

Mr K. Martin (Ward
Representative)
Mr J.P. Cowen (Ward
Representative)
Mr A.C. Stasiak (Ward
Representative)

Mr R.G. Kybird (Ward Representative)
Mr S. Askew (Ward Representative)

In Attendance

Paul Jackson
Heather Burlingham
John Chinnery
Jane Osborne
Jeff Upton

Planning Manager
Assistant Development Control Officer*
Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Committee Officer
Interim Planning & Building Control
Manager*
Senior Development Management Officer
Senior Planning Policy Officer
Principal Planning Officer*
Norfolk County Council Highways

Lindy Warmer
James Stone
Mike Brennan
David Higgins

* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

53/12 MINUTES

With regard to Minute number 48/12 Deferred Application, Attleborough, page 4 of the Agenda, the first paragraph of the second paragraph should read, 'it was one Councillor's belief that to place additional traffic lights at Connaught Plain together with existing lights outside the Post Office would create a worse situation than at present, and that traffic would back up even more'.

With regard to Minute number 49/12 Item (j) of the Schedule of Planning Applications, Old Buckenham, page 9 of the Agenda, the penultimate paragraph should read, 'some properties in Fen Street had suffered flooding and to build on more land, would take away drainage'.

Subject to the above, the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May

Action By

Action By

2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

54/12DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 8 (b), Deferred Applications, Attleborough, and Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 1, Snetterton by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development.

Cllr Claussen declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 2, Mattishall by virtue of close family members owning property in Mattishall.

Cllrs Robinson and Kybird declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 4, Thetford by virtue of being Members of the Moving Thetford Forward Board.

Cllr Bowes declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Item No. 1, Snetterton, by virtue of a relative owning one of the companies who had submitted a letter of objection.

55/12CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Cllrs Claussen and Bambridge were welcomed as Planning Committee Members, as was Cllr English as a substitute. Farewells were accorded to the former Chairman Cllr Gould, and Cllr Wassell.

56/12LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)

Following further consultation with regard to TAAP, the Council had received recommendations from the Inspector on 30 May 2012, who found the TAAP sound, subject to minor amendments as shown on the website. The Policy Team had started to produce documents for adoption, with a report scheduled to go to full Council on 5 July 2012. If adopted, it would be part of Breckland's LDF.

57/12DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

57 .1 Thompson : Demolition of Existing Detached Dwelling & Construction of Replacement Dwelling : Reference : 3PL/2012/0150/F

The demolition of an existing detached dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling was proposed outside the Settlement Boundary. The application had been deferred from the Planning Committee held on 14 May 2012 to enable negotiations to take place in respect of the siting and design of the proposed replacement dwelling.

The applicant was not prepared to amend the proposal further, and

Action By

he had asked Members to consider factors as detailed in the report.

Mr Cowen, Ward Representative advised that since the deferment he had spoken to both Thompson Parish Council and the applicant. He said that the property was of a very urban design in a very rural location and was not appropriate for the location. Whilst the Parish Council did not object to the site being developed, their concern was about the form and layout.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to conditions as listed in the report and an additional condition removing permitted development rights in relation to curtilage buildings.

58/12 ATTLEBOROUGH : PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL/EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT, LONDON ROAD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2011/0528/H

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development. Members had received correspondence with regard to the application.

David Higgins of Norfolk County Council Highways was in attendance to answer questions.

The proposal was deferred by the Planning Committee on 11 April 2012 to enable further consideration to be given to transport matters, in consultation with the applicant and the Highway Authority. Concerns about the potential amenity impact of 2½ storey houses on London Road were also raised. The application was deferred again by the Planning Committee on 14 May 2012.

Revised plans had since been submitted which proposed an extension of the traffic management measures further eastwards along London Road towards the town centre. Speed reactive signs and enhanced cycling links were also now proposed. The number of 2½ storey houses on the London Road frontage had been reduced from seven to five. The remaining units would be interspersed evenly amongst the 2 storey houses.

Mr Hall, Objector and representative of the Attleborough Community Team, questioned the public consultation, and reasons for refusal were the severe impact on the Town Centre and a cycle way that went nowhere. He asked the Committee to support local democracy, the residents of Attleborough, the Town and District Councillors and refuse the application until it was included in ASHAAP.

Ms Taylor, Attleborough Town Council, stated there had been no consultation and despite strong representation by the Town Council and Ward Members no changes of substance had been made to the proposal. The Town Council was not against the development but as

Action By

it was outside the Settlement Boundary it should be part of the ASHAAP.

Mr Osborn, Agent advised that they had listened and acted on all matters of concern.

Cllr Stasiak, Ward Representative commented that if the scheme was not viable, then it should not go ahead, as the people of Attleborough did not want it in its present form. He was still of the belief that it was a "cheap fix". He questioned if any surveys had been done on air quality and air pollution. If there was a need for higher storey houses, they should go in the middle of the development so they overlooked the new houses, and not the residents who currently had private gardens. It was outside the Settlement Boundary.

Cllr Martin, Ward Representative stated that as the application was prior to ASHAAP the totals should come off the proposed 4000 units, and that Attleborough needed assurance that the long term affect on the town, traffic and infrastructure would be taken into account.

In answer to a Councillor's concerns about the safety of the fast London Road, what part of it would be narrowed particularly from the south west, and there being no mention of New Road on Highway's plans, Mr Higgins of NCC Highways believed that whilst there would be more traffic, with the speed reduction features taken down to the full extent of the site and past the employment land, he did not think there would be any significant problem. A balance would need to be arrived at with regard to the positioning of the 30mph sign. He felt it would be difficult to impose a 40mph limit from the A11 roundabout.

When questioned whether a public consultation meeting had taken place, Mr Osborn confirmed that one had been held at the beginning of the process, but the latest proposals had not been discussed, although the Town Council had been copied in to the letter received by Members.

A Councillor asked that weight be given to the comments made by Norfolk Landscape Archaeology.

At New Road there was a blind bend with a 40mph limit, so either end of the development would come into blind bend situations, and as such, a Councillor believed that more thought needed to be given to that access. Added to that, if the development which was outside the Settlement Boundary was approved, she requested that all the hedgerows were carefully dismantled outside of the bird nesting season.

Views from Councillors covered the heavy traffic the employment site would accumulate, could traffic be re-directed to the roundabout rather than into the town, the cycle lane went nowhere, views of the many people upset about the proposal had not been taken into consideration, lack of consultation, and that a meeting should be held

Action By

in the town before the proposal went ahead. The viability of the site was the concern of the developer, the scheme did not reach the Council's standards and it was premature.

The Planning Manager advised that consultation requirements had been met, with the Council going beyond its statutory duty. People had engaged but agreement had not been reached.

The recommendation for approval was not supported.

Members were given advice by the Solicitor and Principal Planning Officer but despite that, a new proposal was made and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds that it was outside the Settlement Boundary and that the highways aspects had not been properly assessed.

RESOLVED, that contrary to the recommendation of Officers, the application be refused.

59/12 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows :

- (a) Item 1 : Snetterton : Erection of a 40MW renewable energy biomass power station and associated works : Applicant : Icen Energy Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0029/F

Cllr Sharpe declared a personal interest by virtue of being the Executive Support Member for Assets & Strategic Development.

Cllr Bowes declared a personal interest by virtue of a relative owning one of the companies who had submitted a letter of objection.

Members had received correspondence about the proposal.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report, which was for the erection of a 40MW renewable energy biomass power station and associated works. The main structures which would form the development would be the turbine and boiler house, two fuel storage barns, wood storage barn, stack and an air cooled condenser. It would also include smaller structures as identified in the report. The total area of the proposed site that formed the application would be approximately 9.0 ha. The site was outside the Settlement Boundary.

Many letters of support and objection had been received from local residents and the areas they referred to were outlined in the report.

Action By

The proposed power station would accord with both local and national planning policies which encouraged the development of renewable energy projects. By addressing current energy problems in the locality, the proposal would also help to promote the development of the Snetterton Heath employment area. Careful consideration had been given to anticipated environmental impacts, and it had been concluded that the scheme would not result in significant adverse effects. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Napier, Shropham Parish Council, stated that there had been overwhelming concern despite the need for electricity, by those who attended a meeting at Shropham Village Hall in February 2012, as the proposal fell outside the core strategy along with other reasons for objection detailed in the report.

Mr Skinner, Snetterton Parish Council, was concerned the proposal was in the wrong place and outside the development area for the village and should be on industrial development land. Local agricultural community would be adversely affected.

Mr Foster, Objector, believed that the application was not a biomass plant but an incinerator and was not on Snetterton Heath, with the River Thet being about a mile from the site. The application was the wrong technology in the wrong place.

Mr Hilton, Icen, stated all limitations and restrictions were covered in their Environmental Statement. Guarantees would be provided with regard to particulates and emissions from the chimney would be caught by filtration. Anglian Farms had given assurances that they could provide all the fuel, would enter into a 15 year agreement and would not use farmers who were not members of Anglian Farms.

Cllr Cowen, Ward Representative, believed there were errors and omissions in the report. He was concerned about the Snetterton and Thetford Area Action Plan. The level of scale of the proposed development would affect future growth of Snetterton as a development area. Volume of straw, location and scale of plant, along with the application being premature were all areas of concern, and there had to be a better alternative than that proposed.

Cllr Askew, Ward Representative believed the proposal was too big a risk to entertain on economic reasons alone. The supply of straw was governed by climate. He believed the applicant's statements raised more questions than they answered. He queried the green credentials. It was the wrong type of system in the wrong place and urged Economic Development to search for a more credible solution.

Action By

Lindy Warmer, Senior Economic Development Officer stated that Breckland's Economic Development Service was in full support of the application, which they had driven since October 2006, during which time they had carried out a number of reviews and studies on energy supply options. It would open up the opportunity for future skills and employment and generate investment into the area.

In answer to questions raised by Members, the applicant advised that there would be no HGV movements along country roads, water used would be for damping down the ash, the current overhead connection would be reinforced. He explained how the electricity went into the National Grid and how the small sub station would allow other connections to be made for other users in the area. They would avoid widening roads and causing hedgerow deprivation.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that they had consulted with numerous wildlife bodies and the Environmental Statement gave details, to which a Councillor requested that if the application was approved, any loss of hedgerows should be done outside the breeding season.

Further questions were asked of the applicant, to which he advised the road structures had been looked at at Snetterton Heath, but they felt they were too difficult to get traffic through the roads, therefore the site proposed seemed to be obvious. Noise pollution would likely be less than currently recorded as background noise.

Subject to confirmation from the Secretary of State that the application would not be called in, the application be Approved, as recommended, subject to conditions in the report with the additional condition of facilitating a local provision for an electricity supply.

- (b) Item 2 : Mattishall : Retention of 1 static home, 2 touring caravans, laundry room, 2 sheds, fences, access/splays parking, c/u ag land to res : Applicant : Mr Michael Cawley & Miss Mary-Lou Cawley : Reference : 3PL/2012/0080/F

Cllr Claussen declared a personal and prejudicial interest by virtue of family members owning property in Mattishall.

The application had previously been referred to the Planning Committee on 14 May, 2012 at which time the resolution had been that the planning permission be approved as recommended. However, the comments of the Ward Representative were not available at that time, and the application had been referred back to allow further consideration of local concerns.

Action By

Five further letters had been received from members of the public but no new issues of concern had been raised apart from devaluation of local properties.

The Principal Planning Officers reminded Members of the requirements of the NPPF.

Mr Mason, Agent, stated he was concerned the application had been brought back, as the Committee had approved the application on 14 May 2012, and requested that Members repeated their previous decision.

Cllr Claussen stated that Enforcement Officers had been warned off the site. He asked that attention be paid to the early engagement between the settled and traveller communities, as he believed in this instance there had been a lack of it which had driven a wedge through both communities. He commented on the NPPF and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Cllr Claussen left the meeting.

Members did not feel that comments received from the Ward Representative included any further new information.

Approved, as recommended.

Candy Sheridan had provided training to the Authority in the past, and the Chairman wished to arrange further training as soon as possible, and urged all Planning Committee Members to attend.

Cllr Claussen returned to the meeting.

- (c) Item 3 : Thetford : Erect 3 storey hotel annex, single storey extension to restaurant, alterations to car park and relocate play area : Applicant : Whitbread Group PLC & Kier Homes : Reference : 3PL/2012/0321/F

Members had received correspondence with regard to the application.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of a three storey detached building (holiday annex) which would provide 36 additional bedrooms to the existing Premier Inn Hotel, a single storey extension to the front of the existing public house to provide additional space for the restaurant and alterations to the on-site car park and relocation of a play area. A previous application (3PL/2011/0715/F) was refused by the Planning Committee on 3 October 2011.

It was considered that the scheme had not addressed the concerns raised by the previous refusal relating to the loss of part of a TPO Woodland Order and the loss of part of an open

Action By

space and, as such, the proposal was considered to be unacceptable and therefore it was recommended for refusal.

Two letters of objection had been received.

Mr Benning, Objector, was the joint owner of a house opposite the proposed development site, and believed the 3 storey building was unacceptable as it would be about 30m from his property and deprive him of mature woodland, affect his privacy, reduce the desirability and value of his property, along with odours produced by the restaurant kitchen. He did not believe the proposal would assist the Thetford town centre regeneration.

Mr Thackeray, Agent stated that they had listened to what had been said in the past, and had compensated for open space, dealt with overlooking and reduced the loss of trees.

Concerns raised by Members covered the play area, the mismanagement of the woodland and community access to the open space.

Refused, as recommended.

- (d) Item 4 : Thetford : Construction of concrete skatepark (228 sqm) : Applicant : Breckland Council : Reference : 3PL/2012/0479/F

Cllrs Robinson and Kybird declared a personal interest by virtue of being Members of the Moving Thetford Forward Board.

Full planning permission for the construction of a Skatepark was sought. The site was approximately 14m by 15m and consisted of a concrete area of ramps, curbs and walls. The structure would be less than 1.4m in height. It would be intended that a fence be erected around the site and lighting installed. No specific details had been submitted as part of the application.

2 letters had been received with regard to noise and disturbance. Other concerns covered hours of operation, access, surface water drainage and litter management.

The Principal Planning Officer advised, that if Members were minded to approve the application that it be deferred to Officers, as Thetford Town Council were not scheduled to discuss the application until Tuesday, 12 June 2012.

Cllr Kybird, Member of Moving Thetford Forward Board, advised that the application was regarded as a key piece of infrastructure for young people on a site adjacent to Thetford Sport Centre.

Action By

Whilst some Councillors did not feel the need for an acoustic fence as CCTV should be sufficient, others felt it would be essential.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it as recommended, subject to conditions, if no further objections are received within the consultation period and Thetford Town Council do not object.

Notes To Schedule

Item No.	Speaker
1	Mr Napier – Shropham P C Mr Skinner – Snetterton P C Mr Foster – Objector Mr Hilton – Icen Mr Askew – Ward Representative Mr Cowen – Ward Representative
2	Mr Mason - Agent
3	Mr Benning – Objector Mr Thackeray - Agent
4	Mr Kybird – Member MTF

Written Representations Taken Into Account

Reference No.	No. of Representations
3PL/2012/0029/F	49
3PL/2012/0080/F	2
3PL/2012/0321/F	
3PL/2012/0479/F	

60/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING

Noted.

61/12 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

62/12 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS

Noted.

63/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

The meeting closed at 2.43 pm

CHAIRMAN

BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL**Report of:** Director of Commissioning**To:** Planning Committee – 9th July 2012**(Author:** Sarah Robertson, Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds))**Subject:** Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2012**Purpose:** The purpose of this report is to update members on Breckland's five year housing land supply, which is a requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework.**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that Members note the contents of this report and any implications for decisions on relevant Planning Applications.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Local Authorities are required through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to produce a five year housing land supply statement annually, as part of their monitoring of deliverable housing land. This is not a new requirement for Local Authorities, indeed this is Breckland's fifth review of the statement. However, the recent publication of the NPPF in March 2012 has altered the requirements for the statement's content.
- 1.2 The five year housing land supply statement assesses Breckland's supply of houses over the next five years and identifies specific sites which the Council considers will deliver housing over the period to 2017. The sites which may be included towards a District's five year supply may include both large and small sites with planning permission. Sites allocated through the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, the Thetford Area Action Plan DPD process and sites that have been demonstrated to be within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), may also be included if they will be delivered within this five year period.
- 1.3 Breckland's housing targets have been identified through the production of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, which sets out the District's housing numbers for the time period 2001/2026. The Core Strategy states that 19,100 new homes will need to be built over this time period across the whole of the District. Over the next five years, and to accommodate existing shortfalls due to previous under-performance in housing delivery, the District is now required to deliver 1,032 dwellings per annum for the next five years. After this point the annual housing land supply target will be 780 dwellings per annum for the remainder of the plan period.
- 1.4 The NPPF requires Local Authorities to include an additional buffer of either 5% or 20% into their housing land supply, to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Due to the previous persistent under-delivery of housing against targets, Breckland is required to include a 20% buffer into its housing land.

- 1.5 This under-delivery is not a reflection on the Council's ability to allocate land for housing development. Despite the good progress the Council has made through its LDF work, under-delivery rests with a number of other factors, many of which are outside of the influence of the planning system. A number of planning applications are not being implemented or are being delivered at a very slow rate despite being unconstrained greenfield sites. The Council's Five Year Housing Land Statement has therefore taken a cautious but realistic view of how housing supply will come forward.
- 1.6 Currently, when taking into account the need to provide a 20% buffer, Breckland can demonstrate 3.41 years supply of deliverable housing land. This represents a shortfall of 1966 dwellings over the coming five year period.
- 1.7 In the absence of being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, the NPPF provides guidance to Local Authorities on the required approach. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered as being up to date. In Breckland's case this applies to the housing numbers allocated within CP1 of the Core Strategy, however the spatial strategy for the District, which identifies the locations for growth is still considered to be in accordance with the NPPF.
- 1.8 The lack of a five year housing land supply within the District will have impact on the determination of planning applications. The NPPF requires local authorities to produce a housing implementation strategy to detail how they will reach and maintain a five year supply. In Breckland, in areas identified within the Spatial Strategy for growth (i.e. the five market towns and Narborough, Harling, Shipdham and Swanton Morley) if a site can be demonstrated to be deliverable, available and suitable. It should be considered favourably within the planning process taking into account the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the NPPF.
- 1.9 In future years, the five year land supply is likely to improve as more of the development within allocated through the Thetford Area Action Plan can be included. The adoption of the Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan will also help to close the land supply shortfall.
- 1.10 The five year housing land supply statement will be reviewed on an annual basis.

2. OPTIONS

3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Members note the contents of this report. The five year housing land supply statement represents a factual statement on the existing situation, and will need to be taken into consideration in the determination of planning applications, as set out within the housing implementation strategy.

4. IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Carbon Footprint & Environmental Issues

4.2 Constitution & Legal

4.3 Contracts

4.4 Corporate Plan

4.5 **Crime and Disorder**

4.6 **Equality and Diversity & Human Rights**

4.7 **Financial**

4.8 **Risk Management**

[Describe only the risks that are immediately obvious in relation to the recommendation]

4.9 **Staffing**

4.10 **Stakeholders / Consultation**

4.11 **Other**

5. WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

All wards in Breckland are affected by the Local Development Framework.

Background papers:-

Lead Contact Officer

Name/Post: Sarah Robertson Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds)

Telephone Number: 01362 656857

Email: sarah.robertson@capita.co.uk

Key Decision – N/A

Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix A – Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2012



a better place, a brighter future
Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA SYMONDS

Five Year Supply of Housing Assessment

2012

1. Background

- 1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the planning framework for Housing. The framework was published on 27th March 2012, and replaces the previous housing policies contained within Planning Policy Statement 3. The NPPF retains the requirement for Local Authorities to identify and update an annual five year supply of deliverable housing land.
- 1.2 The NPPF has made a number of changes to the five year supply requirements, and these can be seen at paragraph 47 of the framework. A key change is the requirement for local authorities to identify an additional buffer of housing land of 5%. This has occurred to ensure there is choice and competition in the market for land. However, where local authorities have persistently under delivered housing, the buffer should be increased to 20%. Breckland's housing requirements are set out within the adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and were informed by the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy
- 1.3 This document assesses Breckland's supply of housing over the next five years. It identifies specific sites which the Council considers will deliver housing over the period to 2017. The assessment includes sites which are currently under construction, sites with the benefit of planning permission for housing and sites which have been allocated for housing that will be delivered within the five year period. The assessment also includes brownfield sites identified in the District's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2010 (SHLAA) as deliverable in five years. The SHLAA can also be found on the Council's website.
- 1.4 In order for sites to be considered as part of the District's five year housing supply they have to be regarded as deliverable in terms of paragraph 47 and footnotes 11 and 12 of the NPPF. In order for sites to be classed as deliverable, footnotes 11 and 12 of the NPPF state that sites should be:
- Available – the site is available for development now
 - Suitable – The site offers a suitable location for development and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities
 - Achievable – there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.
- 1.5 Sites with planning permission identified in the assessment are considered to be suitable and available, as this test was made at the application stage. It is possible that not all sites will be achievable within the 5 year period. Sites identified from the SHLAA have already been tested against these criteria.
- 1.6 This assessment, has considered sites as either being large sites or small sites. Large sites are considered to be those for 10 dwellings or more, whilst small sites are those sites for less than ten dwellings. To further test deliverability of large sites with Planning Permission (10 dwellings and above) a questionnaire was sent to applicants seeking their intentions for development on the site. The questionnaire can be seen in **Appendix 1**. Where a developers intentions were not available a judgement has been made on the achievability of the site based on local experience. However,

the response to this questionnaire was very poor this monitoring year, and as such, responses from last year's survey have been utilised in many cases for the delivery timescales of sites.

- 1.7 As of 1st April 2012 there were 491 dwellings to be built on small-scale sites (Under 10 dwellings) with Planning Permission. Therefore, it is seen as unfeasible to appraise the achievability of every small-scale site. For small sites an average completion rate has been applied based on past trends. Appendix 3 lists all small-scale sites with planning permission.

2. Breckland Five Year Housing Requirement

- 2.1 Policy H1 of The East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) required Breckland to deliver at least **15,200** dwellings over the plan period to 2021. This document still forms part of the Development Plan system at the time of writing this document and is valued for the purpose of this assessment. This figure has been extrapolated until 2026, which creates Breckland's total housing requirement to be 19,100 dwellings as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. This equates to **760** a year. However, the East of England Plan (RSS) was not adopted until May 2008. At this point, to make up for the previous shortfall and to reach the housing requirements Breckland needed to build **780** dwellings per year. **Table 1** shows the housing requirement in detail. Between the financial year 2001/2002 and 2011/2012, **6,466** net new dwellings have been completed in Breckland. Following the adoption of the East of England Plan in 2008, with the need to complete **780** dwellings, Breckland has completed **1,857** dwellings. The East of England Plan required **3,120** dwellings to be completed over this period. This results in a shortfall of 1,263 dwellings. It is considered that the shortfall from earlier in the plan period needs to be accommodated over the short term. To accommodate the shortfall within the next five years of the plan period this would require a yearly requirement of **1,032** new dwellings per annum until 2017, and then 780 dwellings per annum for the remainder of the plan period.

TABLE 1

Year	Actual Completions	Required Completions	Shortfall/Surplus
2001/2002	543	760	-217
2002/2003	605	760	-155
2003/2004	884	760	124
2004/2005	840	760	80
2005/2006	592	760	-168
2006/2007	520	760	-240
2007/2008	625	760	-135
Adoption of the RSS (Previous shortfall has been removed and included within new required completions field)			
2008/2009	607	780	-173
2009/2010	528	780	-252
2010/2011	376	780	-404
2011/2012	346	780	-434
TOTAL since RSS adoption	1,857	3,120	-1,263
Dwellings Remaining to be built over the plan period	11,400		
2012/2013		1,032	
2013/2014		1,032	
2014/2015		1,032	
2015/2016		1,032	
2016/2017		1,032	
FIVE YEAR HOUSING REQUIREMENT		5,160	

3. Breckland Five Year Deliverable Housing Supply

3.1 As stated in Paragraph 1.3 above, this assessment includes only sites with planning permission. As of April 2012 2066 dwellings had the benefit of planning permission. In addition to this the assessment has also included sites which have been allocated within Development Plan Documents, and are expected to be delivered within the next five years. In Breckland this includes sites within the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD. In total this amounts to a further 897 number of dwellings, within the first five years. Breckland is also in receipt of a sound Inspectors Report into the Thetford Area Action Plan DPD, which allocates land for 5,000 new dwellings. A Planning Application has also been submitted for these dwellings. It is considered that the site will deliver the first phase of housing development within the five year period, amounting to 1,160 additional dwellings.

3.2 It is expected that not all of these dwellings will be completed within the five year period of this assessment. As described in Paragraph 1.6 identified sites with planning permission were split into two categories, large sites (10+ dwellings) and small sites (less than 10 dwellings).

3.3 **Table 2** shows the expected delivery of housing on identified sites.

TABLE 2

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total
Large Sites with Planning Permission	372	617	271	207	123	1,590
Small Sites with Planning Permission	243	233	0	0	0	476
SHLAA Sites	0	92	65	57	29	243
Land Allocations	0	47	656	707	507	1917
Total	615	989	992	971	659	4226
Requirement	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	5,160
Shortfall/ Surplus	-417	-43	+10	-239	-373	-934

3.4 **Appendix 2** and **3** shows the identified large sites and how they contribute to the housing projections in **Table 2**. The phasing for the land allocations is contained within **Appendix 4**.

3.5 It is evident from **Table 2** that the projected completions over the next 5 years are below the required completions. From **Table 2** it can be concluded that Breckland has a **4.09** year deliverable housing supply and is 934 dwellings short of the 5 year target.

3.6 As described within paragraph 1.2 above, the National Planning Policy Framework requires local authorities to include either a 5% or 20% buffer of housing land to ensure choice and competition in the market. The advice contained within paragraph 47 of the NPPF suggest that where there has been a record of persistent under delivery local authorities should plan for an additional 20%. From Table 1 it is observed that Breckland has failed to meet its housing target for 9 out of the past 11 years. As such, it is considered that Breckland would be required to apply a 20% buffer to its five year housing land supply.

3.7 Therefore, when applying a 20% buffer to the existing five year housing supply, this creates a total housing requirement of **6,192** dwellings to 2017. When considering this in relation to the total existing supply of dwellings within the district, this would result in a **3.41** year supply of deliverable land.

4. Housing Implementation Strategy

- 4.1 As shown in Section 3 above, Breckland Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing. Therefore, the implications of Paragraph 49 of the National Planning policy Framework are relevant to the District. The Council will set out through this section a Housing Implementation Strategy to set out how it will maintain a five year land supply to meet the housing target.
- 4.2 The principal mechanism to help remedy the current shortfall will be for the Council to consider applications for housing favourably in line with the requirements set out within paragraph 49 of the NPPF.
- 4.3 In order to consider applications for housing favourably in line with Paragraph 49 of the NPPF it may be necessary to make a departure from the Development Plan, such as where Policy CP1 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Document prescribes a particular level of housing to be planned for.
- 4.4 Furthermore, where a site is outside a defined Settlement Boundary as defined in the adopted Proposals Map accompanying the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (2009) and would normally be contrary to Policy DC2, the following information will be required from applicants to justify a departure from the Development Plan.
- A statement which confirms that housing on the site is **deliverable** in line with the requirements of footnote 11 on page 12 of the NPPF within the 5 year period outlined in this document. In order for a site to be considered deliverable it should be:
 - **Available** – the site is available and a developer can be found and constraints overcome to ensure development of the site can begin within the 5 year period.
 - **Suitable** – the site is in a suitable location and in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as contained within the NPPF at paragraph 14.
 - **Achievable** - a timetable of when dwellings are expected to be completed on site within the 5 year period should be included
 - An assessment of any saved policies of the Breckland Adopted Local Plan (1999) to which the proposal is contrary, explaining why, in sustainability terms, the development should proceed contrary to the Development Plan.
- 4.5 The strategy outlined above will remain in effect until future revisions to this document.
- 4.6 The NPPF at paragraph 47 requires Local Authorities to plan for a full range of housing provision, including both market and affordable dwellings. The Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD requires new developments to include affordable housing on all sites of over 5 dwellings or 0.17ha, at a rate of 40%. The phasing for large sites within appendix 2 includes the phasing over the five year period by tenure.

5. Conclusion and Future Actions

- 5.1** Section 3 outlines that as of 2012 Breckland does not have a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for housing. Therefore, Planning Applications for housing will be assessed with regard to the strategy outlined in **Section 4** above.
- 5.2** The growth associated with the Thetford Area Action Plan will continue to support the housing land supply in future years, albeit is currently subject to a phased approach with a significant quantum of development due to be delivered in later phases. Furthermore, the Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan is currently being prepared by the Council, and will allocate land for a further 4,000 new dwellings which will go a considerable way to remedying the current temporary shortfall.
- 5.3** This 5 Year Supply of Housing Assessment will be monitored and updated annually linked to the results.

**Breckland Council – 5 Year Housing Supply
Statement
Developability Questionnaire**

Site Name	
Parish	
Planning Application Reference	
Applicant	

<u>Financial Year</u>	<u>Estimated Market Housing Completions on Site</u>	<u>Estimated Affordable Housing Completions on Site</u>
Financial Year 2012/2013		
Financial Year 2013/2014		
Financial Year 2014/2015		
Financial Year 2015/2016		
Financial Year 2016/2017		
Post 2017		

Additional Comments:

Appendix 2: Large Sites

Planning Application Reference	Site Address 1	Site Address 2	Site Address 3	Number remaining	2012/13		2013/14		2014/15		2015/16		2016/17		Survey Returned	Comments
					Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable		
					3PL/2006/0441/O	Goose Green	(off Dunnetts Close)	Ashil	29	0	0	10	5	8		
3PL/2010/0033/F	Oaktrees	Slough Lane	Attleborough	22	5	0	11	6		0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2010/1041/F	Land to North of Honeysuckle Way	Attleborough	Attleborough	66	0	0	13	13	15	13	12		0		Yes	
3PL/2010/1333/F	Land south of side of Hale Road	Bradenham	Bradenham	11	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2008/0162/D	Part of former technical site	RAF Watton	Carbrooke	113	17	0	33	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2009/0118/D	Norwich Road	Carbrooke	Carbrooke/Griston	64	18	0	18	0	18	0	10	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2009/0274/D	Former RAF Watton Technical Site	Norwich Road	Carbrooke/Griston	27	13	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2007/0652/O	Dereham Swimming Pool	De-Narde Road	DEREHAM	25	0	0	0	0	5	5	10	5	0	0	No	
3PL/2007/1800/D	Moorgate Business Centre	South Green	Dereham	35	18	14	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2009/0712/F	34-36 Swaffham Road	Dereham	Dereham	10	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	

3PL/2010/1142/F	Land north of Norwich Road	Dereham	Dereham	200	8	6	24	18	22	14	24	14	24	10	Yes	Schedule dependent on market conditions and review of viability in line with the s106 agreement
3PL/2011/0565/D	Land at Fleece Meadow	Norwich Road	Dereham	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2009/0204/F	19 Jubilee Avenue	Harling	Harling	12	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2010/0374	Land east of Lopham Road	Harling	Harling	14	3	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2008/0206/F	Memorial Hall	School Close	Kenninghall	12	4	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/1990/0747/D	Part OS plot nos. 353	683 684 & 685	Necton	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	We are unable to give information due to the slow housing market
3PL/1991/1231/D	Part O.S. 5222		Necton	40	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	Yes	
3PL/2010/1345/F	Mill Street	Necton	Necton	30	6	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2008/1427/F	Land adj St Andrews Close	Old Buckenham	Old Buckenham	14	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2009/0310/F	Riverside Garden Centre	Swaffham Road	Scarning	14	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2007/1234/F	Land off Chuch Close	Shipdham	Shipdham	43	8	0	18	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	Yes	
3PL/2010/0293/O	36 Letton Road	Shipdham	Shipdham	11	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2007/1341/F	Land to rear of Conservative club	London Street	Swaffham	22	0	0	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	

3PL/2008/1288/F	Watton Surgery	St Giles Road	Watton	14	5	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2009/1084/F	119 Norwich Road	Watton	Watton	14	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2010/0706/O	Drome Garage	Norwich Road	Watton	19	0	0	7	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2011/0088/D	Former RAF Radar Site	Norwich Road	Watton	154	25	20	25	20	25	6	33	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2004/1811/D	Land off Fengate Drove	Part of site also in Brandon (Forest Heath)	Weeting	21	0	0	7	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	No	
3PL/2007/1569/F	Stonebridge Camp	Thetford Road, Stonebridge	Wretham	27	0	0	10	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	No	

Appendix 3: Small Sites

Planning Application Reference	Site Address 1	Site Address 2	Site Address 3	Proposed dwellings	Number remaining
3PL/2011/0670/F	The Firs	Watton Road	Ashill	2	2
3PL/2006/0752/O	Mill Croft	Hale Road	Ashill	1	1
3PL/2005/0733/O	The Old Crown	The Green	Ashill	1	1
3PL/2007/0503/O	Old School Swimming Pool	Watton Road	Ashill	1	1
3PL/2007/1178/F	The Paddocks	Fir Park	Ashill	1	0
3PL/2011/1408/D	Butterfly Hall	Carvers Lane	Attleborough	3	3
3PL/2009/0359/O	Adjacent to 11 Warren Lane	Attleborough		1	1
3PL/2009/0155/F	Land at 38 Dodds Road	Attleborough		2	2
3PL/2008/1522/O	The Foudary	Foundary Corner, Buckenham Road	Attleborough	1	0
3PL/2011/0563/F	Westcroft	London Road	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2011/1083/F	Robelle	Foundry Corner	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2009/0563/F	Park Farm Bungalow	Morley Road	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2007/1485/O	The Foundry	Foundry Corner	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2005/1381/O	65 Leys Lane	Attleborough		1	1
3PL/2007/1122/O	111 and 113 Besthorpe Road		Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2011/1266/F	Rookwood Dental Surgery	21 Connaught Road	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2011/1175/F	54 Cyprus Road	Attleborough		1	1
3PL/2004/1039/O	G Ellis Butcher	Church Street	Attleborough	4	4
3PL/2008/0599/O	26 Besthorpe Road	Attleborough	NR17 2NA	5	5
3PL/2011/0802/CU	Connaught House	Connaught Road	Attleborough	2	2

3PL/2010/0008/F	Land behind Ladbrokes	Church Street	Attleborough	3	3
3PL/2010/1138/D	49 New North Road	Attleborough		2	1
3PL/2011/1392/D	Wood Farm	Deopham Road	Attleborough	1	1
3PL/2005/1749/O	Plot between 30 + 34 Crown Street	Banham		1	1
3PL/2011/0990/O	Land to the rear of The Willows	Kenninghall Road	Banham	1	1
3PL/2011/0537/F	Land situated between	8 Crown Way and 1 Pound Close	Banham	1	1
3PL/2010/0789/F	The Great Barn	Shingham	Beachamwell	1	1
3PL/2003/0246/F	Plot adjacent to The Cottage	Mill Drift	Beeston	1	1
3PL/2006/1235/O	Catoria	The Street	Beeston	3	3
3PL/2010/0516/O	The Ploughshare PH	The Street	Beeston	2	2
3PL/2005/0971/O	April Cottage	Church Road	Beetley	1	1
3PL/2009/0207/F	Vale Farm	Beetley		1	1
3PL/2011/0623/F	29 Fakenham Road	Beetley		1	1
3PL/2009/0420/F	Attleborough Fish Farm	Norwich Road	Besthorpe	1	1
3PL/2009/0473/D	Hartlands	Norwich Road	Besthorpe	1	1
3PL/2008/0467/O	Land adj Village Farm	Silver Street	Besthorpe	2	2
3PL/2005/1239/O	Bottle Corner	Besthorpe		1	1
3PL/2011/1125/F	Norwich Road	Besthorpe		2	2
3PL/2011/1347/F	Carr Farm	Black Carr	Besthopre	5	5
3PL/2010/0030/F	The Forge	Bintree Road	Billingford	2	1
3PL/2011/0107/F	The Forge	Bintree Road	Billingford	1	0
3PL/2009/0875/F	Village Hall	Foulsham Road	Bintree	3	3
3PL/2008/0096/F	Willow Cottage	Foulsham Road	Bintree	1	1
3PL/2004/0402/O	Allotments	The Street	Bintree	3	3
3PL/2008/0103/F	Site at Church Lane	Blo' Norton		4	4
3PL/2009/0684/O	Oak House	The Street	Blo' Norton	1	1
3PL/2005/1845/O	61 Hale Road	Bradenham		1	1
3PL/2005/0170/O	Carbrooke Equine Centre	Cowslip Lodge	Drury Lane	1	1
3PL/2004/0571/O	20 Newall Avenue	Maid Marion Way	Carbrooke	1	1
3PL/2009/0990/D	Neighbourhood Centre	Blenheim Grange	Carbrooke	8	8
3PL/2007/1420/F	Allcrest	The Street	Caston	4	4
3PL/2010/0108/F	The Red Lion Pub	Attleborough Road	Caston	2	1
3PL/2007/1709/F	Hall Farm	Caston Road	Caston	3	3
3PL/2008/1055/F	Barn at Woodland Farm	Rayners Falgate	Caston	1	1
3PL/2005/0202/O	Site at Grid reference TF771032	Shingham	Cockley Cley	1	1
3PL/2007/1687/F	Manor Farm	Oxwick	Colkirk	1	1
3PL/2008/1072/O	The Rectory	Market Hill	Colkirk	2	2
3PL/2008/0311/F	Land adj to The Crown Inn	Crown Road	Colkirk	1	1
3PL/2011/0747/F	Plot 2 Market Hill	Colkirk		1	1
3PL/2010/0228/F	Plot at rear of Ty-Cae	The Street	Croxton	1	1
3PL/2007/0663/O	Didlington Hall Gardens		Didlington	1	1
3PL/2006/1771/F	Rear of 15 Norwich Street		Dereham	1	1
3PL/2008/1382/F	Water Tower	Cemetery Road	Dereham	2	2

3PI/2009/0829/O	45 Quebec Road	Dereham		1	1
3PL/2011/1274/F	Sheldrick Place	Dereham		1	1
3PL/2007/1783/F	Rear of 1-5 Clifton Terrace	Dereham		9	9
3PL/2008/0318/F	West Lodge	Quebec Road	Dereham	4	4
3PL/2007/0670/F	Rear of Glendower House	Commercial Road	Dereham	1	1
3PL/2006/1713/F	Rear of 17 Norwich Road		Dereham	1	1
3PL/2007/1895/F	Rookery Farm	Elsing Lane	Dereham	3	3
3PL/2007/0158/O	Punchards	236 Norwich Road	Dereham	1	1
3PL/2008/0852/O	38 Stone Road	Toftwood	Dereham	1	1
3PL/2009/0390/F	Plot adjacent 153 Shipdham Road	Toftwood	Dereham	1	0
3PL/2011/0636/F	Amberley	Littlefields	Dereham	2	2
3PL/2007/1777/F	48 Norwich Street	Dereham		2	2
3PL/2011/0177/O	Land adj Peartree Cottage	Neatherd Moor	Dereham	4	4
3PL/2004/1311/O	17 Norwich Road	Dereham		1	1
3PL/2004/0130/O	Land off Westfield Road	Toftwood	Dereham	1	1
3PL/2006/0223/O	2 Stanton Close	Dereham		1	1
3PL/2011/0330/F	Land to the rear of Edovale	Kings Park	Dereham	4	4
3PL/2010/0791/F	42 Theatre Street	Dereham	Norfolk	1	1
3PL/2006/0966/O	Pound Cottage	Cemetary Road	Dereham	2	1
3PL/2010/0907/O	Lyndon	Littlefields	Dereham	2	1
3PL/2011/1142/F	The Baynings	The Street	East Tuddenham	5	5
3PL/2007/0547/O	The Natterjack P H	Chapel Road	Foxley	4	0
3PL/2006/1847/O	Cherry Tree Cottage	Chapel Road	Foxley	1	1
3PL/2008/0498/D	The Fransham Motor Company	Main A47	Fransham	4	4
3PL/2010/0830/D	Plot adj The Manor	Main Road	Fransham	1	1
3PL/2007/1328/F	Church Farm	Station Road	Fransham	1	1
3PL/2008/1060/F	The Hall House	Manor Road	Garboldisham	1	0
3PL/2009/0001/O	Common Farm	Smallworth Common	Garboldisham	2	2
3PL/2008/1679/F	Hill House	Dereham Road	Garvestone	4	2
3PL/2008/0288/O	Greenfields	Mattishall Road	Garvestone	1	1
3PL/2007/0570/O	Hill House	Dereham Road	Gravestone	4	4
3PL/2008/1506/O	Greenfields	Mattishall Road	Garvestone	1	1
3PL/2010/0670/F	Land adj Lingwell House	The Lings	Reymerston	1	1
3PL/2010/0950/O	Street Farm	Dereham Road	Garvestone	1	1
3PL/2010/0188/F	Cart Shed Barn	Gateley Hall	Gateley	1	1
3PL/2009/0616/F	Church Farm	The Street	Gooderstone	4	2
3PL/2006/0960/O	Mill House	The Street	Gooderstone	1	1
3PL/2005/0642/O	Vine Cottage	The Street	Great Cressingham	1	1
3PL/2006/1698/O	2 Watton Road		Great Cressingham	1	1
3PL/2010/0710/O	Vine Cottage	The Street	Great Cressingham	1	1
3PL/2011/0652/F	Rookery Farm	Beeston Road	Great Dunham	1	1
3PL/2011/0539/F	Riceland	2 Litcham Road	Great Dunham	2	2
3PL/2008/0826/F	Land adjacent to The Cottage	Castle Acre Road	Great Dunham	1	1

3PL/2010/0996/F	Keswick	Castleacre Road	Great Dunham	1	1
3PL/2008/1549/D	Echo Farm	Palgrave Road	Great Dunham	1	1
3PL/2005/1655/F	Long Street	Great Ellingham		4	3
3PL/2008/1415/O	68 Long Street	Great Ellingham		1	1
3PL/2009/0353/F	Ellister	Swamp Lane	Great Ellingham	1	1
3PL/2011/0704/D	Timberhill Lodge	41 Church Street	Great Ellingham	1	1
3PL2010/0555/F	21 Long Street	Great Ellingham		2	2
3PL/2007/0408/O	Residential Development	Bittering Street	Gressenhall	4	2
3PL/2007/1484/F	Watton Road	Griston		3	3
3PL/2011/1404/F	The Bluff	Church Road	Griston	1	1
3PL/2005/0072/O	Land adjacent The Hollies	Church Road	Griston	1	
3PL/2008/0804/D	1 Carbrooke Road		Griston	1	1
3PL/2008/0508/O	The Hollies	Church Road	Griston	4	4
3PL/2007/1558/O	Manor House	Church Road	Griston	1	1
3PL/2009/0917/F	The Hollies	Church Road	Griston	1	1
3PL2011/0857/F	Manor Road	Griston		3	3
3PL/2011/0491/F	Brownes Farm	Dereham Road	Hardingham	1	0
3PL/2007/1243/F	Land adjoining East Harling Post Office	Market Street	Harling	1	1
3PL/2008/1289/O	Exton House	White Hart Street	Harling	1	1
3PL/2008/0683/F	Lime Kiln House	Harling		1	1
3PL/2011/0291/F	Plot to the front of Somerleyton House	White Hart Street	Harling	1	1
3PL/2007/1449/O	Mattishall Road	Hockering		3	0
3PL/2004/1746/O	The Willows	Chapel Lane	Hockering	1	1
3PL/2007/1739/F	Land adjacent to 46 Manor Close	Hockering		1	1
3PL/2009/0838/O	Hockering Nursery	Dereham Road	Hockering	1	1
3PL/2008/0525/F	Adjacent Manor Farm	Hockham		1	1
3PL/2005/1014/F	Unicorn Garage	Harling Road		3	3
3PL/2010/0418/O	Church Farm	Church Road	Holme Hale	3	2
3PL/2010/0863/O	12 Station Road	Holme Hale		1	1
3PL/2008/1236/F	Bluebell Cottage	Cook Road	Holme Hale	2	2
3PL/2008/0273/O	Building plot at Bilmar	Station Road	Holme Hale	1	1
3PL/2005/0206/O	Bilmar	Station Road	Holme Hale	1	1
3PL/2009/0428/F	Ivy Farm	Thumb Lane	Horningtoft	1	1
3PL/2004/0981/O	4 West Park Farm Close			1	1
3PL/2009/0549/F	Grange Farm	East Church Street	Kenninghall	4	4
3PL/2004/1367/F	Former Egg Packing Station	Garboldisham Road	Kenninghall	8	0
3PL/2004/1406/F	The Stables/squash court	Kilverstone Hall	Kilverstone	1	1
3PL/2006/0311/CU	Crow Hall Farm Barns	Lexham		2	2
3PL/2005/1333/O	Off Manor Drive to rear of Cedarville	Front Street		1	1
3PL/2008/0292/O	4 Necton Road	Little Dunham		1	1
3PL/2004/1711/F	Manor Farm			2	2
3PL/2011/0676/O	Plot 2 adjacent to Chesnut	Necton Road	Little Dunham	1	1

	House				
3PL/2006/1052/O	Adjacent Walton House	Wending Road	Longham	1	1
3PL/2005/1901/O	Manor Cottage	Wending Road	Longham	1	1
3PL/2008/1049/O	Priory View	Rectory Road	Lyng	1	1
3PL/2011/0820/F	Summerfield	Elsing Road	Lyng	1	1
3PL/2011/0586/F	Malverne	The Common	Lyng	2	2
3PL/2011/0647/F	Holme Farm Barn	Old Hall Road	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2007/2008/F	Rayners Farm Barn	Dereham Road	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2010/1344/F	Land adj Burgh End	Burgh Lane	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2010/0435/D	105 Dereham Road	Mattishall		2	2
3PL/2011/0573/F	Burgh Farm	Norwich Road	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2011/0894/F	Plot 3	Land adjacent 6 South Green	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2007/1306/O	105 Dereham Road	Mattishall		2	2
3PL/2007/1114/O	Rear of Holbrook House	75 Dereham Road	Mattishall	1	1
3PL/2006/0329/O	8 South Green	MATTISHALL		1	1
3PL/2011/0752/D	Earlsmead	The Street	Mileham	3	3
3PL/2011/0935/O	Garden plot adjacent High Trees	The Street	Mileham	1	1
3PL/2011/0192/O	60-62 Malsters Close	Mundford		2	2
3PL/2008/1056/F	Land adj Barton Hay	St Leonards Street	Mundford	1	1
3PL/2009/0102/O	17 Adeane Meadows	off The Lammas	Mundford	1	0
3PL/2010/0478/F	The Mill	Main Road	Narborough	1	1
3PL/2005/0007/O	Clairmarlyn	Dennys Walk		1	1
3PL/2005/1685/O	Land at 29 Hale Road	Necton		1	1
3PL/2007/1617/O	Adjacent to 21 Ketts Hill	Necton		1	1
3PL/2009/0548/D	Site adjacent 18 Mill Street	Necton		3	3
3PL/2011/0910/D	18 Mill Street	Necton		1	1
3PL/2008/0418/O	Oakleigh	Station Road	North Elmham	5	5
3PL/2011/1425/F	Meadow Farm Barn	39 The Street	North Lopham	1	1
3PL/2005/0313/F	Barn at Ferndale House	Harling Road	North Lopham	1	1
3PL/2007/1121/O	Site adj. Hill House	Hillside	North Pickenham	1	1
3PL/2008/0028/O	1 Latimer Way	North Pickenham		1	1
3PL/2008/1653/F	Wysteria Barn	Church Farm, Low Road East	North Tuddenham	1	1
3PL/2011/1035/F	Land adjacent 12 Hargham Road	Old Buckenham		1	1
3PL/2004/1067/F	High House Farm	Fen Street	Old Buckenham	1	1
3PL/2008/1352/O	1, 2 & 3 Hill Cottages	Dereham Road	Ovington	3	0
3PL/2011/0640/F	Riddlesworth Hall	Hall Lane	Riddlesworth	1	1
3PL/2011/0411/F	Barn at Holly Farm	Fen Street	Rocklands	1	1
3PL/2008/1137/O	17 The Street	Rocklands		1	1
3PL/2008/1527/F	Toad Hall	Rocklands		1	0
3PL/2011/1123/F	Spring Meadows	Bell Road	Rocklands	1	0
3PL/2007/0177/D	Barkers Farm	Larling	Roudham/Larling	1	1
3PL/2011/0557/O	The Cottage	Ploughboy Lane	Saham Toney	1	1

3PL/2008/0749/F	Land adj The Hobbit	Cley Lane	Saham Toney	1	1
3PL/2006/1201/O	Goffes School House	Pound Hill	Saham Toney	1	1
3PL/2011/0468/F	Cherry Tree Cottage	Coburge Lane, Hills Road	Saham Toney	1	1
3PL/2005/1478/O	Adj 151 Hills Road	Saham Hills		1	1
3PL/2010/1328/O	Bowers	Richmond Road	Saham Toney	2	2
3PL/2008/0512/O	Land adjacent Werf House	Ovington Road	Saham Toney	1	1
3PL/2009/0197/O	Riversdale	Dereham Road	Scarning	8	7
3PL/2008/0124/F	Site to rear of 1 Dereham Road	Scarning		3	3
3PL/2008/1179/F	Brookside Farm	Chapel Lane	Scarning	1	1
3PL/2009/0798/F	Scarning Dale	Dale Road	Scarning	1	1
3PL/2007/1572/O	23 Park Lane	Scarning		1	1
3PL/2007/0554/F	Fir Acre	Fen Road	Scarning	1	1
3PL/2005/0077/O	S & G Motor Engineers	Chapel Lane	Scarning	1	1
3PL/2006/1177/F	The Homestead	Dereham Road	Scarning	1	1
3PL/2011/0006/F	Barn 4 Tollgate Farm	Norwich Road	Scoulton	1	1
3PL/2008/0686/O	79 Pound Green Lane	Shipdham		1	1
3PL/2008/0111/O	3 Fen Folgate	Shipdham		1	1
3PL/2008/1153/O	Land adj Park Grange	High Street	Shipdham	1	1
3PL/2010/1358/F	Land adj 58 Parklands Avenue	Shipdham		1	1
3PL/2003/0433/F	Old Chapel Site	Chapel Street		1	1
3PL/2007/1779/O	The Hedgerows	11 Letton Road	Shipdham	1	1
3PL/2007/1553/F	New Road	Shipdham		1	1
3PL/2005/1831/O	9 Watton Rd	Shropham		1	1
3PL/2011/0600/D	Land adjacent 14 Watton Road	Shropham		1	1
3PL/2009/0961/O	Bradcar Road	Shropham		1	1
3PL/2006/1483/O	Plot 1 Church Farm	Well Lane	Sparham	1	1
3PL/2010/1233/F	Plot 1	Church Farm	Well Lane Sparham	1	1
3PL/2007/1680/F	Anakainoo	11 The Street	Sporle	1	1
3PL/2009/1048/F	Buildings opposite	Wolferton House	Sprole	1	0
3PL/2011/0989/D	The Street	Sporle		9	9
3PL/2007/1303/O	Hill Farm	The Street	Sporle	8	8
3PL/2007/2032/F	Ebony House	21 The Street	Sporle	3	3
3PL/2009/0856/F	South View	Stanfield		1	1
3PL/2004/1886/O	Land at River Cottage	Lower Stow Bedon	Stow Bedon	1	1
3PL/2011/1205/D	8 Hickling Close	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2006/0251/O	8 Oaks Drive	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2010/1314/F	Swaynsnest Farm	Bayfied Way	Wattton Road	3	3
3PL/2012/0022/F	40 Station Street	Swaffham		2	1
3PL/2011/0785/O	75 The Oaklands	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2008/1376/F	100 London Street	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2004/0906/O	Part of garden	of 63 Mill Farm Nurseries		1	1
3PL/2004/1955/O	10 Watton Road			1	1
3PL/2011/0644/F	Chiff Chaff	19 Lynn Road	Swaffham	2	1

3PL/2010/1087/O	Land off New Sporle Road	Swaffham		4	4
3PL/2010/1082/F	3-8 Plowright Place	Swaffham		4	4
3PL/2011/1340/F	25a Market Place	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2008/0401/F	Chiffchaff	19 Lynn Road	Swaffham	3	3
3PL/2007/1300/F	Land to rear of Greyhound Pub	Swaffham		4	4
3PL/2005/1623/O	Land between 44 & 46 Sandringham Way	Swaffham		2	2
3PL/2005/1304/O	45 Watton Road	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2010/0806/O	48 Station Street	Swaffham		2	2
3PL/2011/0825/O	11 New Sporle Road	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2011/0622/F	Site Adjacent 1 Mill lane	Swaffham		1	1
3PL/2011/1377/F	7 Whitsands Road	Swaffham		4	4
3PL/2007/0594/O	Land adjacent to	1 Spinners Lane	Swaffham	1	1
3PL/2007/0234/F	Land adj. 2 Queens Street	Whitsands Road	Swaffham	2	2
3PL/2006/1454/O	Land adjoining The Octagon House	Town Street	Swanton Morley	1	1
3PL/2007/1043/O	The Elms	Woodgate	Swanton Morley	3	3
3PL/2011/0638/F	12 & 14 St Giles Lane	Thetford		1	1
3PL/2003/1825/F	Broom Covert	Kilverstone Park	Thetford	2	2
3PL/2007/1971/F	Plat adjacent 22 Melford Bridge Road	Thetford		1	1
3PL/2008/0756/F	3 Norwich Road	Thetford		1	1
3PL/2010/0655/F	12 Station Road	Thetford		3	3
3PL/2009/1154/F	23 Old Market Street	Thetford		3	3
3PL/2006/0186/O	89 Norwich Road	Thetford		4	4
3PL/2007/1765/O	Garage Court at the end of	Bracken Road	Thetford	2	2
3PL/2009/0803/F	21 Highlands	Thetford		1	1
3PL/2012/0048/F	11 Airey Houses	Tottington Road	Thompson	1	1
3PL/2008/1697/F	Tottington Road	Thompson		3	1
3PL/2008/1542/F	Manor Farm	Fakenham Road	Tittleshall	4	4
3PL/2005/0679/O	35 Thetford Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2011/1232/F	The Old Stable	Norwich Road	Watton	1	1
3PL/2012/0040/F	The Bull Hotel	High Street	Watton	2	2
3PL/2008/1622/O	10 Monkams Drive	Watton		8	8
3PL/2004/0699/O	88 Norwich Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2005/0211/O	34 Akrotiri Square	Watton		1	1
3PL/2008/1621/O	Westbury	51 Thetford Road	Watton	5	5
3PL/2011/1127/F	63 Jubilee Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2009/0579/F	67 Norwich Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2007/1846/F	99 Dereham Road	Watton		8	6
3PL/2011/1165/F	10 Griston Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2008/1503/O	1 West Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2007/0227/O	Swaffham Road		Watton	2	2
3PL/2011/0356/D	2 West Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2007/0902/O	31 Merton Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2010/0122/F	Loch Farm	Loch Lane	Watton	1	0

3PL2011/1427/F	Station Way	Norwich Road	Watton	1	1
3PL/2005/0611/O	9 East Road	Watton		1	1
3PL/2011/1390/D	10 Monkams Drive	Watton		8	7
3PL/2011/1067/F	128/130 Dereham Road	Watton		2	2
3PL/2008/1561/F	Grooms Cottage	Rougham End	Weasenham All Saints	3	3
3PL/2005/1621/O	West of Rectory Lane	Weeting		3	3
3PL/2008/0578/O	Land adj Fengate Lodge	Shadwell Close	Weeting	1	1
3PL/2009/0409/F	3 Fengate Drove	Weeting		1	0
3PL/2003/1669/O	Moat Farm	Shop Street		2	1
3PL/2006/0303/O	Clovelly	Dereham Road	Whinburgh	2	1
3PL/2008/0999/F	Hamrow Farm	Whissonsett		1	1
3PL/2007/0697/O	Land adjoining Top Driftway	Illington	Wretham	1	1
3PL/2011/0849/F	Old Barn	Illington Road	Wretham	1	1
3PL/2009/0650/O	Land to the rear of The Fieldings	Station Road	Yaxham	3	1
3PL/2004/0627/O	Brake Farm	Brakefield Green		1	1
3PL/2009/0751/F	Land of Station Road	Yaxham		1	1
3PL/2011/1379/F	Plot B	Station Road	Yaxham	1	1
3PL/2011/0404/F	Land off Station Road	Yaxham		1	1
3PL/2010/0261/F	Land off Fieldings Drive	Station Road	Yaxham	4	4
3PL/2004/1806/O	The Fieldings	Station Road	Yaxham	4	3
3PL/2009/0669/F	Hill House	Mattishall Road	Clint Green	2	2
3PL/2010/0072/D	Land at Hill Farm	Well Hill	Yaxham	1	1

Appendix 4: Land Allocations

Site Reference	Number of Units Allocated	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017
D1	180	0	0	30	30	30
D2*	220	0	0	50	50	40
D3	200	0	12	42	36	34
SW1	250	0	0	50	50	50
W1	100	0	12	33	33	0
W2	72	0	5	33	34	0
W3	25	0	0	12	13	0
W4	17	0	0	7	10	0
NAR1	50	0	10	15	25	0
SH1	85	0	10	25	50	0
SM1	50	0	10	15	25	0
Thetford SUE	5000	0	0	387	387	386

*Site D2 is included within the sites with planning permission

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 July 2012

SCHEDULE OF DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

REFERENCE AND DETAILS OF APPLICATIONS	MEETING FIRST REPORTED TO	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION	REASON FOR DEFERMENT
3PL/2008/0874/F: Thetford: Brunel Way: Construction of industrial units	11/08/2008	Approval	For resolution of various outstanding matters
3PL/2011/0967/F : Guist : Land at Bridge Road	03/10/2011	Refusal	To allow Officers more time for further planning discussions to take place on the planning issues

Item No.	Applicant	Parish	Reference No.
1	Ecotricity (Next Generation) L	BRADENHAM	3PL/2011/0854/F
2	David Alston (Norfolk) Ltd	OLD BUCKENHAM	3PL/2012/0193/F
3	Millngate Swaffham Ltd	SWAFFHAM	3PL/2012/0269/F
4	Taylor Wimpey East Anglia	CARBROOKE	3PL/2012/0406/F
5	Richard Johnston Ltd	QUIDENHAM	3PL/2012/0476/O
6	Richard Johnston Ltd	QUIDENHAM	3PL/2012/0477/F
7	Breckland Council	SWAFFHAM	3PL/2012/0557/O
8	Mr & Mrs R Wragg	YAXHAM	3PL/2012/0577/F

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	1	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2011/0854/F	CASE OFFICER: James Stone
LOCATION:	BRADENHAM Land at Wood Farm Church Lane	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: Out Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: No Allocation CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd Unicorn House Russell Street	
AGENT:	Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd Unicorn House Russell Street	
PROPOSAL:	Erect 2 100m wind turbines, access tracks, crane pad areas, electricity sub-station & temp construction compound	

KEY ISSUES

Provision of renewable energy
Landscape character and visual impact
Local and residential amenity (including noise and shadow flicker)
Protected species
Ministry of Defence (MOD) Radar
Aviation safety

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two wind turbines, each with a maximum tip height of 100m. The scheme also includes access tracks, crane pad areas, an electricity sub-station and temporary construction compound. The proposed turbines are Enercon 2.3MW, three bladed turbines. They are variable speed, direct drive turbines mounted on a steel tower with a clockwise blade rotation. The final specification of the turbine to be used is not yet confirmed due to continual improvements to wind turbine design. However, all assessments are based on the specifications of the Enercon E70 turbine.

SITE AND LOCATION

The two turbines would be situated within an agricultural field in the countryside. The southernmost turbine would be the nearest to a Settlement Boundary, being located 1200m north of the northern boundary of the Shipdham Settlement Boundary and its Conservation Area. Furthermore, the site is located on the boundary of Landscape Character Types 10 (Plateau Farmland) and 11 (Settled Tributary Farmland) as defined in the 2003 Wind Turbine Development Landscape Assessment, Evaluation and Guidance report. A line of pylons runs east to west to the north of Daffy Green.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

EIA REQUIRED

Yes

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Planning permission was refused on 17 December 2002 under ref: 3PL/2002/0004/F for the erection of two turbines (reduced from three). The grounds of refusal at Committee related to impact on the landscape and the implications of the traffic which would be generated by the development. The application was dismissed at appeal in September 2003 on the grounds of potential noise problems. The Inspector concluded that whilst the development would have an effect on the living and working conditions of people nearby, those effects would generally fall within acceptable limits apart from the noise produced from the turbines. "The information I have seen on this matter is not to my mind sufficient to illustrate that the resultant noise climate would not give rise to disturbance to local, nearby residents". The Inspector completed her report by stating that "Overall I conclude that the proposal would be in accord with the objectives of the development plan, regional and national policy except in relation to the impact the development would be likely to have on peoples living conditions through noise disturbance. This matter is in my view sufficient to justify refusal of the proposal".

On 4 January 2005 planning permission was refused under ref: 3PL/2004/0313/F for the erection of two E-66 wind turbines with a hub height of 65m and a 70m rotor diameter (The 2002 turbines would have been approximately 20m taller than those in the 2004 submission). Committee refused the application on the grounds that there was currently a significant element of uncertainty about the likely impact of the proposed turbines on civil aircraft safety. However, the resulting appeal in June 2006 was allowed and the Inspector stated that "I have reached the same conclusion as did my colleague, save on the question of noise where I have had the benefit of much fuller information and the up to date guidance of PPS22 and its Companion Guide. In my view, the scheme meets the aims of the relevant development plan policies. Moreover, it is consistent with the Government's energy policies in that it would secure worthwhile savings in terms of carbon dioxide emissions". The appeal decision was, however, quashed at the High Court through Judicial Review with the appeal referred back to the Planning Inspectorate; the Inspector's ultimate conclusions after yet a further Public Inquiry being that, in the light of new evidence in respect of noise, the appeal be dismissed.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.11	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
CP.12	Energy
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.15	Renewable Energy

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

DC.16	Design
DC.17	Historic Environment
DC.19	Parking Provision

CONSULTATIONS

BRADENHAM P C -

Bradenham Parish Council objects.

Our specific objections relate to noise, impact on wildlife, unreasonably close proximity to neighbouring houses causing unacceptable visual dominance and shadow flicker, impact on the Norfolk Cycle Route, and the fact that the proposed development is contrary to Breckland's guidance for wind turbine development in this landscape area.

In view of these detailed objections we would strongly urge the Council to refuse this planning application.

SHIPDHAM P C -

The parish council have the following comments :

This application is not fundamentally different from the previous application which was rejected. It should therefore be rejected.

It does not satisfactorily address the concerns about health and wellbeing of those living in the vicinity, therefore should be rejected.

The developer appears to be unable to decide technical details eg noise levels until the turbines have been put into operation (rather too late). The application should therefore be rejected.

These applications have been received for many years, with no material difference, and each application has caused dissent within the village. The Parish Council believe that accepting this application would harm the community.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

No objections subject to conditions

ENGLISH HERITAGE

The proposal will result in change to the setting of a number of highly graded heritage assets. However, the degree of harm will not be substantial and it might be possible to conclude that this harm would be outweighed by the public benefit of mitigating the effects of climate change.

If minded to approve this application, we would wish to see a condition requiring the removal of the turbines at the end of their operational life, or when they become redundant, whichever is the sooner.

NATURAL ENGLAND

No objection subject to conditions

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

No objections subject to conditions relating to lighting, notification of start date, height of construction equipment, latitude and longitude of each turbine

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY

No objections

NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES

No safeguarding objection to this proposal.

NORWICH AIRPORT (SAFEGUARDING)

No objections subject to conditions relating to requirement for a scheme to address airport safeguarding including mitigation, notice of commencement, details of cranes and their positions

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

No objection subject to conditions to ensure satisfactory highway improvement works.

CPRE NORFOLK

Objects to the application.

The application site lies close to the existing concentration for on-shore wind farms that are operational at North Pickenham, Swaffham Ecotech Centre and Swaffham II; the cumulative impact is already apparent in this area. In addition we draw attention to the fact that the first four off-shore turbines at Sheringham Shoal are now operational, and all 88 will be operational next spring (and are already all too clearly visible from the north Norfolk shoreline at a range of 10-13 miles away). This company is now planning for a wind farm of up to 1,667 turbines of the north east coast. There are also proposals for 333 turbines some 28 miles north of Wells-next-the-Sea, and 140 are being built off the coast of Suffolk.

CPRE Norfolk concludes that the visual effects of the turbines proposed will be both significant and detrimental to the landscape of Shipdham and the surrounding countryside, near and far. The environmental benefits of the scheme, which are small and variable, and insignificant in comparison with the off-shore developments, are greatly outweighed by the damage it would cause.

R S P B

No objection

GREAT ELLINGHAM P C

Object on the basis that similar applications have been previously refused. Concerns about the closeness of the turbines to neighbouring properties and the amount of noise they will create.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

No objections subject to conditions

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

Based on the information submitted, the Council's retained Acoustic Consultant advises that there is no robust or sustainable reason to refuse planning permission on noise grounds. Conditions are proposed in relation to noise limits which are more stringent than those within the Environmental Statement. In respect of Amplitude Modulation, there is a small risk of noise annoyance but it is difficult to predict if it would occur and to what extent. No reasonable condition can be imposed.

Appeal Inspectors on recent planning appeals have suggested using statutory nuisance legislation to address AM if it occurs.

NORFOLK LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

No objection subject to a condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

The Environmental Statement prepared for Ecotricity does not raise any overriding issues in the field of Biodiversity that would argue against the proposal. This is borne out by the responses from Natural England and RSPB which expressed no objection.

The construction access is based on existing agricultural tracks and should not impact on ponds or watercourses in the locality. The issue of bats is more controversial; however, no potential roosts would be affected and there are no known roosts nearby whose flight paths would be at risk from the turbine blades. The survey results recorded low level use of the area and that not at the height of the blades - risks may therefore be classed minimal.

As far as landscape goes, the statement itself points out that any argument for or against large wind turbines can be countered by the opposite point of view. My opinion is not carried by any evidence presented on the planning file and it is noteworthy that the proposed location of the turbines is not significantly different from previous proposals examined in the planning process and subjected to Inspector's scrutiny at appeal when landscape issues were not found to be justification for refusal.

Any consent should be accompanied by conditions requiring the preparation, approval and execution of a detailed Biodiversity Enhancement Plan for the application site as proposed in section 8.8.3 of the Environmental Statement and a programme of monitoring of possible effects on wintering birds, breeding birds and bats as proposed in section 8.8.4 of the statement.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS CONSULTANT

I can confirm that I support the comment offered by English Heritage.

SHIPDHAM AERO CLUB

Objection - proximity to Shipdham Airfield and obvious danger to Air Traffic

DIRECTORATE OF AIRSPACE POLICY - No Comments Received

BEESTON P C - No Comments Received

CARBROOKE P C - No Comments Received

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

MUNDFORD P C - No Comments Received

SCARNING P C - No Comments Received

NATIONAL AND WEST MIDLANDS CASEWORK TEAM - No Comments Received

REPRESENTATIONS

In response to consultation on the application, local comments from the community include the following:-

Objections

- Visual impact - obstruct view of other properties/is an eyesore (visual)
- Noise levels adverse effect on landscape quality
- Birds will be killed
- Sleep disruption, especially for those with medical conditions exacerbated by lack of sleep
- Government recommends 1 mile away from residential(Members bill going through with increase to 1.5 miles). Proposal is less.
- Penetrating low-frequency noise pollution day and night
- Costly method of carbon dioxide reduction
- Increase risk of RTA's as they are a distraction
- Previous applications have been rejected and not much/nothing has changed
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring property
- Impact on the wildlife (including bats) in neighbouring Manor Farm and elsewhere
- Shadow flicker impacts on people and livestock
- Noise impact inside dwellings
- Persecution as already won numerous public enquiries/high court challenges
- Noise restrictions in conditions of 3PL/2006/0470/D should also apply to turbine application
- Not cost-effective and has a low electricity production
- Annoyance during construction
- Radar interference
- Altered behaviour in farm animals
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Inadequate background data and EIA
- Safety of aircraft operating from Shipdham Airfield e.g. wind turbines obstruct natural landing corridor for commercial flights in distress
- MOD have objected as have local airfield
- No economic benefit to Shipdham
- Health risks to vulnerable/elderly people, e.g. Shipdham Manor care home, with risk to mental health
- Impact on tranquility

Support

- Suitable as noise mitigation methods in place
- Clean energy

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to Planning Committee as it is a major application.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

Renewable Energy

* The NNPF is supportive of renewable energy as illustrated by para.97 which states that local planning authorities should 'have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources'. Furthermore, para.98 of the NNPF explains that local planning authorities should 'not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy'. This paragraph also states that applications for renewable energy should be approved 'if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable.'

* At a local level Policy DC 15 Renewable Energy of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy states that "Proposals for renewable energy development, will be supported in principle" and Policy CP12 supports the provision of renewable and low carbon technologies.

* Reference has been made in representations to a document from 2005 entitled Wind Energy Development - A Statement of Breckland Council Policy. However, this is not part of the Development Plan and therefore carries limited weight in the determination of this application.

Landscape Character and Visual Impact

* The site is located on the boundary of Landscape Character Types 10 (Plateau Farmland) and 11 (Settled Tributary Farmland) as defined in the 2003 Wind Turbine Development Landscape Assessment, Evaluation and Guidance Report prepared for Breckland Council and Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.

* Plateau Farmland:- A small group of turbines (being defined as 2 to 12 in the report) is recorded as having a 'Low' impact on all key characteristics of this type of landscape apart from 'Landmarks and Visible Built Structures' and 'Remoteness and Tranquillity' where such a development is considered to have a 'Moderate' impact. With regard to Landmarks and Built Structures, the report states that a small group could potentially provide a point of focus however more than one turbine could appear dominant and out of balance with the general absence of other 'grouped' vertical structures. With reference to Remoteness and Tranquillity, the report states that a small group may be appropriate if linked to the busy areas of the landscape such as the main transport corridors. However, it would be less suited to the more peaceful parts of the landscape type.

* Settled Tributary Farmland:- A small group of turbines is defined as having a 'Low' impact on all key characteristics of this landscape type apart from 'Landform and Topography', 'Land Cover Pattern', 'Skyline' and 'Landmarks and Visible Built Structures' where it is deemed to have a 'Moderate' impact.

* With reference to 'Landform and Topography' the assessment explains that the undulating landform is likely to result in turbines occurring at varied heights which could lead to visual confusion - although this would not be as apparent as with larger groups.

* The section on 'Land Cover Pattern' explains that the hedgerow network and the presence of shelterbelts provide lines or edges in the landscape to which a small group could relate. However the patterning is not as consistent or distinct as other areas. As such, visual connections to these lines are less likely to be apparent.

* With regard to 'Skyline' the report claims that it is tiered with varying heights of tree canopies suggesting that various heights of turbines (over undulating ground) could relate to this pattern. However there is scope for it to make the skyline more confusing.

* Finally, the section on 'Landmarks and Visible Built Structures' claims there are few focal or landmark features within the landscape and those present are individual features such as the village churches. As such there are no obvious 'grouped' features to which a small scale development could relate.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

* The two turbines proposed would be located to the south and south west of those sought in 2002 and 2004. In terms of the distance between the turbines and the nearest joint Settlement Boundary and Conservation Area boundary, the proposed turbines are set at 1200m and 1440m respectively with the previously refused turbines being distanced at 1620m and 1520m respectively.

* With regard to their relationship to the man-made structures to the north, notably the pylons and their east-west run of cables, it is accepted that in this instance there will be some greater separation when compared to the previous applications. The current northerly and southerly turbines would be situated approximately 150m and 350m, respectively, further from the pylons (and associated cables) than the previous turbines would have been.

* Notwithstanding this modest increased distance, the visual relationship would not be significantly different. In addition, no previous Inspector concluded that landscape impact was a reason to dismiss the appeals. Furthermore, as highlighted above, this is supported by information contained in the Landscape Assessment , Evaluation and Guidance Report as there are not deemed to be any key characteristics that are highly sensitive to the proposed turbines. They do not impact on valued features or designated landscape, to include AONB's or National Parks. They do not impact significantly on any high grade heritage assets within the locality, as evidenced by English Heritage's lack of objection relating to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, subject to the ultimate removal of the turbines.

* Whilst the turbines would result in significant change to the landscape it is not considered that the change would be so harmful as to warrant refusal on the grounds of impact on landscape character or visual amenity.

Local and Residential Amenity

A. Noise

* The Council's retained Acoustic Consultant concludes that, fundamentally, the noise assessment in the Environmental Statement has been carried out in a generally competent manner and the noise levels from the proposed wind turbine development will comply with published standards and guidance.

* Despite these overall conclusions, it should be noted that there will most certainly be some type of noise impact on the residents and the surrounding environment. However, it is very difficult to precisely quantify this level of impact due to the level of uncertainty based upon varying environmental conditions and the subjective element that applies to any potential noise issues. It is precisely this evaluation of uncertainty around the potential noise impact of the development that has been at the heart of previous planning appeal rulings.

* Conditions are proposed which incorporate noise limits that are more stringent than those proposed in the Environmental Statement, in line with relevant guidance contained in ETSU-R-97. The issue of Amplitude Modulation (AM) has been researched and the consultant has confirmed that there is a small risk of noise annoyance from AM occurring. However this is very difficult to predict if it would occur at Shipdham and to what extent. In this respect, there is no reasonable condition that can be imposed. The Consultant has reviewed a number of recent planning appeal decisions which address the problem and acknowledge the risk of AM occurring. However, planning inspectors have not refused permission based upon it. The planning inspectors involved have suggested using statutory nuisance legislation to address AM if it occurs.

* The Council's Environmental Health Officer has therefore concluded, having taken extensive advice from a leading independent acoustic expert on the matter, and taking account of the noise conditions that can lawfully be imposed on any planning permission, that there are no noise grounds to justify a recommendation to refuse this application. Noise disturbance, despite some uncertainties, is therefore, not considered to be an acceptable reason for refusal.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

B. Shadow Flicker

* The submitted shadow flicker assessment concluded that one residential property could be affected by shadow flicker. However, the applicants have stated that if incidences of shadow flicker occur, the mitigation scheme proposed will be implemented and that such mitigation has been demonstrated to be effective at a number of UK wind turbine sites. The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a condition to address this issue.

Protected Species/Biodiversity

* It is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to any European Protected Species on or in close proximity to the site and would enhance biodiversity in the locality. There are no internationally statutory designated sites within the application site or within 5km of the developable area. There are three SSSIs within 5km of the site and seven County Wildlife Sites within 4km of the site. An extended Phase 1 habitat survey was carried out in 2005 and updated in 2010 and found that the hedgerows within the site are mainly species poor whilst there were no Great Crested Newts in the thirteen ponds on site. Furthermore, it was concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the badger setts along the western boundary of the site.

* Natural England has stated that the application will not have an impact on any statutory or non-statutory designated sites in the vicinity and from the information provided, it is unlikely that the application will adversely affect any protected species. Natural England also explained that the methodology used to survey the site for bats and birds was satisfactory but that it would also have been useful to carry out automated surveys at turbine locations. It should also be noted that the RSPB has not objected to the scheme.

* The proposal will include the establishment and management of species-rich grassland and field margins to improve biodiversity in the locality.

* The Tree and Countryside Consultant raises no objection subject to conditions.

Cultural Heritage

The proposal will result in change to the setting of a number of highly graded heritage assets in the vicinity of the site and, in some instances, that change will result in a degree of harm. However, English Heritage has explained that the degree of harm will not be substantial and that it might be possible to conclude that this harm would be outweighed by the public benefit of mitigating the effects of climate change.

* Norfolk Landscape Archaeology reiterate the stance taken by English Heritage and feel that although the proposal will impact on below ground deposits these can be dealt with by a condition.

Aviation

* Norwich International Airport has explained that whilst the proposed development has certain elements that continue to concern them they do not feel that the proposal warrants a recommendation for refusal provided the grant of planning permission includes the requirement to comply with the airport's recommended conditions. Furthermore, NERL Safeguarding (NATS) have concluded that although the proposed development is likely to impact on their electronic infrastructure they have no objection to the proposal.

* Following a re-assessment of the application, the MOD has withdrawn its objection to the proposal. In the interests of air safety, the MOD requests that the turbines are fitted with aviation lighting.

* Shipdham Aero Club has objected to the proposal on the grounds of danger to air traffic. However, air safety is not considered to be an obstacle to this proposal because both the National Air Traffic Service and the Civil Aviation Authority have not objected to the scheme. It should be noted that the first appeal (ref: APP/F2605/A/03/1109816) regarding proposed turbines

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

on the field in question made reference to Shipdham airfield. The inspector explained that the airfield lies to the east of the village whereas the field in question lies to the west. Aircraft from the airfield do not overfly the village and the extended base leg is in a generally westerly direction some way to the north of the turbine site. Whilst the glider approach is to the west of the airfield it is generally to the east of the village and again some distance from the appeal site. The Inspector accepted that it is conceivable that there could be potential conflict with pilots in distress but felt that the possibility of this occurring was extremely remote. The Inspector did not consider that an objection on these grounds was sufficient to justify a refusal. Furthermore, the Inspector stated that in reaching this conclusion they have taken into account that from time to time the airfield may be used for distress and diversion purposes.

Flood risk

* The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which means that there is a 1 in 1000 chance of flooding on an annual basis. The site overlies a principal aquifer (Chalk), which is highly permeable with soils of high leaching potential. Principal aquifers are geological strata that exhibit high permeability and provide a high level of water storage. They support water supply and river base flow on a strategic scale.

* Having reviewed the information as submitted, the Environment Agency has no objection to the proposed development.

Access

* The applicants have stated that the proposed use of the site is not a traffic generating use but that there will be increased levels of traffic around the construction phase. Whilst NCC Highways have no objection to the proposal they disagree with the applicants' claim that no temporary highway improvements are required and have, therefore, asked for conditions to ensure adequate highway improvements.

Conclusion

* The proposal seeks permission for the generation of renewable energy and so is supported in principle by policies in the Development Plan. It is considered that there would be no unacceptable impacts on the local area with regard to cultural heritage, landscape, visual amenity, aviation safety/radar and protected species. Furthermore, it is felt that the issues of noise and shadow flicker relating to local and residential amenity have been adequately addressed by the applicant, subject to appropriate conditions being imposed.

* The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3920** Limited to 25 years
- 3920** Environment Agency conditions
- 3920** Natural England conditions
- Biodiversity/wildlife

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

- 3920**
- 3920** MOD conditions
- 3920** Norwich Airport conditions
- 3920** Contaminated Land conditions
- 3920** NLA condition
- 3920** Highway conditions
- 3920** Ceasing of operations
- 3920** External lighting
- 3920** Noise - compliance measurements
- 3920** Noise -disturbance
- 3920** Noise - assessment of rating level of noise
- 3920** Noise - measurement locations
- 3920** Wire/cabling/services
- 3920** Soil removal
- 3920** Ancillary buildings materials
- 3920** Shadow flicker
- 3920** Electromagnetic interference
- 3920** Hours of operation
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	2	RECOMMENDATION : REFUSAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0193/F	CASE OFFICER: Chris Raine
LOCATION:	OLD BUCKENHAM Land at Shrublands Attleborough Road	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: Out Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: No Allocation CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	David Alston (Norfolk) Ltd C/o Agent	
AGENT:	EJW Planning Ltd Lincoln Barn Norwich Road	
PROPOSAL:	Remove steel grain store, demo. of 4 bungalows, convert agric. barns to 8 residential units & erect 10 dwellings	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Conversion of buildings
Replacement dwellings
New build dwellings
Affordable housing
Highway related matters

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks full planning permission for the following:

- demolition of 4 existing bungalows and an existing large commercial/agricultural building;
- the erection of 10 new dwellings (including 4 replacement dwellings)
- conversion of buildings to 8 new dwellings

The entire scheme provides the following mix of properties:

4 x 5 bed dwellings; 2 x 4 bed dwellings; 5 x 3 bed dwellings; 2 x 2/3 bed dwellings; 4 x 2 bed dwellings and a 1 bed dwelling.

The site is accessed at two points from the adjacent Attleborough Road.

The application would also facilitate the removal of an existing grain store from the site.

SITE AND LOCATION

The site is a large parcel of land located within the countryside between Attleborough and New Buckenham and is located adjacent to the western side of Attleborough Road which provides access to the site. The south-eastern part of the site consists of two pairs of semi-detached

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

single storey dwellings; in the eastern part of the site, immediately adjacent to the Attleborough Road carriageway, is a collection of redundant traditional agricultural buildings; in the northern part of the site is a further group of traditional farm buildings and the western part contains a large modern agricultural building. With regard to adjacent land uses there is an existing detached two storey dwelling with extensive curtilage to the north.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2011/0440/F - Demolition of mid 20C bungalows, conversion of barns to 8 dwellings and erection of 15 dwellings - Refused.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

CP.01	Housing
CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.11	Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape
CP.14	Sustainable Rural Communities
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.03	Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside
DC.04	Affordable Housing Principles
DC.11	Open Space
DC.14	Energy Efficiency
DC.16	Design
DC.17	Historic Environment
DC.20	Conversion of buildings in the countryside

CONSULTATIONS

OLD BUCKENHAM P C -

Outside the settlement boundary, no access to key local services, over reliance on private cars, also no adequate access to public transport.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

Object unless attenuation pond is re-positioned or flood plain compensation is provided.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused on grounds of failure to provide off site facilities to link with local services, inadequate access to public transport provision; unsustainable location

HISTORIC BUILDINGS CONSULTANT

No comment.

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

There is a need to provide further investigation work in relation to protected species on-site (bats) and the results should be reported to the Council.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection subject to conditions.

HOUSING ENABLING OFFICER

Following discussions with the applicant, a commuted sum equivalent to the 40% of the dwellings has been agreed. Due to the location of the application site the Strategic Housing Team believe that it is not well located to services etc. for affordable housing on-site and believe there are sites closer to services that would better serve the housing needs of the village. A commuted sum in this specific case would assist in providing an equivalent number of affordable units in a more sustainable location.

STREETSCENE

The access roads look extremely tight, although dimensions appear not to have been given. The access roads look tight and winding and I have doubts a refuse vehicle can easily and safely navigate them. Moreover, it will be likely that the refuse vehicle could stray slightly off the track and damage the grass, as this will be a private unadopted road (I think) we will be liable for any repairs. Additionally, although turning circles have been provided for at the end of the roads, these look insufficient to be able to turn an 18 tonne vehicle around. It is also likely that residents and visitors would use the turning circles as additional parking areas. I would need wider roads than those indicated, and larger turning areas, with the turning areas marked off as no parking zones. Failure to do so may result in the refuse vehicle being unable to adequately access the sites and subsequently refusing to drive up there. This would mean residents would be told to bring their bins to the roadside, which would not be received well.

ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON/CRIME - No Comments Received

NORFOLK LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY - No Comments Received

NORFOLK WILDLIFE TRUST - No Comments Received

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL STRATEGY - No Comments Received

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections have been received, a summary of which is as follows:

Outside of the Settlement Boundary; traffic on the adjacent carriageway is fast flowing; no access to public transport; set a precedent for others within the locality; existing residents will be evicted and the barns are not capable of conversion.

Attleborough Community Team reiterates concerns regarding piecemeal development before the adopted of the ASHAAP

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as it is a major application.

Principle of Development

* The scheme consists of three distinct elements, namely the conversion of former agricultural buildings, "replacement" dwellings for those scheduled to be demolished and new additional dwellings in the countryside.

Conversion of Buildings

* The principle of converting agricultural buildings is acceptable in planning terms in accordance with the NPPF and Policy DC20 of the Breckland Core Strategy.

* Criterion A of DC20 requires the assessment of the proposal in relation to the impact upon the character and appearance of the rural landscape and requires it to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the locality. In this instance it is considered that the conversions are sufficiently sympathetic to the traditional nature and appearance of the buildings. The Historic Buildings Consultant agrees with this conclusion.

* Criterion B requires residential conversions to have reasonable access to local key services and facilities. In this instance the site is a significant distance from local services and facilities. However, Policy DC17 of the Adopted Core Strategy allows for the conversion of buildings in locations where they would not normally be considered acceptable if the buildings exhibit particular historic or architectural merits. In this instance the group of buildings are an attractive collection, some of which occupy prominent public views and they are recognised by Norfolk Landscape Archaeology as a priority in the regional research framework for archaeology as a disappearing building type. On the basis of these factors it is considered appropriate to forego the sustainability concerns relating to the conversion of the buildings and, as such, not raise a concern in relation to Criterion B.

* Criterion C requires developments to have appropriate access to the highway network and for that local highway network to be capable of dealing with the demands of the development proposed. It is considered that the conversion would comply with this requirement.

* Criterion D requires the building/s scheduled for residential conversion to be substantially intact and capable of conversion without significant extension or re-building. In this instance, it is evident, as demonstrated in the application, that the buildings are capable of conversion and do not require significant extensions.

* With regard to ecology, previously conducted protected species surveys have concluded the likely presence of bats and as such an inspection is required. The agent has agreed to undertake a visual inspection as requested by the Tree and Countryside Consultant and the results of this will be reported verbally.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

* On the basis of the above assessment, and assuming that the protected species surveys do not result in any negative findings, the conversion element of the proposal is acceptable in planning terms.

Replacement Dwellings

* The "replacement" dwellings are also consistent with planning policy including Policy DC3 of the Breckland Core Strategy.

* They are considered to be proportionate to the dwellings which are to be replaced; the existing dwellings are occupied (no case for abandonment); appropriately located on the basis of the existing plots and there is no net increase in the number of properties. Their design and appearance relates satisfactorily to those proposed adjacent buildings and the wider rural landscape.

* On this basis it could be argued that the four dwellings marked as T3a - d would be acceptable on the basis of this policy.

New Build Dwellings

* In relation to the new build dwellings, given that the site is outside of the Settlement Boundary for Old Buckenham, there is a general presumption against new residential development unless there are special circumstances eg agricultural worker's dwelling, in accordance with Policies SS1 and DC2 of the Breckland Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

* Notwithstanding this, it is evident that the District does not benefit from having a 5 year supply of housing land and the NPPF makes provision, in principle, for Local Planning Authorities to positively consider sites that are not within defined Settlement Boundaries. The NPPF also highlights a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Clearly this must be balanced against other planning issues eg protection of the countryside, good design etc.

* In this instance the agent acknowledges that the site is outside of any Settlement Boundary, however it is suggested that there is a need to consider this against the following:

- Enabling development for the conversion of the former agricultural buildings;
- Presumption in favour of sustainable development from the NPPF;
- Significant shortfall of housing within the district;
- It is deliverable;
- Removal of a large modern agricultural building from the landscape;
- High quality design helps contribute to sustainable nature of the proposal.

* In assessing the proposal against the three roles set out in the NPPF it is considered that whilst the proposal would meet acknowledged housing need, it does not provide accessibility to local services and therefore cannot satisfy the social role. The closest available facilities are in Old Buckenham, approximately 1.7km away and Attleborough town centre, approximately 2.8km away. In addition there are inadequate pedestrian links to both of these settlements which means that there would be an over-reliance on the private car.

* Whilst the proposal would make some contribution to the local economy, the NPPF stresses that development must be in the right locations. Given the isolated nature of the site away from local services it is not considered that the proposal fulfils the economic role as set out in the NPPF.

* In terms of the environmental role, the conversion works would secure the long term future of a traditional group of outbuildings. This must be weighed against the isolated nature of the site which would lead to over-reliance on the private car which in turn cannot be considered to achieve the desire to use natural resources prudently.

* In balancing the proposal against these 3 roles, it is considered that the scheme cannot be considered to be sustainable.

* In relation to enabling development, it is evident that the buildings have some historic and

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

architectural merit and occupy a relatively prominent location within the countryside, however this needs to be weighed against the aforementioned concerns relating to sustainability. Furthermore, despite a request to the agent, no details have been provided to highlight that the level of expenditure associated with the conversion works outweigh the resulting values of the resulting residential units and how exactly the new build elements of the scheme relate to any potential shortfall. On balance, it is considered that the scheme is not an acceptable enabling development.

* The fact that the scheme can be delivered quickly and the scheme would result in the removal of a large modern building from the rural landscape is acknowledged but do not outweigh the above concerns.

* On balance, the new build part of the scheme is considered to be unacceptable in planning terms.

Affordable Housing

* The application requires an affordable housing contribution in accordance with Policy DC4 and the Housing Team is satisfied that the proposed commuted sum is acceptable. This would be secured through a legal agreement, which would also include a recreation contribution as required by Policy DC11 of the Breckland Core Strategy, which the applicant is also agreeable to.

Highway Related Matters

* There has been significant concern expressed with regard to the highway safety implications of the scheme. The Highway Authority has objected on the grounds of the development failing to provide sufficient off-site facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities to link with existing local services; the proposal does not have adequate access to public transport provision and the site is in an unsustainable location. However, there is no objection on technical grounds eg visibility etc.

Other Issues

* Policy DC14 of the Adopted Core Strategy requires developments of this size to provide at least 10% of the energy they require from on-site and/or decentralised renewable sources. It is considered appropriate to use a planning condition to secure such a provision.

* The Environment Agency has requested that the attenuation pond be repositioned or flood plain compensation be provided. The agent has agreed that it can be repositioned.

* The Streetscene Team has expressed reservations at the ability for refuse collection vehicles to enter the site due to the limited width of the proposed roadway within the site and the lack of sufficient turning provision which may lead to future residents being asked to take their bins to the site access. The agent has been made aware of this potential issue for future residents and they are happy to accept this.

Conclusion

* In conclusion, the proposal as submitted, by virtue of the additional units, represents an unacceptable development in planning terms and is, therefore, recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

Refusal of Planning Permission

REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

- 9900** Conversion/replacements acceptable
- 9900** Six additional dwellings unsustainable

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	3	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0269/F	CASE OFFICER: James Stone
LOCATION:	SWAFFHAM Castle Acre Road/Brocks Road	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: In Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: General Employ Area CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Millngate Swaffham Ltd & Tesco Stores Limited c/o Agent	
AGENT:	Chase & Partners 20 Regent Street St James	
PROPOSAL:	Demolish buildings & Erect new supermarket (A1) landscaping, servicing, parking & highway improvements/new access	

KEY ISSUES

Sequential test
Town centre impact
General Employment Zone
Design/character of area
Residential amenity
Highway safety and parking
Natural environment

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a new food supermarket. The total gross external area of the building will be 3,417 sq m of which the net sales area will be 1,970 sq m. The sales area can be broken down into 1,550 sq m for convenience goods and 420 sq m for comparison goods. The proposal also includes associated parking, servicing and landscaping and highways improvements to provide a new access. It should be noted that the original scheme has been slightly amended, due to Norfolk County Council Highway Authority comments, resulting in improved access arrangements.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site is a 1.187 ha. parcel of brownfield land to the north of Swaffham at the junction of Brocks Road and Castle Acre Road, which is one of the main routes through Swaffham. The site is approximately 330m away from the primary shopping area boundary of Swaffham and is within the Swaffham Settlement Boundary. Finally, the site, which is vacant, is within the Eco-Tech General Employment Area and currently comprises a derelict building that was constructed within the Eco-Tech Business and Innovation Park as a series of workshop units.

DC131_new

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

EIA REQUIRED

A screening opinion was provided prior to the submission of this application and it was determined that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

No relevant site history

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

SS1	Spatial Strategy
CP.07	Town Centres
CP.10	Natural Environment
CP.13	Accessibility
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.06	General Employment Areas
DC.09	Proposals for Town Centre Uses
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.14	Energy Efficiency
DC.16	Design
DC.19	Parking Provision

CONSULTATIONS

SWAFFHAM TOWN COUNCIL -

The Town Council is supportive of the application subject to agreement of an appropriate Section 106 agreement dealing with public transport improvements and town centre vitality issues. It was also thought to be paramount to improve walking and cycling routes to and from the town centre. A Section 278 agreement should be obtained for a pedestrian crossing or pedestrian refuge across the A1065 to the new Abel Homes Development.

A great deal of thought has gone into the design of the new store, with many similarities to the Tesco Store at Ramsey in Cambridgeshire. Notwithstanding this, the Town Council share concern raised by objectors regarding Town Centre vitality. All possible means must be used therefore through the Section 106 agreement to address and compensate this, so that Swaffham continues to thrive.

The Town Council have made a separate representation in respect of the legal agreement details direct to Millingate Swaffham Ltd and to Breckland Council.

In conclusion the Town Council have no objections to the Planning Application, they are supportive subject to the appropriate Section 106 being agreed to protect and enhance the Town

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

of Swaffham.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

We have no objection to the proposed development subject to planning conditions.

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

No objection

CRIME PREVENTION/ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON OFFICER

I do not wish to formally object to the proposals at this time. However, there are opportunities to design out crime and/or the Fear of Crime and, to promote Community Safety.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

It is concluded that the proposed store is in a sustainable location and has no adverse implications for the surrounding highway network subject to suitable conditions, informatives and a s106 agreement. Therefore, there are no highway objections to the application.

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER

The Arboricultural, Landscaping and Ecological Reports are noted and accepted and these should form part of the permitted plans for the development.

While the Ecological study did not demonstrate the existence of specially protected species it should be noted that Policy CP10 requires measures for the enhancement of biodiversity on the proposal site. Building on the ecological study and the landscaping plan a scheme for the positive encouragement of biodiversity on the post-development site should be conditioned to any consent.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

Based on the information provided to me at this time, I recommend approval providing the development proceeds in line with the application details and subject to conditions to alleviate environmental concerns.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

The Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed the Desk Study dated February 2012 Ref P9632/G200/D and agrees with the proposals for a site investigation. It has also been noted that the adjacent land to the north and west was associated with a firework factory and records indicate there was also a backfilled pit approx 183m to the west of the proposed development site.

ASSET MANAGEMENT - No Comments Received

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

REPRESENTATIONS

There have been many letters of representation both in favour of the development and objecting to it.

Letters of support have referred to job opportunities; improved choice of products; increased number of shoppers to Swaffham; removal of need to travel to other towns and so a reduction in car journeys; free parking; improvement to the visual amenity of the area.

Letters of objection have referred to the detrimental impact on retail offer in the town centre; traffic; reliance on cars and so environmental harm; lack of need for a new supermarket; provision of poor jobs; people won't walk to the town centre; if Breckland Council charge for parking the town will be at a disadvantage because Tesco provide free parking.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to Planning Committee as it is a Major application.

Policy

* The NPPF at paragraphs 24 and 26 requires out-of-town retail development proposals such as this to be assessed against two key policy tests: i) whether there are any suitable and sequentially preferable alternative sites (within or closer to the town centre); and ii) whether significant adverse effects on town centre vitality and viability or planned investment are likely to occur. Where a proposal fails to satisfy any of these tests, permission should be refused.

* Core Strategy Policy CP7 seeks to restrict retail development outside town centres unless there is a need for development, there are no sequentially preferable sites and no negative impact on town centre viability and vitality. This policy pre-dates the NPPF and previous national policy set out in PPS4.

* The applicant has provided an assessment of the proposal against policy requirements, addressing in some detail the sequential and retail tests. To provide an impartial view on these issues the Council has commissioned its own consultants, NLP, to assess the information provided. NLP have also undertaken its own assessment of the likely retail impact of the development proposal.

Sequential Test

* Following discussions, one town centre site has been identified as being potentially sequentially preferable to the application site, namely land off Lynn Street encompassing the Post Office depot and former Sixth Form and adjacent plots. Based on the information available, it has been concluded that the majority of this land is not available for development. Due to the size and configuration of the site, and taking account of heritage matters, the remaining potentially available land is not considered to be suitable for a comparable retail development, even applying flexibility to store format. Accordingly, it is considered that there are no sequentially preferable sites and the requirements of policy in this respect have been met.

Retail Impact

* Careful consideration has been given to the likely retail impact of the proposed store on the surrounding area, with particular reference to effects on Swaffham town centre. Based on advice from the Council's consultants, NLP, it is estimated that the direct impact of the proposal on spending in the town centre would be: -15.6% for convenience shopping, -5% for comparison shopping, and -11.7% overall.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

* For convenience shopping, trade diversion from the town centre would be focussed mainly on three stores: Asda, Co-op and Iceland. Of these stores, Asda appears to be most at risk, although there is currently no evidence to suggest that any of the stores would be likely to be forced to close. Some store closures could result for smaller convenience outlets, but widespread closures are not anticipated. The greatest direct impact is forecast for the Waitrose supermarket, but this store is afforded no protection under planning policy due to its out-of-town location.

* For comparison shopping facilities, it is considered that the relatively small anticipated negative impacts would be offset by forecast population and expenditure growth.

* Consideration has also been given to the likely indirect effects of the proposal on the town centre due to changes in patterns of linked trips. This requires judgements to be made about the extent to which shoppers using the Tesco store would link trips with shops in Swaffham when compared to shoppers using town centre supermarkets, bearing in mind the overall number of trips and the potential of the new store to retain shopping trips that would otherwise occur outside the town. NLP's view on this matter is that, overall, the loss of linked trips associated with town centre supermarkets would be balanced by new trips linked to the Tesco store. In coming to this conclusion account has been taken of likely shopping patterns and the relatively direct access available from the Tesco store to the town centre. The applicant's offer to contribute towards the improvement of pedestrian links to the town centre and to make store car parking available to shoppers using the town centre could also assist in this respect.

* Overall, having had regard to the retail statement from the applicant and the independent assessment from NLP, it is considered that whilst the proposed Tesco store would inevitably have some negative impacts on the town centre, the adverse effects would not be significant. Therefore, it is judged that widespread closures are not likely to occur, despite some existing town centre food stores potentially operating below company averages. Any negative impacts on the town centre would also need to be balanced against the potential benefits in terms of stemming expenditure outflow from the town and increased competition and customer choice, although these latter benefits would be diminished should Asda or Waitrose cease trading. On the basis of the information available, it is considered that the requirements of the retail impact test have been met.

General Employment Zone

* The proposal will result in the loss of land zoned as General Employment Land contrary to Cre Strategy Policy DC6. However, it is not considered that an objection to the application could be substantiated on this basis given that the site has remained vacant for several years and that ample provision for new employment land has been made through recent land allocations. It is anticipated that 100 jobs will result from this development, with 50 of them being full time. It is not considered that the proposal would prejudice the development of remaining sites at the Ecotech Business Park for employment purposes.

Design/Character of the Area

* The site is currently a disused brownfield site that is visually unattractive and detracts from the visual amenity of the area. The proposal would result in the demolition of an existing, unattractive building and the erection of a much more aesthetically sensitive supermarket. The scheme will also include some landscaping but it should be noted that this is minimal due to the size constraints of the site.

Residential Amenity

* The proposed store would not be located directly adjacent to any residential properties but there are dwellings to the east of the site, on the opposite side of Castle Acre Road. There has been no objection from the Council's Environmental Health team providing conditions are attached to

DC131_new

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

any decision. These conditions include restricting loading and unloading times and times when power tools, vehicles or machinery shall be used on the site.

* Furthermore, a planning condition will ensure that adequate security is provided at the site including the provision of CCTV and car park lighting.

Highway Safety/Parking

* The proposal involves alterations to the junction of Castle Acre Road with Brocks Road by substituting the existing simple priority junction with a ghost island right turn facility, and for new accesses to Brocks Road for customers and service vehicles. The junction alterations have been the subject of a satisfactory safety audit. The speed limit is to be altered by extending the 30mph limit to the north of Brocks Road as part of this scheme and a footway is to be provided on the eastern side of Castle Acre Road, extending from Admiral Wilson Way to terminate at Tower Meadow.

* The site is accessible by non-car modes and whilst it is adequately served by public transport, the Highways Authority feel that there is a need for bus stops to be provided by the store. The bus stops will be the subject of a Section 106 agreement.

* The application is supported by a Transport Assessment, the scope of which was agreed with the Highway Authority. The document provides a robust assessment of the impact of the proposal and demonstrates that, in the event of approval, the traffic generated by the site can be adequately accommodated on the surrounding highway network.

* The store will be provided with acceptable levels of customer parking, which will include the provision of plug-in power points for electric cars.

* The Highway Authority has concluded that the proposed store is in a sustainable location and has no adverse implications for the surrounding highway network. Therefore, there are no highway objections to the application. It should also be noted that the Highways Agency has no objection to the application.

* A draft Section 106 agreement has been provided by the applicant and will provide a financial contribution towards an improved bus service. The financial contribution will also include other community enhancement measures. Details of the agreed areas for funding will be reported verbally at Committee.

Natural Environment

* The Tree and Countryside Consultant is satisfied with the content of the arboricultural, landscaping and ecological reports. While the ecological study did not demonstrate the existence of specially protected species it should be noted that Policy CP10 requires measures for the enhancement of biodiversity on the proposal site. Building on the ecological study and the landscaping plan, a scheme for the positive encouragement of biodiversity on the post-development site will be conditioned to any consent.

Conclusion

* The proposed supermarket would not be overly detrimental to the vitality and viability of the town centre. It should also be noted that the applicant has demonstrated that there are no other suitable sites in, or closer, to the town centre. Finally, the scheme would not be harmful to the residential amenity of the locality whilst the applicant would provide adequate financial support to enhance public transport.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3048** In accordance with submitted AMENDMENTS
- 3920** Contam Land Remediation
- 3920** Contam Land Verification Report
- 3920** Contam Land Unsuspected contam
- 3920** No infiltration of surf water drainage
- 3920** Piling not permitted
- 3920** Surface water drainage scheme
- 3920** Details of fume extraction systems
- 3920** Full details generators compressors etc
- 3920** No power tools in certain hours
- 3920** No burning waste
- 3920** Method details to lessen dust/noise
- 3920** Loading/unloading
- 3949** Contaminated Land - Site Investigation/Remediation
- 3946** Contaminated Land - Unexpected Contamination
- 3941** Renewable Energy
- 3920** Scheme to provide security
- 3740** Highways: vehicular access
- 3740** Highways: visibility splays
- 3740** Highways: laid out parking etc
- 3740** Highways: on site parking provision
- 3740** Highways: provision of wear and tear
- 3740** Highways: comply with Plan
- 3740** Highways: wheel cleaning provision
- 3740** Highways: all vehicles to use wheel cleaning
- 3740** Highways: scheme of off-site improv works
- 3740** Highways: complete off-site improv works
- 3740** Highways: extend 30 mph zone
- 3740** Highways: submit overarching travel plan
- 3740** Highways: no occupy until plan approved
- 3920** Biodiversity scheme
- 3920** Net retail sales area not exceed 1,970 sqm
- 3994** S106 note bus improvements
- 3994** Highways Note INF1
- 3994** Highways Note INF6
- 3923** Contaminated Land - Informative (Extensions)
- 3994** Env Agency Informatives
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	4	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0406/F	CASE OFFICER: Chris Raine
LOCATION:	CARBROOKE Beaufort Park RAF Watton Phase 2	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: In Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: Sites with PP 4 HSG CONS AREA: N TPO: Y LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Taylor Wimpey East Anglia Tartan House Etna Road	
AGENT:	Taylor Wimpey East Anglia Tartan House Etna Road	
PROPOSAL:	Re-plan and substitution of revised house types to plots 19 - 29	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Visual impact
Neighbour amenity

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks planning permission to revise part of a consented housing estate (plots 19 to 25). The application proposes the reconfiguration of the layout of the plots to increase the consented number of dwellings from 7 to 11 and in turn this will require alternative house types to be used. The 11 units consist of 2 x 2 bedroom units and 9 x 3 bedroom units.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site forms part of a larger consented housing estate which has been developed in part. The site lies adjacent residential dwellings with an area of public open space to the south.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

3PL/2009/0118/D - Residential Development with associated access, car parking and open space
- Approved.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

DC.01 Protection of Amenity
DC.16 Design

CONSULTATIONS

WATTON TOWN CLERK - No Comments Received

CARBROOKE P C -
No comments received

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

No objection.

NATURAL ENGLAND

No objection.

CRIME PREVENTION/ARCHITECTURAL LIAISON OFFICER

No objection.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

No objection subject to a condition.

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

No objection.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection.

STREETSCENE - No Comments Received

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

REPRESENTATIONS

Objections have been received, a summary of the points raised are as follows:

Increase in properties and parking will impact upon flood risk; property will now be amongst smaller properties which will devalue existing properties; concern that they could be sold to Housing Associations; disruption from vehicle movements to residents on Stirling Road.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as it is a major application.

Principle of Development

* The site benefits from planning permission for residential development and amending the agreed scheme is entirely acceptable in planning terms.

Visual impact

* It is considered that the revised layout and increased density still retains sufficient space in and around the dwellings so as to relate satisfactorily with those existing dwellings in the vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed house types in terms of their design, external materials and size are entirely consistent with the wider estate despite being smaller than those previously agreed.

Neighbour amenity

* The revised layout still provides for sufficient separation distances to neighbouring properties so as to safeguard light and outlook. Furthermore, these separation distances, coupled with the positioning of openings within the proposed dwellings, are sufficient to safeguard privacy levels.

Other issues

* The Highway Authority, the Contaminated Land Team, Natural England and the Tree and Countryside Officer all have no objections to the scheme.

* Concern has been raised by third parties as to the devaluation of property by having smaller dwellings adjacent. This does not represent an acceptable planning reason for resisting planning permission.

* Concern has also been raised as to the possible sale of these properties to Housing Associations. It is not possible for the Local Planning Authority to restrict who the properties should be sold to as part of a planning approval.

Conclusion

* The scheme is considered to acceptably relate to its surroundings and satisfactorily safeguard neighbour amenity and is, therefore, recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3106** External materials and samples to be approved
- 3920** Boundary treatment

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

- 3920** Site investigation
- 3920** Parking/turning laid out and retained
- 3949** Contaminated Land - Site Investigation/Remediation
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions
- 4000** Variation of approved plans

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	5	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0476/O	CASE OFFICER: Chris Raine
LOCATION:	QUIDENHAM & Snetterton Richard Johnston Ltd Harling Road	APPN TYPE: Outline POLICY: Out Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: No Allocation CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Richard Johnston Ltd Harling Road Snetterton	
AGENT:	Plandescil Ltd Connaught Road Attleborough	
PROPOSAL:	Proposed extension to industrial development (Mixed Use)	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Highway safety
Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved for an extension to an existing industrial estate in Snetterton. The application proposes the creation of 5,650m² of both B1c light industrial and B2 general industrial and 16,600m² of B8 storage and distribution. The land would be accessed through the existing industrial site to the south-east. An indicative layout has been provided.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site consists of a roughly square shaped parcel of agricultural land which lies immediately to the south-east of the A11 dual carriageway with an existing commercial/industrial site to the south-west and south-east. To the north-east is further agricultural land.

EIA REQUIRED

No

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

No relevant site history

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

SS1	Spatial Strategy
DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.07	Employment Development Outside of General Employment Area
DC.14	Energy Efficiency
DC.17	Historic Environment
DC.19	Parking Provision

CONSULTATIONS

SNETTERTON P C - No Comments Received

QUIDENHAM P C -

No objections to either of these.

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

No objection subject to a condition.

HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE

No objection.

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS

To be reported verbally

PRINCIPAL PLANNER MINERAL & WASTE POLICY

Object unless:

1. the applicant carries out investigations to identify whether the resource is viable for mineral extraction, and
2. if the mineral resource is viable, the applicant considers whether it could be extracted economically prior to development taking place.
3. If the resource could be extracted economically prior to development taking place, then this must be carried out in order that the mineral resource underlying the site is not needlessly sterilised.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection subject to conditions.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

No objection.

NORFOLK LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

A heritage statement has not been submitted with the application to address the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment. We therefore ask that the applicant submit the results of an archaeological evaluation prior to the determination of the planning application in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (2012), para. 128.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY - No Comments Received

NATIONAL GRID - No Comments Received

REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as it is a major application.

Principle of Development

* The land forms part of the countryside and has no specific designation, but lies immediately adjacent to a large commercial site which is classified as a General Employment Area within the Local Planning Authority's Core Strategy. Policy DC7 does not necessarily support new employment uses outside of General Employment Areas unless particular criteria are met eg no other suitable sites are available; expansion of an existing business. This scheme does not comply with any of the defined criteria. However, this needs to be balanced against the aims of the NPPF which seeks for the planning system to support sustainable economic growth and the Core Strategy's aim to see significant employment growth along the A11 corridor at the Snetterton Heath Employment Area (Policy SS1). Given its excellent links to road and rail and the increase in commercial premises in this area, including the emerging motorsport and performance engineering sectors, it is considered that the proposal represents a sustainable proposal and, as such, would not compromise the strategic aims for employment in the District.

Highway Safety

* Given the site's close proximity to the A11, the Highways Agency has been consulted. They have confirmed that they have no objection subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a Transport Statement. Norfolk County Council, as local Highway Authority has also been consulted. At the time of writing their comments have not been received and as such their response will be reported verbally.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

Amenity

* The site is considered to be sufficiently distanced from "noise sensitive" sites eg residential properties so as to ensure that no significant nuisance would be caused. The Environmental Health Team has confirmed that it has no objection in principle. They have suggested that given the use is proposed for 24 hour working that the position and orientation of the buildings needs to be carefully considered. It is appropriate to control this at the reserved matters stage.

Other issues

* Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (NLA) has requested that a Heritage Statement be submitted prior to the determination of the application.

* Whilst acknowledging this request, NLA confirm that no artefacts have previously been found in the site despite a number of artefacts having been found within the locality, albeit they suggest this could be due to a lack of previous investigations. With this in mind it is considered appropriate to recommend a planning condition in relation to the undertaking of archaeological investigations rather than undertaking survey work at this time.

* Norfolk County Council Minerals Team has been consulted and they have confirmed that the site is identified as a mineral resource (sand and gravel) on the Minerals Resource Map and consequently they object unless the applicant can identify that the extraction of this resource is unviable. The applicant has been requested to assess the viability of extraction on this site and their findings will be reported verbally.

* The Contaminated Land Officer has no objection subject to the imposition of conditions.

Conclusion

* In conclusion, subject to there being no objection from Norfolk County Council as local Highway Authority and the resolution of the issues associated with mineral extraction, the scheme is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and is, therefore, recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Outline Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3005** Outline Time Limit (3 years)
- 3058** Standard Outline Condition
- 3060** Standard outline landscaping condition
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3920** Transport Statement
- 3949** Contaminated Land - Site Investigation/Remediation
- 3946** Contaminated Land - Unexpected Contamination
- 3923** Contaminated Land - Informative (Extensions)
- 3920** 10% energy requirement
- 3920** Floor areas
- 3740** Any highway conditions
- 3920** Any Archaeology Conditions
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	6	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0477/F	CASE OFFICER: Chris Raine
LOCATION:	QUIDENHAM & Snetterton Richard Johnston Ltd Harling Road	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: Out Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: General Employ Area CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Richard Johnston Ltd Harling Road Snetterton	
AGENT:	Plandescil Ltd Connaught Road Attleborough	
PROPOSAL:	Erection of 2 warehouse buildings (Units 15 & 16)	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Visual impact
Highway safety
Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two warehouse buildings (B8 use) on commercial land in Snetterton. The buildings have pitched roofs and would be constructed using a steel frame construction with external cladding. The site is accessed via an existing private road which adjoins the Harling Road to the south-west.

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site consists of a parcel of vacant land within an allocated employment area. There are existing commercial buildings adjacent and planning permissions for further buildings to be added to the site. The site is accessed via the existing private roadway which adjoins the public carriageway (Harling Road) to the south-west.

EIA REQUIRED

No

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

A number of planning permissions have been granted in the recent past for industrial premises.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.06	General Employment Areas
DC.14	Energy Efficiency
DC.16	Design

CONSULTATIONS

SNETTERTON P C -

No objections

QUIDENHAM P C -

No objections.

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

No objection subject to a planning condition.

PRINCIPAL PLANNER MINERAL & WASTE POLICY

No objection.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

No objection.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY - No Comments Received

HEALTH & SAFETY EXECUTIVE - No Comments Received

NATIONAL GRID - No Comments Received

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS - No Comments Received

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

REPRESENTATIONS

None.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as it is a major application.

Principle of Development

* The application site forms part of an allocated "General Employment Area" in accordance with Policy DC6 of the Core Strategy and, as such, the principle of new B8 buildings on the site is acceptable in principle.

Visual Impact

* The simple pitched roof design and external cladding is entirely consistent with those adjacent buildings. Furthermore, the overall size of the buildings is consistent with those in the vicinity. On this basis the buildings are entirely consistent with the locality and have no unacceptable visual impact.

Highway Safety

* The Highways Agency has confirmed the need for a planning condition requiring the submission and agreement of a Transport Statement.

Neighbour Amenity

* The buildings are a significant distance from any local residential units or other sensitive uses. The Environmental Health Team has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal. With this in mind it is considered that there will be no significant harm to the amenities of residents within the locality.

Other Issues

* The Contaminated Land Team and the Norfolk County Council Minerals Team have confirmed that they have no objections.

Conclusion

* The proposal is consistent with Policy DC6 of the Core Strategy in providing additional business premises on a General Employment Area and it would not cause any localised harm. As such, the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3920** Transport statement
- 3920** Materials as quoted
- 3920** Surface water drainage
- 3920** On-site parking and turning

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

- 3920** 10% energy requirement
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	7	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0557/O	CASE OFFICER: Jayne Owen
LOCATION:	SWAFFHAM Sandringham Way Land between 44 & 46	APPN TYPE: Outline POLICY: In Settlemnt Bndry ALLOCATION: No Allocation CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Breckland Council Elizabeth House Walpole Loke	
AGENT:	Daniel Connal Partnership The Glasshouse Kings Lane	
PROPOSAL:	Provision of a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings	

KEY ISSUES

Principle
Design, layout and siting
Landscaping
Amenity
Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The proposal seeks outline planning permission including access, appearance, landscaping and layout to construct a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings on land owned by Breckland Council at Sandringham Way in the town of Swaffham. Shared access is proposed from Sandringham Way. Parking for two vehicles for each dwelling is provided to the front of the site. Proposed materials are bricks and clay pantiles to match existing dwellings on Sandringham Way.

Proposed landscaping includes removal of an existing scrub hawthorn hedge to the east of the site. A bin storage area is provided for each dwelling. Level access and door openings would be compliant with Part M of the Buildings Regulations. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, an Arboricultural Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Study and Ecological Assessment.

The application is a resubmission of a previously approved scheme which was approved by the Planning Committee on the 31st October 2011 under planning reference 3PL/2011/0958/O. The site area has been slightly reduced as it has transpired that Breckland Council do not own the whole of the site previously indicated.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

SITE AND LOCATION

The application site comprises land within the Settlement Boundary of the town of Swaffham. The site is currently laid to grass and is located between 44 and 46 Sandringham Way, Swaffham. The site is enclosed by close-boarded fencing to the west and east with established trees to the south and south-east of the site. There is a bungalow to the west with adjacent flat roofed car port addition and the garden areas of a bungalow and two storey dwellings lie to the east of the site.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3PL/2011/0958/O - Provision of pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings to area of vacant land between 44 and 46 Sandringham Way - Approved 1st November 2011

3PL/2005/1623/O - Erection of two dwellings - Approved 21st November 2005

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.02	Principles of New Housing
DC.11	Open Space
DC.12	Trees and Landscape
DC.16	Design

CONSULTATIONS

SWAFFHAM TOWN COUNCIL -

No objection

TREE & COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTANT

No comment

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL - HIGHWAYS

No objection subject to condition

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

One representation has been received commenting as follows:

The plot in question has been used for years to keep our children playing close to home also the property will be overlooking my garden when the bushes which have also been there for years are removed, the area in front of the plot is used by residents for parking when there is no space left on the roads. I am strongly opposed to this being used as a building plot and will encourage other locals to complain about this proposal too.

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as the applicant is Breckland Council. The site area has been slightly reduced in size as it has transpired that Breckland Council do not own the whole of the site previously indicated.

Principle

* The site is within the Settlement Boundary of the town of Swaffham and therefore is in general accordance with Core Strategy Policy DC2 Principles of New Housing. In addition, outline planning permission has previously been granted for two dwellings on this site under planning references 3PL/2005/1623/O and 3PL/2011/0958/O.

* In addition, Core Strategy Policy DC11 states that all new development is expected to provide a contribution towards outdoor playing space equivalent to 2.4 hectares per 1000 population. In normal circumstances this would be secured by way of a unilateral undertaking however as the applicant is Breckland Council this cannot be achieved in this way. The Council has agreed that should the land be sold it will be stipulated on contract that a unilateral undertaking will be required to be entered into to secure the required recreation contribution.

Design, Layout and Siting

* The proposed dwellings would be positioned centrally within the site and following a similar building line to the adjacent dwellings to the west. Adequate amenity space for each dwelling would be provided. The dwellings are well designed and in keeping with existing built form. Materials are proposed to match existing dwellings in Sandringham Way. Provision is made for a bin storage area for each dwelling. In summary, it is considered that with respect to design, layout, siting and appearance the proposal is acceptable.

Trees and Landscape

* It is proposed that the existing scrub hawthorn hedge to the east of the site would be removed.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

The site is currently laid to grass, however some levelling would be required to the south east of the site.

* The Tree and Countryside Consultant has made no comment on the proposal.

Amenity

* There is sufficient separation distance between the proposed dwellings and existing dwellings to the west and east. The side boundaries of the site are currently enclosed by close-boarded fencing of approximately 1.5 m in height.

* There is one small first floor window within each side facing elevation which would serve a landing. In addition, the nearest neighbouring property to the west is a bungalow with adjoining flat roofed carport in close proximity to the boundary and to the east the nearest dwellings are sited a significant distance from the common boundary with their rear gardens separating them from the proposed dwellings.

* In summary, it is considered that, if permitted, the proposed dwellings would not have a significant impact on existing residential amenity by way of significant overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy. A condition may be attached to any consent granted to prevent any further windows or other opening being inserted at first floor level or above in the west and east flank elevations of the proposed development.

Highways

* Norfolk County Council has been consulted on the application and no objections have been raised subject to conditions.

Conclusion

* The site is within the Settlement Boundary of Swaffham and therefore the proposal is in general accordance with Core Strategy Policy DC2. Outline planning has previously been granted for two dwellings on this site under planning permission reference 3PL/2005/1623/O and 3PL/2011/0958/O. It is considered that the proposed dwellings are acceptable in terms of design, layout and siting and would be in keeping with the existing built form. Materials are proposed to match existing dwellings in Sandringham Way. The proposed dwellings would have no significant impact with respect to existing residential amenity and no objections have been raised on highway safety grounds. The application accords with national and local plan policies and approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Outline Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3005** Outline Time Limit (3 years)
- 3058** Standard Outline Condition
- 3060** Standard outline landscaping condition
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3920** Highways
- 3920** Levels
- 3106** External materials and samples to be approved

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans
- 3996** Note - Discharge of Conditions
- 3994** Unilateral Undertaking

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

ITEM	8	RECOMMENDATION : APPROVAL
REF NO:	3PL/2012/0577/F	CASE OFFICER: Lisa Hendry
LOCATION:	YAXHAM 1 Stone Cottages Norwich Road	APPN TYPE: Full POLICY: Part In Set Bndry ALLOCATION: No Allocation CONS AREA: N TPO: N LB GRADE: N
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs R Wragg 1 Stone Cottages Norwich Road	
AGENT:	Jonathan W Burton 12 Park Road Dereham	
PROPOSAL:	Two storey extension to side and first floor extension including dormer window to rear	

KEY ISSUES

Principle of development
Design and appearance
Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

This application proposes an extension to form a new entrance hall and wc at ground floor level with a new bathroom above and a new enlarged dormer window to the rear elevation.

SITE AND LOCATION

1 Stone Cottages is a semi-detached cottage located in Norwich Road, Yaxham. Surrounding the property are a mixture of residential dwellings to the north, south and west with a paddock to the east.

EIA REQUIRED

No

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

No relevant site history

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies of the adopted Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the adopted Site Specific Policies and Proposals Document, including the Proposals Maps, have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application. The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework have also been taken into account, where appropriate

DC.01	Protection of Amenity
DC.16	Design

CONSULTATIONS

YAXHAM P C -

Yaxham Parish Council has no objection to this application.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS

No objections or comments on the grounds of Environmental Protection.

REPRESENTATIONS

None

ASSESSMENT NOTES

* The application is referred to the Planning Committee as the applicant is an employee of Capita Symonds working with Breckland Council.

Principle of Development

* The dwelling lies inside the Settlement Boundary where the principle of development is acceptable subject to appropriate design details and there being no adverse impact upon residential amenity.

Design & Appearance

* The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale, design and materials and would not be at odds with the characteristics of the existing street scene. The eaves and the ridge of the extension are lower than those of the existing cottage creating a subservient element and retaining the balance of this semi-detached cottage. The use of matching materials will relate adequately to the existing dwelling.

Amenity

* The proposed extension does not adversely impact on the amenities of the neighbours. The composition of the extension coupled with the separation distance to the neighbouring properties means that neither outlook, privacy or light would be significantly compromised. The extension

DC131_new

BRECKLAND COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - 09-07-2012

would be positioned adjacent an existing paddock thus limiting any impact on neighbouring properties. The proposed dormer window to the rear will replace a smaller dormer window and as such overlooking of neighbouring properties will not be significantly worsened.

Conclusion

* Given that the design and appearance of the extension are considered to be acceptable and there would be no adverse impact upon residential amenity, the scheme is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION Planning Permission

CONDITIONS

- 3007** Full Permission Time Limit (3 years)
- 3046** In accordance with submitted plans
- 3110** External materials to match existing
- 3998** NOTE: Reasons for Approval
- 4000** Variation of approved plans

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

DOC - COMPLETE

3DC/2011/0064/DOC	Lovell Partnership	THETFORD Sweyn Close/ Fulmerston Road	Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18 & 20 on pp 3PL/2010/0013/F
3DC/2012/0055/DOC	Mr M Joyce	BESTHORPE Plot adjacent to The Haven Norwich Road	Discharge of conditions 3, 7, 8 and 10 on pp 3PL/2011/1176/F
3DC/2012/0065/DOC	Mr H Woodyatt	WATTON 10 Griston Road	Discharge of condition 3 on pp 3PL/2011/1165/F
3DC/2012/0077/DOC	Mr S Cleverley	HORNINGTOFT Barns at Ivy Farm Thumb Lane	Discharge of condition 8 on 3PL/2009/0428/F
3DC/2012/0079/DOC	Mr Stuart Johnson	CARBROOKE Willow End Cottage Willow Corner	Discharge of condition 5 on 3PL/2012/0044/F

DOC-Discharge FULL

3DC/2012/0061/DOC	Paul Rackham Ltd	ROUDHAM/LARLING Buildings 1, 3, 8 and 15 Camp Farm	Discharge of condition 6 on pp 3PL/2011/0851/CU
-------------------	------------------	--	--

Permission

3PL/2011/1173/D	HDD RAF Watton	CARBROOKE Neighbourhood Centre Blenheim Grange	Erect 2 storey nursery building, 15 car parking spaces (2 disabled), soft play area & garden space
-----------------	----------------	--	---

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0109/F	Cranswick Country Foods (Nor	WATTON Cranswick Country Foods (Norfolk) Ltd Brandon Road	Extension to provide increased production line space following the demolition of an existing lean to structure
3PL/2012/0111/F	Mr S Leslie	ROCKLANDS Church Farm Barn	Minor material amendment to pp 3PL/2011/0198 in respect of additional floor area to conversion & erect cart lodge
3PL/2012/0191/F	Mr D Nickerson	CARBROOKE 2 Steppe Cottage Shipdham Road	Erection of two storey side extension and re-locate vehicular access
3PL/2012/0350/D	Ideal Development (UK) Limited	ICKBURGH In between 67 & 69 Ashburton Road	Erection of new dwelling and garage
3PL/2012/0362/F	THPD Properties Ltd	YAXHAM Yaxham Waters Dereham Road	MMA to pp 3PL/2011/0378/F in respect of stationing of different type of lodge on plot 1
3PL/2012/0375/F	Mr Daniel Grocott	SWAFFHAM 4 The Pightle	Demolition of existing dwelling and garage & erection of 4 no. terrace houses
3PL/2012/0383/F	Mr & Mrs D Lawrence	LITCHAM Lime Kiln House Back Lane	Single storey side extension to provide entrance porch & bike/bin store
3PL/2012/0385/F	Thpd Properties Ltd	YAXHAM Yaxham Waters Holiday Park Dereham Road	Extension to veranda

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0405/F	Mr S Kelly	CASTON 4 Bridge Cottages Attleborough Road	Extension to the side/rear of dwelling and detached cart shed style garage/wood store with storage above
3PL/2012/0404/F	Mr A Hall	OLD BUCKENHAM 35 Hargham Road	Erect attached double garage, convert existing garage to hobbies room & new additional vehicular access
3PL/2012/0403/F	Mr J Luck	BEETLEY Land at Fakenham Road	Erection of stable (retrosepctive)
3PL/2012/0400/F	Mr & Mrs K Fowler	SPORLE 45 Priory Close	Single storey extension to front & detached single storey garage to rear
3PL/2012/0397/F	Orchard Developments E A Ltc	MILEHAM The Street	Demolish bungalow & erection of 2 single storey dwellings
3PL/2012/0391/F	Mr & Mrs S Swallow	ASHILL The Hollies Church Farm	Conservatory to side
3PL/2012/0388/F	Mr & Mrs A Leeder	ROCKLANDS The White Hart 47 The Street	Proposed Extension
3PL/2012/0387/F	Oakwood Properties	SWAFFHAM 32 Whitsands Road	Proposed side extension, front porch, alterations & new detached garage, demolition of extg conservatory & garage

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0386/F	Dereham Town Council	DEREHAM St Nicholas Churchyard Wall Washbridge	Erection of buttress to existing churchyard wall
3PL/2012/0447/F	Anglian Water Services Ltd	CARBROOKE Watton Borehole Site Norwich Road	Increase the height of two Borehole Kiosks
3PL/2012/0446/F	Anglian Water Services Ltd	HOE Hoe Borehole Site	Increase height of existing borehole kiosk
3PL/2012/0444/F	Mr R Wickenden	SOUTH LOPHAM 10 Blo Norton Road	Single storey rear extension and front entrance porch
3PL/2012/0443/F	Mrs Elizabeth Nichols	CARBROOKE White Hall Caudle Springs	Installation of solar roof mounted electricity generating system on the roof of the coachhouse
3PL/2012/0441/F	Mr M Rix	GRESSENHALL Westfield The Green	Proposed detached garage
3PL/2012/0438/F	Mr & Mrs T Shepherd	BEETLEY Beechcroft 45 Elmham Road	Single storey extension to side and replace flat roof with hipped end
3PL/2012/0434/F	Mr N Timmins	SWAFFHAM 5 Dove House Row Norwich Road	Demolition of conservatory to rear and erection of new rear extension

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0431/F	Mr K Prior	DEREHAM 41 Swanton Drive	Erection of a single storey side extension south facing
3PL/2012/0428/F	Mr & Mrs M Fendley	HOCKERING 2 Leys Lane	Single storey infill extension to rear
3PL/2012/0427/F	Adrian Gracie	THOMPSON The Chalet Mill Road	Erection of single storey rear extension (retrospective)
3PL/2012/0423/F	Mr A Bunn	HARDINGHAM 49/50 Policemans Loke High Common	Erection of two storey side extension to enclose a new staircase
3PL/2012/0420/F	Ms Phillips & Mrs Franks	GREAT ELLINGHAM Glenfield House Attleborough Road	Demolition of existing conservatory & erection of new
3PL/2012/0419/F	Mrs J Andrews	SWANTON MORLEY Wayside Cottage Town Street	Proposed rear conservatory
3PL/2012/0418/F	Connaught Bowls Club	ATTLEBOROUGH Club House Station Road	Extension to conservatory on rear elevation of clubhouse
3PL/2012/0415/F	D S Brandish Developments	YAXHAM Plot 3 Fieldings Drive Station Road	Construction of detached residential dwelling (amended design)

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0411/F	Mrs Emily Canham	WENDLING Mill Close Manor Drift	Installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)
3PL/2012/0409/F	Mr & Mrs N Sproston	OVINGTON Sunnyside Farm The Street	Installation of 2 small scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)
3PL/2012/0490/F	Mrs A Stanley	SHIPDHAM Copelands Farm Carbrooke Lane	Stable block and associated storage (haybarn & feed room)
3PL/2012/0481/F	Mr Andrew Doubleday	CRANWORTH Hill Crest Bungalow	Conversion of existing building to a single dwelling
3PL/2012/0466/F	Croxton Park Ltd	BRADENHAM Huntingfield Farm Mill Street	Installation of 40 Solar PV Panels mounted onto a triangular steel framework in a single line 22m x 2.2m
3PL/2012/0459/F	Mr K Stone	STOW BEDON/BRECKLES Cottage Farm Bungalow Lower Stow Bedon	Replacement dwelling with attached garage
3PL/2012/0458/F	Anglian Water Services	BRADENHAM New Borehole BH05 New Lane	Proposed new borehole for water abstraction & associated works
3PL/2012/0456/F	Mr & Mrs Rands	MUNDFORD 35 Brecklands	Single storey front extension and rear dormer

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0454/F	D & A (2127) Ltd	DEREHAM 41 Market Place	Proposed minor demolition & alterations
3PL/2012/0453/F	Mr Ricky Lain	NORTH ELMHAM 64 Orchard Close	Single storey rear extension to dwelling to accommodate new kitchen and increased area to sitting room/lounge
3PL/2012/0448/F	Mr A Riley	ATTLEBOROUGH 116a Ollands Road	Demo. of garage & extensions, erection of two single storey extensions to rear & side & detached double garage
3DC/2012/0070/DOC	Mr T Valentine	ROCKLANDS Holly Barn Holly Farm	Discharge of conditions 2, 3 & 4 on pp 3PL/2011/0411/F
3PL/2012/0478/LB	South Pickenham Estate Co. Lt	SOUTH PICKENHAM South Pickenham Hall	Works to roof and top floor. Other minor alterations to ground and first floor.
3PL/2012/0463/CU	CVS UK Ltd	ATTLEBOROUGH Daglas House Connaught Plain	Change of use of ground floor office (Use Class A2) to use as a veterinary clinic (sui generis use)
3PL/2012/0455/LB	D & A (2127) Ltd	DEREHAM 41 Market Place	Proposed minor demolition & alterations
3PL/2012/0442/LB	Mrs Elizabeth Nichols	CARBROOKE White Hall Caudle Springs	Installation of solar roof mounted electricity generating system on the roof of the coachhouse

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0436/LB	Dr Diana Coben	GARBOLDISHAM The Coach House Kenninghall Road	Repair and renovation of dilapidated building with collapsed roof. Hipped roof to northern end.
3PL/2012/0421/LB	Ms Phillips & Mrs Frank	GREAT ELLINGHAM Glenfield House Attleborough Road	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of new
3PL/2012/0407/CU	Mr N McLeod	GRESSENHALL High House Farm Bilney Road	Change of use from agricultural building to light industrial B1 Use Class (retrospective)
3PL/2012/0402/CU	Mrs A Hillier	SHIPDHAM Pound Green Hotel Pound Green Lane	Change of use of existing hotel into single dwellinghouse
3NM/2012/0031/NMA	Mr L Devlin & Mr B Beales	HARLING Land East of Lopham Road	Amendment to 3PL/2010/0374/F (enlarge dwelling on plot 1, new electricity sub-station opposite plot 15)
3NM/2012/0030/NMA	Mrs D Tunmore	NEW BUCKENHAM Green Point Castle Hill Road	Amendment to pp 3PL/2011/107; Change in window patterns and openings, door to garage and finish to porch
3NM/2012/0029/NMA	Richmond Park Golf Club	WATTON Richmond Park Golf Club Saham Road	Amendment to 2006/1163/F - realignment of footpath
3NM/2012/0028/NMA	Mr D Godliman	WHINBURGH/WESTFIELD Orchard Cottage Shipdham Road	Amendment to 3PL/2008/0884/F in respect of shape of garden room & change glass roof of kitchen to tiles

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3NM/2012/0014/NMA	S S Agripower & P J Southgate	ATTLEBOROUGH Land off Stony Lane Crowshall Farm	Amendment to 3PL/2011/1170/F in respect of reposition approved digester & use double feed hopper
3PL/2012/0382/LB	Mrs J Gordon	BRETtenham Rushford College Church Lane	Extensions & alterations to coach house, omit kitchen window (west elevation) Amendment to PP 3PL/2008/1079
3PL/2012/0376/CA	Mr Daniel Grocott	SWAFFHAM 4 The Pightle	Demolition of existing dwelling and garage & erection of 4 no. terrace houses
3PL/2012/0357/CU	Mr Hans Roediger	GREAT DUNHAM Old Rectory	Change of use of the Coach House from outbuilding to annex
3PL/2012/0349/LB	Mr R Greenwood	OLD BUCKENHAM The Granary 1 Mill Road	Install wood burning stove to first floor living room
3PL/2012/0518/F	Anglian Water Services Ltd	DIDLINGTON Didlington BH1	Increase height of existing borehole kiosk - Didlington BH01
3PL/2012/0517/F	Anglian Water Services Ltd	NORTH PICKENHAM North Pickenham BH3 Site	Increase height of existing borehole kiosk
3PL/2012/0496/F	Anglian Water Services	DIDLINGTON Didlington BH02	Increase height of existing borehole kiosk at Didlington BH02

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Permission

3PL/2012/0495/F	Anglian Water Services	NORTH PICKENHAM North Pickenham WTW	Increase height of existing borehole kiosks
3PL/2012/0384/F	Mr Martin Gent	GREAT ELLINGHAM Homestead Bow Street	Replacement dwelling with detached garage/games room with store space above
3PL/2012/0381/F	Lidl UK GMBH	DEREHAM Lidl Foodstore Kingston Road	Minor material amendment to pp 3PL/2010/0206/F in respect of variation of materials and external amendments
3PL/2012/0363/F	Dr Jo Connolly	THOMPSON Magnolia Cottage Pockthorpe Lane	Additional window & provision of air source heat pump & minor revisions
3PL/2012/0356/F	Mrs C Hanworth-Wood	SPORLE 20 Sydney Dye Court	Erection of extension to rear to include utility & sunroom
3PL/2012/0303/F	Mr Michael Davey	HARLING Blackwater Lake	Change of use of existing summer house and amenity lake to provide a single holiday let facility
3PL/2012/0232/F	Mrs B Matthews	BRADENHAM Honeysuckle Cottage 12 Church Street	Replace existing pitched/flat roof with new pitched roof, reinstate chimney on right & remove chimney on left
3PL/2012/0207/F	Mr Ian Leonard	SHIPDHAM Hall Farm	Installation of three small scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

Refusal

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Refusal

3PL/2012/0096/O	Mr & Mrs Barry Pardue	BANHAM Rear of 59 Crown Street of Greyhound Lane	New cottage style dwelling and garage.
3PL/2012/0119/F	Mr Gordon Phillips	GREAT DUNHAM Rookery Farm Beeston Road	Installation of a single small scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.5m diameter blades)
3PL/2012/0140/F	Mrs Kerry Gibb	MILEHAM Holly Farm Dereham Road	Installation of a single small scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.5m diameter blades)
3PL/2012/0233/F	Mr C Wallis	GREAT CRESSINGHAM Vine Cottage The Street	Erect single & 2 storey extensions to dwelling, open fronted garage to front & to rear garage with attic storage
3PL/2012/0331/F	Thetford Municipal Almshouse	THETFORD The Old Ambulance Station Earls Street	Demolish building & erect two storey building & single storey bldg behind to provide 3 flats for elderly people
3PL/2012/0365/F	Mr G Riddle	CROXTON The Old Vicarage The Street	Erection of 4 houses, with associated access, parking and turning areas
3PL/2012/0368/F	Mr & Mrs P Walker	DEREHAM 24 Windmill Avenue	Extensions and alterations
3PL/2012/0378/O	Mr & Mrs A Leeder	ROCKLANDS 47 The Street	Residential development (Erection of 3 houses)

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Refusal

3PL/2012/0393/F	Mr P Yallop	DEREHAM Casa Mia 14 Windmill Avenue	Erection of 2m closeboarded panel fence (retrospective)
3PL/2012/0394/A	Mr T Burgess	THETFORD Norfolk Trade Centre Mundford Road	Erection of externally illuminated free standing sign (retrospective)
3PL/2012/0398/F	Mr P Alderman	ASHILL Land adjoining 53 The Woodlands	Erection of detached bungalow
3PL/2012/0410/F	Mr Colin Bidewell	BRISLEY Mill House The Green	Installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)
3PL/2012/0417/F	T Ulph	WHISSONSETT The Old Bell High Street	Minor material amendment to pp 3PL/2009/0916/F in respect of changes to approved plans (retrospective)
3PL/2012/0464/F	Mr Bruce Edmonson	WHISSONSETT Brick Kiln Farm Mill Lane	Installation and operation of two 50kW wind turbines on agricultural land at Brick Kiln Farm
3PL/2011/1313/LU	Mr R Muggridge	HOCKHAM Puddledock Farm Wretham Road	Erection of front and rear 2 storey extensions
3PL/2012/0330/CA	Thetford Municipal Almshouse	THETFORD The Old Ambulance Station Earls Street	Demolition of existing building

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

List of decisions made by the Breckland Council under the agreed terms of delegation.

Refusal

3PL/2012/0460/LU	Co-Dunkall Limited	CASTON Bilhams Cottage The Street	Proposed double garage
------------------	--------------------	---	------------------------

Temporary Permission

3PL/2012/0369/F	Mr P Barley	WRETHAM 4 Thorpe Farm Cottages Croxtan Road	Use of existing mobile home as an annexe to 4 Thorpe Farm Cottages
-----------------	-------------	---	--

PLANNING COMMITTEE 09 July 2012.
MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

Reference No.	Applicants Name	Location	Proposal	Decision
3CM/2012/0008/F	Director of Childrens Services, Norfolk County Council	Swaffham Infant & Nursery School, White Cross Road, Swaffham	Replace existing asbestos cement kitchen roof with dark grey steel sheeting roof, render walls & replace windows	Approval with conditions