

# Development Committee



**Please contact:** Linda Yarham

**Please email:** [linda.yarham@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:linda.yarham@north-norfolk.gov.uk) Direct Dial: 01263 516019

**TO REGISTER TO SPEAK PLEASE SEE BOX BELOW**

Wednesday, 7 October 2020

A meeting of the **Development Committee** will be held **remotely via Zoom** on **Thursday, 15 October 2020** at **9.30 am**.

**Please note that due to the Covid-19 restrictions, meetings of Development Committee will be held remotely via Zoom video conferencing and live streamed on Youtube.**

**Public speaking:** If you wish to speak on a planning application on this agenda, please email [DemocraticServices@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:DemocraticServices@north-norfolk.gov.uk) no later than 5.00 pm on the Tuesday before the meeting and include a copy of your statement. You will have the opportunity to make your statement by video link but in the event that this is not possible, or if you would prefer, your statement will be read out by an officer.

**This meeting will be broadcast live to Youtube and will be capable of repeated viewing. The entirety of the meeting will be filmed except for confidential or exempt items. If you attend the meeting and make a representation you will be deemed to have consented to being filmed and that the images and sound recordings could be used for webcasting/ training purposes.**

**Emma Denny**  
**Democratic Services Manager**

**To:** Mrs P Grove-Jones, Mr P Heinrich, Mr A Brown, Mr C Cushing, Mr P Fisher, Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, Mrs W Fredericks, Mr R Kershaw, Mr N Lloyd, Mr G Mancini-Boyle, Mr N Pearce, Dr C Stockton, Mr A Varley and Mr A Yiasimi

**Substitutes:** Mr T Adams, Mr D Baker, Dr P Bütikofer, Mrs S Bütikofer, Mr V FitzPatrick, Mr N Housden, Mr J Punchard, Mr J Rest, Mrs E Spagnola, Mr J Toye and Ms K Ward

All other Members of the Council for information.  
Members of the Management Team, appropriate Officers, Press and Public



**If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance**  
If you would like any document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact us

**Chief Executive:** Steve Blatch  
**Tel** 01263 513811 **Fax** 01263 515042 **Minicom** 01263 516005  
**Email** [districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:districtcouncil@north-norfolk.gov.uk) **Web site** [www.north-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk)

## AGENDA

**PLEASE NOTE: THE ORDER OF BUSINESS MAY BE CHANGED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN**

### PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTIONS
2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBER(S)
3. MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 1 October 2020.

4. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS
  - (a) To determine any other items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.
  - (b) To consider any objections received to applications which the Head of Planning was authorised to determine at a previous meeting.

5. ORDER OF BUSINESS
  - (a) To consider any requests to defer determination of an application included in this agenda, so as to save any unnecessary waiting by members of the public attending for such applications.
  - (b) To determine the order of business for the meeting.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests that they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Code of Conduct for Members requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest.

### OFFICERS' REPORTS

### ITEMS FOR DECISION

#### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

7. BRISTON - PF/19/1648 - ERECTION OF 9 DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES (3 NO. TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGS, 2 NO. TWO-STOREY SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS AND 4 NO. SEMI-DETACHED CHALET BUNGALOWS, ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD AND DRIVEWAYS; HOLLY HOUSE, THE LANE, BRISTON, NR24 2JX FOR OPTIONS FOR HOMES LIMITED (Pages 1 - 10)

8. WALSINGHAM - PF/20/0590 ERECTION OF DETACHED TWO STOREY DWELLING: ST JAMES COTTAGE, 18 BRIDEWELL STREET, WALSINGHAM, NR22 6BJ FOR MESSRS FITZPATRICK (Pages 11 - 20)

9. APPEALS SECTION (Pages 21 - 24)

- (a) New Appeals
- (b) Inquiries and Hearings – Progress
- (c) Written Representations Appeals – In Hand
- (d) Appeal Decisions
- (e) Court Cases – Progress and Results

10. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

11. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

To pass the following resolution, if necessary:-

“That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act.”

#### PRIVATE BUSINESS

12. ANY OTHER URGENT EXEMPT BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

13. TO CONSIDER ANY EXEMPT MATTERS ARISING FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA

This page is intentionally left blank

**BRISTON - PF/19/1648 - Erection of 9 dwellings with garages (3 no. two-storey detached dwellings, 2 no. two-storey semi-detached dwellings and 4 no. semi-detached chalet bungalows, associated access road and driveways; Holly House, The Lane, Briston, NR24 2JX for Options for Homes Limited**

Minor Development

- Target Date: 22 October 2020

Case Officer: Mrs L Starling

Full Planning Permission

## CONSTRAINTS

- LDF - Residential Area
- Section 106 Planning Obligations
- Proposed Residential Use Allocation
- LDF - Settlement Boundary
- SFRA - Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding
- Landscape Character Area
- Unclassified Road

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CDA/15/1746: Holly House, The Lane, Briston, Melton Constable, NR24 2JX - Discharge of conditions 4 (ext. wall materials),5 (boundary wall materials),6 (air source heat pumps), 7 (ext. lighting), 8 (surface water), 9 (CEMP), 10 (landscaping), 13 (tree protection), 16 (proposed management & maintenance), & 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 (all highways) of planning permission PF/15/1746 - Condition Discharge Reply 12/07/2018

PF/15/1746 PF - Holly House, The Lane, Briston, Melton Constable, NR24 2JX - Erection of 12 shared ownership dwellings and garages - Approved 06/04/2017

PF/15/0352 PF - Holly House, The Lane, Briston, Melton Constable, NR24 2JX - Erection of twelve shared ownership dwellings with garages - Refused 09/07/2015

PF/14/0992 PF - Holly House, The Lane, Briston, Melton Constable, NR24 2JX - Erection of twelve shared ownership dwellings and garages - Withdrawn by Applicant 03/11/2014

## THE APPLICATION

Planning permission is sought for the erection of 9 open market dwellings with attached garages to be constructed on land to the rear of Holly House, The Lane, Briston. The site has an area of approximately 0.42 hectares and is a long, narrow rectangular area of heavily overgrown land approximately 150 metres in length by 30 metres in width. The land was used until around 2010 as orchard land in connection with Holly House. A substantial native hedge runs along the southern boundary which separates the site from Orchard Close. The site would be accessed through a small residential estate and served by a new single point of access off Bure Road immediately to the south at the junction with Orchard Close.

The scheme would provide market housing in a linear pattern (with Plot 1 located to the western corner) comprising of the following mix of dwellings;

Plot 1 - detached 3-bedroom house with attached double garage

Plots 2 & 3 - pair of semi-detached 2-bedroom houses with attached single garages

Plots 4 & 5 - detached 3-bedroom houses with attached single garages

Plots 6 & 7 - semi-detached 3-bedroom one and a half storey chalet bungalows with attached single garage

Plots 8 & 9 - Semi-detached 2-bedroom one and a half storey chalet bungalows with attached single garage

Amended plans/details were received in August 2020 in response to concerns raised by officers to elements of the originally submitted proposal and have been subject to a full re-consultation and publicity. The revisions relate primarily to proposed site layout, design, elevation and floor plan changes for individual plots and, the substitution of detached with attached garaging.

## REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

At the request of Councillor Stenton in light of her agreement with the objections raised by Briston Parish Council and local residents to the originally submitted scheme and revised application as follows;

- The site access is considered unacceptable due to it exiting onto the narrow part of The Lane. Access to the site should be provided alongside Holly House and out onto The Lane, given that this point of The Lane is much wider than where the access is currently proposed.
- Concerns that the developer will grub up all the hedge along the Bure Close side of the site. This is an old hedge and home to much wildlife, as well as giving excellent insulation/noise reducing properties between the proposed development and existing dwellings in Bure Close and Orchard Close.

## PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL

Briston Parish Council

Objection/concerns relating to the access to the site. The access route onto Orchard Close is extremely narrow and unsuited to taking more traffic. The access from Orchard Close onto The Lane is also narrow here and as a busy village road unsuited to more traffic. A more acceptable access would be through the grounds of Holly House and onto The Lane as the road is much wider at this point.

In addition to concerns raised regarding the access with regard to the application as first submitted the PC had the following objections

- Houses, not bungalows being built opposite the existing properties on Orchard Close would lead to loss of privacy for the residents in Orchard Close.
- Concerns that the open space may be built on by the developer at a later date and would hope that as a condition of planning for this development this space is handed over to the local authority.
- Concerns about the effect on the environment as there seems to be no provision for retaining existing trees and in particular the boundary hedge onto Orchard Close. The PC hope that as a condition of planning, this hedge is protected and as many of the trees as feasible.

## REPRESENTATIONS

*Proposals as first submitted*

9 letters of objection raising the following concerns

- Impact of scheme on highway safety, in particular increase in traffic using Bure Road and junction of Bure Road/Orchard Close.
- Hedge to rear of site should be retained (no less than 3 metres in height) to protect privacy of properties on Orchard Close and residents.
- Whilst a reduction from 12 to 9 dwellings is welcomed, concern that scheme still includes houses and not all bungalows opposite Orchard Close.
- Recommendations in AIA/CEMP should be conditioned/adhered to in respect of protecting trees, hedging and wildlife.
- Details of air source heat pumps should be agreed by condition to avoid noise/amenity issues for surrounding properties.
- Open space shown to east has potential to be developed in the future and makes proposed housing numbers such that developer contributions are not applicable (previously approved scheme subject to a S106 agreement for shared 50% equity/affordable dwellings, play area/park provision and North Norfolk SAC payment). Impact upon the residential amenities of the occupants of surrounding properties, particularly relating to noise disturbance and loss of privacy to properties on Bure Road adjacent to the proposed site entrance, Baldwin's Close and Orchard Close.
- Lack of capacity at medical centre to serve future residents and impact upon existing drainage problems.
- Potential for scheme to lead to future development of open land to the north
- Site should be accessed via Holly House (The Lane) to the west.

#### *Proposals as amended*

No representations received.

#### CONSULTATIONS

##### County Council (Highway)

No objections, subject to the imposition of the conditions requested for the previously approved scheme. These relate to access and parking/turning provision, the need to secure a scheme detailing provision for on-site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period and detailed drawings relating to off-site highway improvement works (including Public Rights of Way works).

##### Landscape Officer

No objection. Request conditions relating to Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) - which should also include all of the habitats on site; hard and soft landscape scheme to include mitigation/enhancement opportunities for biodiversity (such as bat and bird boxes, native planting, mammal access points in fences); retention of hedgerows and no external lighting to be erected without prior written approval.

##### Environmental Health

No objections, subject to conditions.

##### Planning Policy Manager

Considers objection to application as first submitted is now unsustainable when considering all aspects of the application, including the bringing forward of new market dwellings in Briston.

The amended scheme addresses some of the previous concerns regarding improved design and site layout and now provides a scheme that offers more generous plot sizes than the previously approved (2015) scheme and utilises the land across the whole site.

The applicant has attempted to positively address issues such as adaptability, broadband connectivity and sustainable construction as part of the scheme.

The site has not been brought forward since its allocation in 2011 and as such the proposed development is to be welcomed.

Concerns that the application does not provide the number of dwellings in line with the site allocation and Core Strategy policy, and as a consequence of the unsubstantiated decision to limit density the development does not provide any affordable housing.

#### Anglian Water

No comments as the application is not a major development. Advise as to the applicant's responsibility to check for any Anglian Water assets which cross/are within close proximity to the site, any encroachment zones should also be reflected in site layout, diverting or crossing over any AW assets will require their permission.

#### Natural England

Confirmed they have no comments to make given the proposals would be unlikely to significantly impact upon any statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. Standing advice referred to in respect of other matters.

#### Strategic Housing

*(Comments on application as first submitted. No further comments provided on amended plans)*

Object. The application is for 9 homes of which none appear to be affordable but open market dwellings.

Briston is a Service Village and so, in line with policy HO2, on developments of 2 or more units 50% of these should be affordable. The developer has not submitted to a viability assessment to justify the lack of affordable housing in the development.

There is a proven housing need for the provision of more affordable housing in Briston, with 696 applicants on the Housing Register who have a housing need and would consider housing in Briston. Of these, 68 applicants are in Bands 1 or 2, the highest need.

With regard to the proposed housing mix, the proposed development consists of: 3 x 3 bed houses (detached), 3 x 3 bed houses (semi-detached) and 4 x 2 bed bungalows (chalet). Analysis of the housing list shows that the recommended mix for four homes (44%) based on need would be: affordable rent 2 x 1 bed, 2 persons houses, flats or bungalows (one of which should be Cat 2 of part M) and 2 x 2 bed 4 person bungalows or houses (one of which should be Cat 2 of part M).

The proposed development does meet some of the applicable development control housing policy requirements such as HO1 required 40% of dwellings have two bedrooms or fewer - Proposed 4 out of 9 (44%) and required 20% suitable for elderly infirm or disabled – four of the homes are bungalows, however, these are chalet bungalows where one of the bedrooms is upstairs bedroom.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.



## CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

## POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 3 - Housing

SS 4 - Environment

SS 6 - Access and Infrastructure

HO 1 - Dwelling mix and type

HO 2 - Provision of affordable housing

HO 3 - Affordable housing in the Countryside

HO 7 - Making the most efficient use of land (Housing density)

EN 2 - Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 4 - Design

EN 9 - Biodiversity and geology

EN 10 – Development and Flood risk

CT 5 - The transport impact of new development

CT 6 - Parking provision

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

North Norfolk Design Guide (SPD)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 – Decision-making

Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

## MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- Principle
- Affordable housing
- Design, layout and housing mix
- Landscape, biodiversity and trees
- Highways
- Residential amenity
- Environmental considerations

## APPRAISAL

### Principle

The site is within the defined settlement boundary for Briston which is designated as a Service Village under policy SS 1 of the Core Strategy and adjoins a designated residential area. It is allocated for housing in the Housing Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) as site BR 124 and its redevelopment for housing has been accepted previously in the context of the current development plan, with planning permission granted in 2017 (ref: PF/15/1746) for 12 dwellings and garages to be constructed on the site. Six of the dwellings

in that scheme would have been co-ownership provided through a Joint Equity Scheme (a form of Intermediate affordable housing), with the other six being market dwellings.

The agent has confirmed that the pre-commencement conditions attached to that permission discharged in 2018 (under ref: CDA/15/1746) and some works commenced on site including the installation of access gates, digging of trial holes for soils testing, excavating of soakaways and some drainage works, with the applicant's intention at the time to complete the development. Funding issues prevented this from taking place, but as pre-commencement conditions have been discharged and a 'material operation' has been carried out it is considered likely that the 2015 permission is extant.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle and complies with Core Strategy policy SS 1

### Affordable housing

Since the site's allocation in the 2011 Site Allocations DPD and the granting of planning permission in 2017, there have been changes in national planning policy with regards provision of affordable housing on smaller sites through revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the associated Planning Practice Guidance. Discussions took place in 2019 between the Council and the developer in terms of the implications of these changes in respect of the site and the issues encountered in respect of its development.

At this time, given that the developer was proposing to construct 9 dwellings (the extant permission was for 12 dwellings and the allocations DPD stated that the site was suitable for around 10 dwellings), as the development would not fall within the definition of 'major development' (10 or more dwellings or a site of 0.5 hectares or more) it was accepted there would be no requirement to provide affordable housing either on-site or off-site via a financial contribution.

These changes to the NPPF are considered to be a material planning consideration in the assessment of the current application, given that the NPPF post-dates the Council's housing policies and allocations DPD in this respect. As the proposed scheme is not major development, whilst regrettable, it is acknowledged that the refusal of the application on the basis of lack of affordable housing provision, cannot be justified.

The site layout as first submitted excluded areas of land which it is considered could have had potential to accommodate additional dwellings in the future rather than being included as part of the scheme which would have thereby triggered the requirement for affordable housing. Whilst the proposed development would have a density less than the 30 dwellings per hectare required under Policy HO 7, the scheme would however offer a less cramped form of development, than the approved 2015 scheme which to accommodate 12 dwellings had a somewhat compromised layout. The amended layout is also such that there is no realistic opportunity to provide further dwellings on the site.

### Design, housing density and housing mix

In respect of housing mix and type, Policy HO 1 of the Core Strategy requires that for development of more or more dwellings, 40% (equating to 4 of the 9 dwellings proposed) should comprise of not more than 2 no. bedrooms and have an internal floor area of no more than 70 sq. metres. As amended the 4 of the 9 dwellings would have 2 bedrooms or less and two of them would comply with the 70 sq.m requirement. The other two smaller dwellings would only slightly exceed this requirement having floor areas of 77 sq. metres. Therefore, on balance, it is considered this, along with the fact that the scheme would help to provide a mix of 2 and 3 bedroom properties and taking into account the sustainable location of the site, in this instance refusal of the application on this ground alone would be difficult to justify.

Furthermore, whilst the density of the development at 22 dwellings per hectare would be less than the 30 dwellings per hectare required by Policy HO 7, given the constraints of the site in terms of its linear nature, the relationships with existing properties, the indicative density (being suitable for approximately 10 dwellings) stated in the Site Allocations DPD, along with the character and pattern of existing surrounding development and open land to the north, the density being proposed is considered appropriate in this location.

Whilst Policy HO 1 also requires that 20% of the proposed dwellings (which would equate to 2 of the 9) be suitable or adaptable for disabled/elderly occupation to provide, given that 4 of the 9 would be bungalows (albeit chalet style with some bedroom accommodation in the roof space), it is considered that these could be adapted if needed to provide accessible accommodation.

In visual terms, the design, layout, scale and massing of the dwellings proposed is considered acceptable given the context of development surrounding the site, with the access point and layout helping to provide a natural conclusion to the small residential estate through which it would be accessed.

It is therefore considered that the proposals as amended would result in development which would be in keeping with its context and would protect the character and appearance of the wider area in accordance with Policies SS3, HO1, HO7 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy and Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### Landscape, biodiversity and trees

The previously approved scheme and the current application recognised the importance of protecting the trees, hedgerows and wildlife habitats present on the site by adopting a layout with the proposed dwellings having their rear gardens backing onto Orchard Close and Baldwin's Close to the south.

Subject to conditions as recommended by the Landscape Officer, it is considered that the scheme would have no unacceptable impacts on landscape features on or adjacent to the site.

With regard to biodiversity, conditions to ensure a sensitive construction methodology, a landscaping scheme that incorporates additional tree planting, ecological enhancement features (e.g. bat and bird boxes, native planting, mammal access points in fences) and requiring details of external lighting would mean there would be no net loss of biodiversity and may result in enhancements

On that basis, it is therefore considered that the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policies SS4, EN2, EN9 and EN13 of the Core Strategy and Section 15 of the NPPF.

#### Highways

The proposed development would be served via a shared single access at the corner of Bure Road/Orchard Close. Concerns have been raised by both the Parish Council and local residents that proposed access is unsuitable to cater for additional traffic due to being extremely narrow, with similar concerns raised in respect increased traffic using The Lanes/Bure Road.

The Highway Authority however, have no objections on highway safety grounds to the access as proposed or the revised on-site parking/turning arrangements. Furthermore, significant weight has to be attached to the fact that the position of the access remains in the same location as previously approved and as is suggested in the Site Allocations DPD

Therefore, subject to the imposition of the requested highway conditions, it is considered that the scheme would safeguard highway safety in accordance with Policies CT5 and CT6 of the Core Strategy.

### Residential amenity

Residential properties on Orchard Close, Baldwin's Close and Bure Road which are a mixture of close-knit detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and bungalows lie to the south of the site. Older detached properties lie to the east (fronting onto The Loke), and to the west, including Holly House, there are detached properties on larger plots fronting onto The Lane. The site is also bounded directly to the north by agricultural/open land.

Whilst the reduction in the number of dwellings proposed is considered by some residents as beneficial to the amenities of the area, concerns have been raised from the Parish Council and residents that the redevelopment of the site in the manner proposed would cause harm to the residential amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties, particularly those located on Baldwin's Close, Orchard Close and Bure Road, and that the inclusion of houses is out of keeping with the character of the area.

Whilst it is acknowledged that a mixture of house types is being proposed (with some being two-storey or chalet style with first floor accommodation), it is considered that the scheme has been designed in a manner which would comply with the minimum separation distances recommended by the Basic Amenity Criteria in the North Norfolk Design Guide in respect of protecting the occupants of neighbouring properties from unacceptable loss of light, privacy or disturbance.

Furthermore, the design, orientation and siting of the proposed dwellings is such that it is considered that adequate levels of privacy and amenity would be afforded to the occupants of the proposed dwellings, with each of the properties served by adequate levels of amenity space.

It is therefore considered that the scheme as amended would adequately protect the residential amenities of the occupants of both the existing neighbouring properties, as well as providing adequate levels of amenities of the future occupants of the proposed dwellings. As such, the scheme is considered to comply with Policy EN4 of the Core Strategy in respect of protecting residential amenity.

### Environmental considerations

The site is situated in Flood Risk Zone 1 where any risks from flooding are unlikely.

It is proposed that foul water will connect into the existing foul sewer with Anglian Water consent.

No objections have also been raised by the Council's Environmental Health Officer on environmental grounds to the revised proposals subject to the imposition of conditions.

### Other considerations

As part of the Policy BR 124 within the Site Allocations DPD, the 2015 permission was approved subject to a S106 agreement which included a Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) payment. This payment was required on a number of allocated sites to allow for the provision of monitoring and where necessary, to provide mitigation against the any impacts of increased visitor pressure on European Sites. Given that a S106 agreement is not required as part of the current application, Eastlaw have confirmed the SAC/SPA payment which would be required (equating to £50 per dwelling) can be paid direct to the Council prior to the issuing of any decision. The Applicants agreement to the payment of this has been sought.

### Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed scheme would be acceptable in terms of principle, housing density and mix. The design of the dwellings and layout proposed are considered acceptable in the context of the development in surrounding vicinity, and would not raise any significant

landscape or environmental concerns. The scheme is also not considered to result in significant detriment to the residential amenities of neighbouring or future occupiers, and highway safety would be adequately safeguarded.

#### RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL subject to the receipt of the SAC payment and conditions relating to the matters listed below and any other considered necessary by the Head of Planning:

- Time limit for implementation
- External materials
- Air source heat pumps
- Removal of PD rights for openings/windows,
- CEMP
- Hard and soft landscaping
- Retention of hedgerows (minimum 3m in height to south and 2.4m to the north)
- Tree protection and retention
- Highways and parking
- External lighting

Final wording of conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning

This page is intentionally left blank

**WALSINGHAM – PF/20/0590 Erection of detached two storey dwelling: St James Cottage, 18 Bridewell Street, Walsingham, NR22 6BJ for Messrs FitzPatrick**

**Target Date: 15 October 2020**

Case Officer: Jayne Owen

Full application

## CONSTRAINTS

Landscape Character Area

SFRA - Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding

LDF - Residential Area

Conservation Area

LDF - Settlement Boundary

Listed Building Grade II - Consultation Area

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DE21/13/0163 ENQ

St James Cottage, 18 Bridewell Street, Walsingham, NR22 6BJ

Erection of dwelling

Advice Given (for pre-apps) 21/02/2013

## THE APPLICATION

The proposal is for a one and a half storey two bedroom detached dwelling on part of the rear garden area of 18 Bridewell Street. The site is located in Chapel Yard within the central, older part of the main village of Walsingham and within the conservation area. Chapel Yard provides vehicular access to a number of properties and the Anglican Shrine. The site is enclosed by housing to the north and west, and by buildings within the grounds of the Anglican Shrine to the east. The southern side is bounded by a wall. Chapel Yard also contains the offices and ancillary buildings associated with the Anglican Shrine. The host dwelling, 18 Bridewell Street is a grade II listed building and there are three other grade II listed buildings in close proximity to the site.

The land is currently partly enclosed by flint and brick walls. New boundary fencing is proposed to the northern and western boundaries of the site. The proposed building would have an entirely rendered finish with a clay pantiled roof, coloured aluminium frame windows and hardwood doors. All surface water is proposed to be directed to new soakaways, foul drainage to be routed to the existing mains drain.

The scheme has been revised since it was first submitted. The main changes are as follows:

- The dwelling has been reduced in size by removing the proposed single storey flat roofed element to the rear (north) of the dwelling. The proposal as revised comprises a one and a half storey dwelling with kitchen/dining/living area, hall, wc and car port providing space for one vehicle with two bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms above.
- The proposed turntable to be sited within the rear amenity area has been removed
- The proposed materials have been changed from brick, render and timber cladding to an entirely rendered finish

- The removal of the single storey flat roofed element now allows for the retention of more vegetation (T5 and T8 lilac bushes and T9 Plum), all of which are sited to the rear of the proposed dwelling.

#### REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE:

The applicants (Councillors Tom and Vincent Fitzpatrick) are members of the Council

#### TOWN COUNCIL:

Walsingham Parish Council object for the following reasons:

- Overdevelopment of the site in the historic conservation area of Little Walsingham. The design of flat roof and wooden cladding is inappropriate in the conservation area particularly as the site is surrounded by traditional buildings.
- The access onto Bridewell Street is unsafe. The use of the turntable would be unenforceable and whether drivers are reversing or driving out, the view of on-coming traffic (and pedestrians) is obscured by the adjacent building and the road is narrow.

The Parish Council have been re-consulted on the amended plans and comments are awaited. Any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

#### REPRESENTATIONS:

Four objections received raising the following summarised concerns. The representations are available to view in full on the Council's website.

#### *Original scheme*

- Overdevelopment, noise, light and quality of life
- Loss of trees; impact on wildlife; land has become small stretch of woodland rich in bird life, trees and plants which will be absorbing carbon dioxide. This little breathing space in a built up village should not be lost to yet another sterile and unnecessary building.
- Parking provision/highway safety if vehicles reversing out, where visibility is severely limited
- Potential damage to property from vehicles attempting to reverse colliding with building
- Conditions are requested covering the following, should these conditions not be attached, objection is raised to the proposals
  - (1) No more than one vehicle to be accommodated on the site at any one time, such vehicle to enter and exit the site facing forwards (and not by reversing)
  - (2) During construction process, no scaffolding shall be erected and no vehicles shall be used or parked in such a way as to restrict or impede access (on foot and by vehicle) to the flint building opposite the access gateway of the development, belonging to the owner of 4 Common Place, Walsingham
  - (3) During the construction process, all persons involved in the construction process and visitors to the site shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the flint building, opposite the access gateway of the development and belonging to the owner of 4 Common Place, Walsingham, is not damaged
- Request that if the Council has standard alternative wording to deal with the above, that an opportunity is given to comment on it, it is presumed the Council will attach additional conditions to ensure that all vehicles accessing Chapel Yard in connection with the



construction do so in accordance with the relevant traffic standards. In addition, it might be sensible for the entrance gateway of the proposed development to be widened

- Comments of the Highways Authority are noted however the condition does not include an express requirement to use the turntable
- Overlooking, impact on sunlight and daylight and overshadowing (as detailed under Policy 10 of emerging local plan); use of vehicular access will cause noise, fumes and vibration; little amenity space provided for enjoyment of new residents
- Impacts arising from surface water run-off
- Impact on adjacent heritage assets (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area), their settings and wider conservation area; no public benefit to counter this; objections made by the Parish Council endorsed

#### *Revised scheme*

Any additional comments arising from re-consultation following revisions to the proposals will be reported at the meeting.

#### Norfolk County Council Highways

##### *Originally submitted scheme*

No objections subject to a condition that prior to first occupation the proposed on-site car parking and turning area is laid out, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter.

##### *Revised scheme*

Nothing further to add to original comments

#### Conservation and Design Officer

Considers that whilst the revisions to the proposals have reduced the level of harm compared to the proposals as originally submitted, it cannot be concluded that it has been removed altogether. Therefore, unless it is considered that the public benefits accruing from the proposals would outweigh the 'less than substantial' harm identified, refusal is recommended.

#### Landscape Officer

Whilst the revised design does now offer improvements on the original iteration, considers there remains scope to accommodate landscape mitigation that would be of wider amenity value. It is also considered that the design could be further revised to result in a build that is better assimilated within its plot and more successfully complements the characteristic Chapel Yard.

#### Norfolk CC Historic Environment Service

No objections subject to a condition

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, refusal of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

#### CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

#### POLICIES

##### North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

SS 3 – Housing

SS 4 - Environment

SS 6 - Access and Infrastructure

CT 5 - The transport impact of new development

CT 6 - Parking provision

EN 2 - Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

EN 4 - Design

EN 9 - Biodiversity and geology

EN 10 - Development and Flood risk

EN 13 - Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation

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

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

#### MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle
2. Design and layout and impact on heritage assets
3. Highways
4. Residential amenity
5. Landscaping
6. Ecology

#### APPRAISAL

##### 1. Principle (Policies SS 1 and SS 3):

The application site lies within the settlement limit of Walsingham which is designated as a Service Village as set out in Policy SS 1 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy. Policy SS 1 states that a

small amount of new development will be focused on a number of designated Service Villages to support rural sustainability. The development is therefore acceptable in principle having regard to Policies SS 1 and SS 3.

## 2. Design and layout and impact on heritage assets (Policies EN 4 and EN 8)

Policy EN 4 states that all development should be designed to a high quality, reinforcing local distinctiveness. Design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.

The application site lies within the Walsingham Conservation Area and is surrounded by four separate listed buildings including the host dwelling, 18 Bridewell Street. The site forms part of the curtilage of No.18 Bridewell Street and the three other listed buildings comprise No's 2-6, 10 and 12 Bridewell Street.

Policy EN 8 requires that development proposals should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of designated assets through high quality, sensitive design. Development that would have an adverse impact on their special historic or architectural interest will not be permitted.

Further Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are also relevant. S66 sets out a general duty with respect to listed buildings and conservation areas in exercise of planning functions as follows:

*'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'*

S72 requires that *'with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'*

In addition, Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

*'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

In terms of the relevant heritage assets, the application site lies within the Walsingham Conservation Area and is surrounded by four separate listed buildings as noted above. The conservation area is characterised by the close-knit arrangements between its buildings and the often limited amenity space available. In principle therefore, the proposed development would be in keeping with the prevailing form and character of the conservation area. In reality, however, local value has been placed on the natural contribution made by the site both in terms of the species it attracts and the greenery provided within the built envelope. Inevitably, a new dwelling of any type would have an impact upon this, in particular having regard to the fact that virtually all of the existing trees would have to be removed to facilitate the proposed build.

The foreshortening of the curtilage of No.18 would not be a positive change in terms of the setting of this heritage asset. In addition, since original officer advice was given (in 2013) with respect to the principle of developing this site, the concept of heritage harm has become more firmly

embedded within the planning system. Only 7 m of garden is reserved for the listed building, with double this amount being associated for the new build. As such, significant visual and physical competition with the heritage asset would result, which it is considered would translate into 'less than substantial harm' being caused to the heritage asset and would be contrary to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework unless significant public benefits could be demonstrated.

With regard to impact on the setting of the other three listed buildings (No's 2-6, 10 and 12 Bridewell Street), whilst the proposed development would affect the views out from these heritage assets, particularly having regard to the proposed removal of trees and their replacement with a significant new three dimensional presence, it is considered that this level of harm would be more modest and would not block any key or 'designed' views of these properties.

In addition, in terms of the detailed design, flat roof forms are not generally supported within the adopted North Norfolk Design Guide, particularly in sensitive locations, and there is very little historic precedent for timber cladding within the centre of Walsingham.

#### *Revised scheme*

The dwelling has been reduced in size by removing the rear single storey flat roofed element and a two bedroom property is now proposed. As a consequence, this has allowed greater separation distance between the new build and the listed host dwelling and has allowed some trees to be retained to the rear of the dwelling.

However, the proposal remains unacceptable for a number of reasons as set out below:

- the dwelling would still fill virtually the full width of the site and would thus have a similar 3D presence when viewed from the Bridewell Street direction.
- the development would still clearly result in the foreshortening of the historic curtilage of the listed building.
- an entirely rendered finish creates a building of quite stark appearance within what is predominantly a brick and flint yard.
- This starkness would not be helped by the removal of the two trees at the front of the site which might otherwise have helped to provide some softening of the built form at the front of the site.
- With its prominent bargeboards and rooflights, the roofscape would have a suburban and more modern appearance

Overall, whilst the level of harm has been reduced by the revised scheme, it has not been removed. Any harm to heritage assets for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be weighed against any other material planning considerations or public benefits accruing from the proposals.

It is considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets and that there are no other material planning considerations or public benefits accruing from the proposals which would outweigh this harm. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies EN 4 and EN 8 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

In relation to the impact of the proposals on the historic environment, the Historic Environment Service (HES) advise that the site lies within the medieval town of Little Walsingham, probably founded in the 12<sup>th</sup> century by the Augustinian St Mary's Priory. 12 Bridewell Street may have 16<sup>th</sup> century origins, while the house immediately to the south of the proposed development (1-3 Common Place) is 15th century in date. Consequently, there is potential that buried heritage assets with archaeological interest will be present at the site and that their significance will be adversely affected by the proposed development. Whilst no objections are raised, if planning permission is granted, it is requested that this be subject to a programme of archaeological mitigatory work in accordance with Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The HES have provided a suitably worded condition to secure this.

### 3. Highways (Policies CT 5 and CT6)

In terms of the scheme as originally submitted, the highway authority had some reservations regarding the suitability of the site access to provide vehicular access in such close proximity to the pedestrian accesses beyond. However, it has also been confirmed that this is not within the adopted highway and therefore falls outside of their remit.

The highway authority also comments that the access onto Bridewell Street benefits from suitable visibility of oncoming vehicles, but that there is little provision for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users, however it is considered that an objection on this matter alone would be difficult to substantiate for a single dwelling.

In the light of the above, the highway authority confirmed that as the proposal does not affect the current traffic patterns or the free flow of traffic, they do not object subject to a condition relating to on-site car parking and turning area, provision and retention thereafter.

On that basis, the proposed development is considered to comply with the requirements of Policies CT 5 and CT 6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

### 4. Amenity (Policy EN 4)

Policy EN 4 requires that proposals should not have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers. In addition, Policy EN 4 requires an appropriate level of amenity area to be provided for new dwellings.

In addition, paragraph 3.3.11 of the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document states that private garden areas should be of adequate size and shape to serve their intended purpose. They therefore need to reflect the likely number of occupants within each dwelling and have an aspect which is substantially free from shading from trees and buildings during the year. It is recommended that the area of a plot given over to private amenity space should normally be no less than the footprint of the dwelling on that site.

A number of concerns have been raised by local residents in relation to the potential for adverse impacts by way of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of daylight and sunlight and noise and disturbance from increased vehicular movements associated with the dwelling.

One dormer window serving a bedroom and two rooflights serving bedroom 2 and the landing are proposed within the rear facing roof slope of the dwelling together with one first floor window also serving the landing. However, there would be a sufficient degree of separation between these

windows and No 18 to ensure that significant overlooking would not arise. In addition, there are a number of trees on the common boundary which are proposed to be retained.

A dormer window serving bedroom 1 and three rooflights serving two en-suite bathrooms and bedroom 2 are proposed within the front facing roof slope of the proposed dwelling which overlook Chapel Yard. It is not considered that significant overlooking would arise from these windows with respect to any nearby properties.

Whilst the proposal will undoubtedly affect the outlook from neighbouring properties, there is no private right to a view and it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts or that it would result in a significant loss of daylight or sunlight with respect to any nearby properties which would warrant a refusal on this ground.

Whilst the rear amenity area provided is relatively small and would also include retained trees which would result in some shadowing, on balance it is considered acceptable in terms of the requirements of Policy EN 4.

With regard to the concerns relating to potential for increased levels of noise and disturbance arising from the development, in particular in relation to vehicular traffic movements are noted, it is not considered that in normal circumstances the proposed development would give rise to an increased level of noise and disturbance likely to constitute a statutory nuisance or result in material harm to living conditions.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers which would warrant a reason for refusal which could be substantiated. An acceptable level of residential amenity would be provided for the future occupiers. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the requirements of Policy EN 4.

#### 5. Landscaping (Policies EN 2, EN 4)

The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and the Landscape Officer has been consulted. The Landscape Officer has commented that the scheme as revised now allows for retention of more vegetation; T5 and T8 lilac bushes and T9 Plum, all of which are sited to the rear of the proposed dwelling.

The Landscape Officer noted that T4 (Apple) was shown on one of the drawings but that this not correlate with the revised AIA. This has now been clarified and the T4 is proposed to be removed as set out in the revised AIA. In total, six fruit trees would need to be removed to facilitate the development - four plum trees and two apple trees. The report states two of the plum trees are unclassified due to poor condition and two are classified as having low amenity value, the two apple trees have also been classified as low amenity value. However, the report also acknowledges that overall, there is some visual amenity to adjacent properties and to the ecology of the immediate area of the village (courtyard) from the cumulative impact of the group of trees as a whole.

The revised AIA now includes some mitigation for the loss of the six trees which is an improvement and is appropriate given the mature age of some of the existing trees. Two new fruit trees and a selection of shrubs and climbers are proposed, all of which are located within the rear garden and will not make a wider amenity contribution. It is considered disappointing that revisions suggested by the Landscape Officer have not been incorporated into the revised plans. They were to realign

the building closer to either the west or the east boundary in order that some trees on the southern site boundary (that have wider amenity value by being visible from Bridewell Street when looking up Chapel Yard) would remain. The existing mature group of fruit trees are considered an intrinsic component of the character of the existing site some of which could be retained or replaced with new landscape planting as referred to below.

Whilst more vegetation (one tree and two large shrubs) is now shown as retained which does provide a small amount of ecological gain, there is little wider amenity value or public benefit as the vegetation is not in public view. The revised design will result in a hard edge to the new build on the most visible southern boundary with Chapel Yard. Even if it is not possible to retain existing trees on this boundary, a more modest size dwelling on a slight realignment would allow for new landscape planting (trees and climbers) to be accommodated in the southern part of the site which would soften the southern boundary and the frontage to Chapel Yard.

Whilst the revised design does now offer improvements on the original iteration, it is considered there remains scope to accommodate landscape mitigation that would be of wider amenity value and that further revisions could be made which would result in a build that is better assimilated within its plot and more successfully complements the intrinsic characteristics of Chapel Yard.

It is therefore considered that the application fails to satisfactorily accord with Policy EN 4 in terms of retaining existing important landscaping and natural features and providing appropriate mitigation and compensatory measures for the loss of trees which are considered to make a valuable contribution to the existing character appearance and setting of Chapel Yard.

## 6. Ecology (Policy EN 9)

The proposal is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment which concludes that there would be no significant impact on protected species and the results show the site as hosting a moderate potential for breeding birds. The fruit trees were deemed to be locally important for pollinators, so the species selection of two new fruit trees as mitigation for the loss of fruit trees is entirely appropriate. Its recommendations are appropriate and include low level external lighting and limiting timing of site clearance to avoid the bird nesting season. The enhancements proposed (bat tiles, bat box, bird nesting boxes and use of pollinator friendly plants in any landscape scheme) are also considered appropriate.

Subject to a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations and enhancements set out in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment, the proposal would accord with Policy EN 9 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

## 9. Conclusion

It is considered that the form of the development as proposed by way of its design, appearance layout, siting and materials would result in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets and that there are no significant public benefits which would outweigh this harm. As such the development would fail to accord with Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy EN 8 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

The proposed development by virtue of its design, appearance, layout, siting and materials is not considered to have proper regard to local context or preserve or enhance the character and quality of the area. In particular, the proposal would also result in the loss of trees at the front of the site resulting in a hard edge to the new build on the most visible southern boundary with Chapel Yard

and no proposals are included for appropriate compensatory landscape mitigation which would be of wider amenity value. As such the proposal fails to accord with Policy EN 4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Subject to no issues arising from re-consultation in relation to the amended plans **REFUSE** for the following reasons:

- In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority due to its design, appearance, layout, siting and materials the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets and as such would fail to accord with Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy EN 8 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy.
- The proposed development by virtue of its design, appearance, layout, siting and materials is not considered to have proper regard to local context or preserve or enhance the character and quality of the area. In particular, the proposal would also result in the loss of trees at the front of the site resulting in a hard edge to the new build on the most visible southern boundary with Chapel Yard and no proposals are included for appropriate compensatory landscape mitigation which would be of wider amenity value. As such the proposal fails to accord with Policy EN 4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy.

Final wording of reasons to be delegated to the Head of Planning.



## **APPEALS SECTION**

### **(a) NEW APPEALS**

**AYLMERTON - PO/19/1410 - Erection of 1 no. dwelling with associated access (outline with all matters reserved other than access); Land off Church Road, Aylmerton, NR11 8PU for Mr Richardson**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**BLAKENEY - PF/20/0293 - Variation of condition 3 of planning permission PF/19/0768 to remove the restriction that 2no. of the 6 no. caravans should be touring caravans; Grimes Caravan Site, Langham Road, Blakeney, Holt, NR25 7PR for J Bunn Homes (Blakeney) Ltd**  
WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**FIELD DALLING - PO/19/1249 - Proposed agricultural dwelling (Outline planning permission with all matters reserved); Strawberry Farm, Langham Road, Field Dalling, Holt, NR25 7LG for Sharrington Strawberries**  
INFORMAL HEARING

### **(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS – PROGRESS**

**HOLT - PO/18/1857 - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 110 dwellings with associated infrastructure to service 2 hectares of land potentially for a new Two Form Entry (2FE) primary school, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with main vehicular access point from Beresford Road and secondary pedestrian, cycle and emergency access from Lodge Close. All matters reserved except for means of access; Land off Beresford Road, Holt for Gladman Developments Ltd**  
PUBLIC INQUIRY 20 October 2020

**CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - ENF/18/0164 - Alleged further amendments to an unlawful dwelling; Arcady, Holt Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7TU**  
INFORMAL HEARING

**ITTERINGHAM - ENF/17/0006 - Annex which has permission for holiday let is being used for full residential purposes; The Muster, Land adjoining Robin Farm, The Street, Itteringham, Norwich, NR11 7AX**  
PUBLIC INQUIRY

(c) **WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND**

**AYLMERTON - PO/19/1410 - Erection of 1 no. dwelling with associated access (outline with all matters reserved other than access); Land off Church Road, Aylmerton, NR11 8PU for Mr Richardson**

**ERPINGHAM - PO/20/0100 - Outline planning application for eight (8no.) open-market dwellings (2no. 2-bed, 4no. 3-bed and 2no. 4-bed) and garages, and footpath to School Road, with all matters reserved except for highway / vehicular access.; Land to the south of, Eagle Road, Erpingham for Mr Alston**

**GIMINGHAM - PF/19/0870 - Two storey detached dwelling; Land adj to 1 Harvey Estate, Gimingham, Norwich, NR11 8HA for Mr Mayes**

**WIVETON - PF/19/0856 - Retention of an electronic communications base station without removing the existing 12.5m high monopole mast and attached transmission dish (as required by condition 5 of prior approval ref. no. PA/17/0681); Telephone Exchange, Hall Lane, Wiveton for Arqiva Limited**

**HIGH KELLING - ENF/16/0131 - Alleged Unauthorised Development and Recreational Activity; Holt Woodland Archery, Cromer Road, High Kelling**

**NORTH WALSHAM - ENF/18/0339 - Material change of use of the land for stationing of containers and jet washing of coaches, and a breach of condition as coaches are stored and manoeuvred outside the area details in the planning permission 02/0013; Bluebird Container Storage, Laundry Loke, North Walsham, NR28 0BD**

**RUNTON - ENF/20/0058 - Erection of a rear extension; The Thatched Cottage, The Hurn, West Runton, Cromer, NR27 9QS**

**WIVETON - ENF/18/0061 - Works not in accordance of permission- Telecommunications monopole not removed.; Telephone Exchange, Hall Lane, Wiveton**

(d) **APPEAL DECISIONS - RESULTS AND SUMMARIES**

**CLEY-NEXT-THE-SEA - PF/19/1893 - Installation of 3no. Pay and Display Machines (2no. in the visitor centre car park and 1no. at the Cley Beach Road car park); Cley Marshes Visitor Centre & Cley Beach Road Car Park, Coast Road, Cley-next-the-Sea, Holt, NR25 7SA for Mr Morrirt  
APPEAL DECISION:- APPEAL ALLOWED**

**DILHAM - PF/19/1565 - Erection of a two storey rear extension; 2 Ivy Farm, Honing Road, Dilham, North Walsham, NR28 9PN for Mr Paterson  
APPEAL DECISION:- APPEAL DISMISSED**

**HINDOLVESTON - PO/19/1751 - Erection of 2 no. dwellings with access (Outline application with all matters reserved other than access); Land off The Street, Hindolveston, NR20 5AW for Mr Macann  
APPEAL DECISION:- APPEAL DISMISSED**

**SWANTON NOVERS - PF/19/1366 - Demolition of outbuilding and creation of vehicular access and conversion of barn to residential dwelling; Barn at rear of, Dennisby House, The Street, Swanton Novers for Mr & Mrs Barnes  
APPEAL DECISION:- APPEAL DISMISSED**

**TRIMINGHAM - PF/18/2051 - Installation of 56 static holiday lodge bases, with associated access, services, veranda, car parking spaces and landscaping; Woodland Holiday Park, Cromer Road, Trimingham, Norwich, NR11 8QJ for Woodland Holiday Park  
APPEAL DECISION:- APPEAL DISMISSED**

(e) **COURT CASES - PROGRESS AND RESULTS**

No change from previous report.

This page is intentionally left blank