

DELEGATED REPORT

Appl. No : 2020/0962/D
Parish : Easton

Applicant's Name : Ms Alison Cornish
Site Address : Phase 1 Land South Of Dereham Road, Easton, Norfolk
Proposal : Reserved Matters for access, appearance, scale, landscaping and layout following Outline permission 2014/2611 (890 dwellings), for Phase 1 (Phases W and Z) comprising 291 dwellings and associated works including open space, sustainable drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks.

Recommendation : Approve subject to conditions
(Summary)

Proposal and site context

The application seeks approval of reserved matters for 291 dwellings and associated works including open space, sustainable drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks, following outline permission ref 2014/2611 for 890 dwellings, a village hall, shop and public open space, allotments with associated infrastructure and highway works on 40.01ha of land.

Approval was given in December 2019 ref 2019/1963 for approval of details required by Condition 33 of the outline relating to the requirement for a design code. The design code sets out the guiding principles and a range of design parameters to which this application relates.

A phasing plan approved with the outline application showed 7 areas of residential development and the current application relates to two of those described as Phase 1 (W and Z). The associated foul water pumping station and electricity sub-station was originally shown to the north of Dereham Road, in Phase T. This has been re-located to the main part of Phase 1 to the south of Dereham Road resulting in the loss of one dwelling. The description has been amended accordingly.

The site itself is located in the village of Easton to the south of Dereham Road. The primary access is from Dereham Road with a spine road running through the site and connecting on the west side to Bawburgh Road.

Relevant planning history

2013/2293	Scoping opinion for Easton village masterplan	EIA Required
2014/2611	The erection of 890 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works.	Approved
2019/1963	Discharge of condition 33 of outline planning permission 2014/2611 - Design Code	Approved

Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

NPPF 02 : Achieving sustainable development
NPPF 04 : Decision-making
NPPF 05 : Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF 06 : Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy and safe communities
NPPF 09: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 11 : Making effective use of land
NPPF 12 : Achieving well-designed places
NPPF 14 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 15 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Joint Core Strategy (JCS)

Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities
Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 12 : The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes
Policy 15 : Service Villages

South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) Development Management Policies

Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

Site Specific Allocations and Policies Easton Neighbourhood Plan

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
South Norfolk Place making Guide (2015)

Consultations (summarised - for full text and plans please refer to online comments)

Easton Parish Council

Original comments (7 July 2020):

- Easton Parish Council is unable to support this application as it fails to comply with several planning policies. We would ask that this application is Deferred permission until the matters listed have been addressed. Concern relating to the details of technical reports. Details approved under 2019/1963 have not been fully adhered to.

Additional comments (26 October 2020):

- Representation submitted through Hewitsons Solicitors on behalf of the Parish Council relating to its Public Sector Equality Duty As set out in section 149 of the 2010 Act (13 October 2020)

- Comments in relation to ecology details.

Comments on amended scheme (5 January 2021):

- The comments are the views, comments and objections expressed by Easton Parish Council in respect of the Planning Application (June 2020) presented by Persimmon Homes in planning application 2020/0962.
- While the Parish Council is pleased to see that Persimmon Homes have taken onboard a number of the concerns raised in our original response adopted by EPC on 6th July 2020.
- We are disappointed that they have failed to make reasonable adjustments in regard a number of key areas, as such it is our considered opinion that on balance, we must make the following statement. Easton Parish Council at this time continues to be unable to support this application as it fails to comply with several planning policies.
- We would ask that South Norfolk Council, as the Local Planning Authority, Deferred the determination this application until the matters listed have been addressed.

Comments on amended scheme (March 2021):

- We have provided detailed comments as to our concerns over this application and we note the comments of the LLFA and as such we accept their professional opinion in this matter however while design, in theory, may be acceptable. The practical living with the proposal may be a different matter and as such, we look to raise the following concerns with you for careful consideration and justification.
Safety of the basin areas:
- 1.1. Basin 1 is on route to Easton College and the new Special Educational Needs School as well as the existing Primary School. This area will need to be fenced to avoid the danger of standing water.
- 1.2. Basin 2 is next to a LAP and will need to be secured to avoid the danger of standing water.
- 1.3. Basin 3 is close to several frontages of residential homes and will need to be secured to avoid the danger of standing water.
- 1.4. Basin 4 does not meet Anglian water requirements. To say it may do in the future is in our opinion a poor excuse for not meeting their requirement at this time. This area will need to be fenced to avoid the danger of standing water.
- 1.5. We would request that a watching brief is insisted on concerning items 1.1 – 1.3 and should it be noted if standing water was to occur for more than 30 minutes after rainfall then safety measures will need to be implemented.
- 1.6. We would look for item 1.4 to be addressed by building to the current Anglian Water requirements at this time.
- 1.7. We would look for all Basins and swales to be managed by one single entity.
Swales:
- 2.1. We are concerned with the wording used by Richard Jackson Engineering Consultants which states:
- 'The consequences of failure will mean that excess water will flow down the highway to the low part of the site, which is unlikely to cause any damage or inconvenience'.
- 2.2. The word 'unlikely' does not provide comfort in this matter, as a village we have experienced the effects of flooding when the drains cannot cope.
- 2.3. The redesign of Swale 3 to include a trench of 2.5m will create more of a canal feel given its depth in that area especially if there is standing water.
- 2.4. How will safety be managed of the Swales have standing water?
- 2.5. Crate storage to the South of Swale 3 is a concern about long-term maintenance as well as its positioning under an unmade pathway and close to a LEAP.
Corner Plots Drainage:
- 3.1 We would request that a piped system around the outside of the building is the most suitable solution.
- Buffer Zones:
- 4.1. We continue to seek that the Buffer zones are established early to allow time to

establish and would look for this to form part of the planning consent.

- 5. Refuse Plan
- 5.1 We continue to have concerns as to some of the drag distances residents will face. We ask the council to justify any drag distance over 30m which is against current guidance.
- 5.2 The location of BCP 20 continues to be a concern as to its positioning so close to the front door of Plot 141.
- **B. We consider the application should be approved.**
- We hope that as part of the planning process, full consideration of all the points we have raised previously and relation to this amended consultation are fully considered and justified should they have to be balanced against the policies within the Easton Neighbourhood Plan and other local and national policies.
- Councillors review all applications by measuring this against the planning criteria contained within the 14 policies identified within the Easton Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, Section 12: Achieving well-designed places, states the importance of both high-quality buildings with design vision, plus effective engagement between applicants and communities affected by the development. Para 125 specifically identifies the role of the Neighbourhood Plan, where available, in reflecting local aspiration and shaping the design vision of any new scheme.
- C. There are no additional information/comments relevant to the consideration of the application.

District Councillor (Councillor Dewsbury)

Original comments (17 June 2020):

- This application should only be determined by the Committee as the local parish council has found several discrepancies which I agree should be scrutinised in public by a committee.

Comments on amended scheme (8 December 2020):

- The application can be determined by delegated decision.

Highways England

Original comments (30 June 2020):

- Offers no objection. This development is a little way off the strategic road network, the application is for agreement of layout, construction materials and other matters not agreed at outline stage and is unlikely to change traffic generations or result in other impacts upon the Strategic Road Network. The granting of this permission is therefore, unlikely to result in a severe impact upon the Strategic Road Network. Highways Act Section 175B is not relevant to this application.

NCC Highways

Original comments (7 August 2020):

- In relation to highways issues only, notice is hereby given that Norfolk County Council requests amendment / additional information be submitted.
- In addition to the above, with reference to the drainage strategy, whilst I have no objection in principle to the use of swales, soakaways and basins as proposed (subject to detailed design). The site has very variable characteristics, therefore additional infiltration testing will be required at the location of any feature to be adopted by the County Council.

Comments on amended scheme (29 January 2021):

- In relation to highway matters, I can confirm that subject to the minor points the County Council would have no objection to the revised layout shown on drawing EAS-PL01 rev D and therefore to the granting of reserved matters permission.

SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager

Original comments (5 August 2020):

- The 67 affordable homes comprise 22.95% of the 292 total dwellings in this phase. The tenure mix (85/15) complies with the S106 obligation.
- Overall, the package provides a good mix to meet a wide range of housing circumstances. The internal layouts and floorspaces are acceptable.
- On this basis, I have no objection to the application.

Comments on amended scheme (9 December 2020):

- I note that there is no change to the mix of affordable housing. Consequently, my comments of 5 August remain applicable, and I still have no objection to the application.

NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Original comments (9 July 2020):

- This is the detailed design of phase 1 which would inform any adoption application to third parties such as Anglian Water or Norfolk County Council Highways Authority. The general principles of the drainage strategy using SuDS is acceptable but details on how this will be implemented still need to be provided to ensure that a drainage scheme would meet the National Non – Statutory Technical SuDS standards. We welcome that shallow, vegetated SuDS have been incorporated into the design of this application. We are unable to recommend that the conditions Nos 35 and 40 of outline permission 2014/2611 are discharged at this time.
- We strongly advise specifically consulting the Environment Agency to establish if infiltration Basin 4 would adversely affect the closed landfill site to the north of Dereham Road.
- We note the comments of the Parish Council but emphasise that the surface water drainage has multiple benefits of having shallow green surface SuDS to manage flooding, increase biodiversity, amenity and water quality to waterbodies (including groundwater).
- We request further information to be submitted.

Comments on amended scheme (31 January 2021):

- The updated information provided by the applicant has been reviewed and although additional details have been provided there is still significant evidence missing to support a robust drainage strategy for this development.
- We are unable to recommend that conditions 35 and 40 of outline permission 2014/2611 are discharged at this time. We request further information is provided.

Comments on amended scheme (10 March 2021):

- The updated information provided by the applicant has been reviewed and sufficient information has been provided to clarify the concerns raised in our previous response (our ref. FW2020_0992) to support a robust drainage strategy for this development.
- We are able to recommend the discharge of conditions 35 and 40 of outline permission 2014/2611.

Natural England

Original comments (16 June 2020):

- Natural England has no comments to make on this application.
- Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.
- Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

Sport England

Original comments (12 June 2020):

- The proposed development does not fall within either our statutory remit (Statutory Instrument 2015/595), or non-statutory remit (National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Par. 003 Ref. ID: 37-003-20140306), therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response in this case, but would wish to give the following advice to aid the assessment of this application.

Comments on amended scheme:

- No further comments received

Senior Heritage & Design Officer

Original comments (22 July 2020):

- This is a reserved matters application and the overall layout generally follows that approved in the design code with good access to securely overlooked public space, clear and legible block structure and coherent road hierarchy. The main concerns are however with regard to density issues and the spacing of properties, car parking and provision of landscaping in lower order roads specifically how “the lanes” are handled. At present this looks cramped in some areas. Being the first phase this will have a bearing on how the rest of the estate will develop and I do not consider that the approach to ‘lanes’ is not compatible with the design code criteria.
- My principal concern at present is the density and concentration of units in the lane area of the phase. There is a lot of frontage car parking. The development quite a cramped and vehicle dominated environment. Landscaped trees are in tight spaces and it is questionable whether they will grow to maturity
- I note that the parish council’s concern at the measurement of garage widths and that this does not reflect County Council recommendations.
- Detailed comments also given on individual plots, design.
- Main areas of concern is the lane link and I consider this needs to be looked at in terms of house types, frontage landscaping and car parking arrangements. Although generally happy with the way the scheme has followed the design code with the rural, village and contemporary character areas it would be useful to have a materials plan which shows the materials and feature cladding etc for focal point buildings. Also require a plan with boundary treatments.
- Applicants should also be aware that Building for Life has now been updated with Building for a Healthy Life.

Further comments (27 July 2020):

- Further to previous comments I have been contacted by the parish council regarding commenting on the point they have made about the layout
- With south facing elevations I do not believe this is too much of an issue, however the gable end will be quite large to the west of the garden for 168 and quite over bearing – the unit could be moved forward, or a different unit type with shallower plan such as 170 – or it could be switched with 170.

Comments on amended scheme (3 February 2021):

- Some tweaks have been made to the layout in response to other comments from the Parish and Highways
- Detailed comments made on individual plots, design, car parking, shared surfaces, bin collection points and landscaping.
- Concern raised previously regarding the perception of a higher density in the middle of the area where there was a lack of landscaping and a lot of frontage parking. This has now been much improved.
- Public spaces are well overlooked and secure
- Throughout the scheme, although a relatively high density of housing has been achieved, building lines are varied with varied setbacks.
- In terms of character and identity, there are certain limitations due to the standard house types specified by a volume national housebuilder, however within these parameters changes in materials and detail are used to follow the three separate character areas as specified in the design code, and together with the identified key spaces/public spaces this will help to establish a

sense of place and some variety and character in the development. This is set out in the design code compliance document.

- In planning terms the scheme can generally be considered to be in compliance with the design code as set out in the submitted document.

Comments on amended scheme (March 2021):

- No further comments received

Historic England

Original comments (1 July 2020):

- Do not wish to offer any comments. Suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, and other consultees, as relevant.

Comments on amended scheme (8 December 2020):

- Do not wish to offer any comments.

NCC Ecologist

Original comments (8 July 2020):

- An Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan (Hopkins Ecology, May 2020) has been submitted in support of the discharge of Conditions 31 and 32 of 2014/2611, for Phase 1. The plan has been informed by updated ecological surveys. In 2019 the site remains largely unchanged from the baseline surveys in 2013/2014 although pond 3 which supported a moderate population of GCN in 2014 contained no newts in 2019.
- The plan is broadly fit for purpose but it is recommended that clarification is sought on drawing 9033-L-02 rev D as there appears to be several iterations – one which shows a native hedgerow along the eastern boundary (within the Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan (a), and one that does not (b).
- Conditions recommended relating to bird and bat boxes and requirement for work is in the Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan to be overseen.
- The applicant is also encouraged to incorporate hedgehog highways beneath the close board fences to permit the movement of hedgehogs across the entire site. The applicant should also be made aware that the roost in the Diocesan building is extant (2019/1400) as this should be taken into consideration with Phase 3 and 4.

Comments on amended scheme (2 November 2020):

- Comments relating to condition wording, amendments to plans, and inclusion of hedgehog gaps.

Comments on amended scheme (29 December 2020):

- I would recommend that; figures (e.g. for the % of bird and bat boxes/hedgehog gaps in para 3.16) are firmed up (i.e. 10% rather than ~10%) and that; where hedgerows are to be breached the width of breach should be specified for clarity (rather than saying "as small a breach as possible" (para. 3.12).
- Remedial action (e.g. replacement of dead trees) this should be undertaken within the next available planting season (para. 5.9)
- Please note paragraph 3.12 the Diocesan building also contains a BLE maternity roost (and soprano pipistrelle maternity roost) (see 2019/1400).
- The Landscaping Plans in Appendix 1 are not legible.
- In terms of ecological constraints (para 5.2) - The applicant/ecologist is advised that two possible badger setts have recently (December 2020) been found within the wooded belt within the ecological mitigation land between the application site and land identified for the SEN school. Their approximate locations are provided.
- I would recommend that a time limit on the validity of RM application/Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan is secured by condition as the plan is based on the results of ecological survey last undertaken in 2019, which have a limited lifespan. For example a moderate population of GCN were found offsite in 2014, but not in 2019. GCN

presence/absence varies year to year so in, for example, 3 years' time, they may well be present again and mitigation would be required.

- I would suggest that if works have not commenced by winter 2021/22 (at the latest) updated ecological surveys should be undertaken and the results submitted to the LPA and the validity of the Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan is reviewed.

Comments on amended scheme (26 January 2021):

- Ecological and Green Infrastructure Management Plan for the Discharge of Conditions 31 and 32 (ref. 2014/2611) (Hopkins Ecology, updated 22 January 2021). The report has addressed comments and is fit for purpose Conditions 31 32 for Phase 1 can be discharged from an ecological perspective.

Norfolk Police Liaison Officer

Original comments (19 June 2020 & 2 July 2020):

- There are no objections regarding the overall plans for road access into the residential development, the routes being visually open and where it is required to limit access to residents, the use of changes in road surface or narrowing of the carriageway have been incorporated.
- The scheme is also to incorporate a mix of dwellings, which will enable a greater potential for homes to be occupied throughout the day, this should assist with natural surveillance, community interaction and environmental control.
- Concerns raised relating to layout of amenity space, location of some communal areas. Comments in relation to some dwelling boundaries, shared paths, and rear parking courts.

Comments on amended scheme (2 July 2020):

- Comments relating to detail of; bin collection points, play facilities design and visitor parking, security during construction phase.

Comments on amended scheme (16 December 2020):

- No further comments.

Norfolk Constabulary (via NPS)

Original comments (25 June 2020)

- Central Government place great emphasis on the role of the Police. Furthermore, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) gives significant weight to promoting safe communities.
- Norfolk Constabulary have highlighted that this application represents a major proposal that will place significant additional pressure on police resources. This development, alongside other development proposals in the area, will place considerable strain on existing resources. Therefore, to address this, further investment will be required to enhance the capacity of the police (including with regard to recruitment, uniform / equipment and vehicles provision).
- Therefore this substantial application needs to address the impact on policing of the development in the context of NPPF advice, existing and emerging Development Plan policy (and CIL). This is to ensure that the developer contributes to the infra-structure required by the police to deliver a safe and secure environment and quality of life (and limit crime and disorder and the fear of crime) for future residents.

Comments on amended scheme

- No further comments received

Anglian Water Services Ltd

Original comments (30 June 2020):

- Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.
- The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Whitlingham Trowse Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.
- From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method

of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management.

Comments on amended scheme (22 December 2020):

- We have reviewed the applicant's submitted foul drainage strategy, flood risk documentation and surface water drainage information and consider that the impacts on the public foul sewerage network are acceptable to Anglian Water at this stage.
- We request that we are consulted on any forthcoming application to discharge Condition 35 and 42 of outline planning application 2014/2611.

Environment Agency

Original comments (2 July 2020):

- Environmental Permit: Part of the proposal area, specifically the small area of the proposed pumping station and surrounding landscaping to the North of Dereham Road, lies on top of a permitted closed landfill, Easton Pit (permit reference EAWML 71211 / EPR/YP3598NU), operated by RG Carter Ltd.
- The applicant is strongly advised to liaise with the permit holder in regards seeking a permit variation as undertaking works upon any part of the permitted landfill area without amendment of the permit closure plans would be in breach of the permit.
- The permit holder remains responsible for maintaining, monitoring and controlling activities in the aftercare phase for as long as required by their permit. This means until the permit is surrendered. The developer should note that it may be a number of years before this permit can be surrendered.
- Where developments are proposed on closed landfills, those developments must not compromise the operator's ability to manage and monitor their site in accordance with their permit.
- The applicant/LPA should also note that the permitted landfill site is known to be producing landfill gas. You should be aware of the potential risk to the development from landfill gas and should carry out a risk assessment to ensure that the potential risk is adequately addressed.
- Groundwater and Contaminated Land: Whilst no documents were supplied relating to land contamination or piling, we understand none of the highlighted issues appeared to specifically relate to Phase 1. However, our letter response to the original application of 21 January 2015 (ref: AE/2015/118702/01-L01), in particular the technical appendix and report reviews should be considered for the application as a whole and in particular, other phases.
- It is noted however that insufficient detail relating to the risk to groundwater was provided in the Richard Jackson Engineering Consultants Surface & Foul Water Reserve Matters Supporting Documents of 20 March 2020 (ref: 49120 Rev A). This document does not refer to the risk of pollution from the SuDS strategy to groundwater, which was discussed in our letter for the original application (ref: AE/2015/118702/01- L01). Please refer to the informative appended to this letter, which we expect to be addressed for all phases, including Phase 1. The surface water strategy has identified possible shallow groundwater but this needs further investigation, specifically in areas of proposed infiltration.
- Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) informative included with detailed information.
- Waste: Development in close proximity to activity regulated by an Environment Agency permit. New development within 110m metres of a permitted deposit for recovery site, 350m of a permitted recycling site, and 620m of a quarry could result in impacts including the nearby community being exposed to noise and dust. The severity of these impacts will depend on the time and duration of activities on these sites, the scale of operations within the sites and prevailing weather conditions. Environmental Permitting Regulations require operators to demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable precautions to mitigate impacts of their operations.
- If materials that are potentially waste are to be used on-site, the applicant will need to ensure they can comply with the exclusion from the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) (article 2(1) (c)) for the use of, 'uncontaminated soil and other naturally

occurring material excavated in the course of construction activities, etc...' in order for the material not to be considered as waste. Meeting these criteria will mean waste permitting requirements do not apply. Where the applicant cannot meet the criteria, they will be required to obtain the appropriate waste permit or exemption from us.

Comments on amended scheme

- No further comments received.

SNC Environmental Quality Team

Comments received (12 November 2020)

- The Acoustic Technical Memorandum produced by Adrian James Acoustics Ltd. assesses the impact of entertainment noise from the Norfolk Showground on the residents of Easton Phase 1. The Technical Memorandum uses the noise data obtained by AECOM during the 2014 Sundown Music Festival (arguably the loudest event currently held at the Norfolk Showground). Noise data obtained from the events noise consultant for the 2019 Sundown Festival (which I understood to have reached the maximum potential for the event to grow) has been used to validate the 2014 data.
- Whilst the Noise Council Code of Practice on Environmental Noise at Concerts (1995) is dated and identifies areas for further work, it is general considered the most appropriate guidance regarding noise from concert type events. The Code of Practice aims to strike a balance between the music noise levels required on site at a music event and level of the music noise at residents' premises. In particular, it allows the music noise to be clearly audible at residents' premises during the daytime in return for much quieter levels during the night-time when residents will be wishing to sleep (i.e. from 23:00). A review of this Code of Practice commenced last year and a new Code of Practice was expected to be published earlier this year which I was hoping to feed into this assessment. Unfortunately, the publication of the new Code of Practice is still awaited.
- The Acoustic Technical Memorandum produced by Adrian James Acoustics Ltd. concludes that the 2019 and 2014 noise data for the Sundown Festival indicate that the Music Noise Level at the proposed development would have met Noise Council Code of Practice on Environmental Noise at Concerts (1995) 2 suggesting that noise emissions from the Sundown Festival would not unreasonably impact on future residents of Phase 1.
- Whilst I would not disagree with the conclusions in the Acoustic Technical Memorandum produced by Adrian James Acoustics Ltd. we would recommend that where possible/practicable dwellings are orientated, designed and built to minimise the exposure of residents to noise from the Norfolk Showground e.g. Glazing units and vents to windows being of a type that offer a higher resistance to the passage of noise e.g. standard double glazing units a noise reduction factor beginning at around 36dB whereas units offering a noise reduction factor much higher than this are available. Having none habitable rooms located on the side of the dwelling facing the Showground.

SNC Landscape Architect

Original comments (18 November 2020):

- Proximity of dwelling at plot 14 and substation to RPA of T11 does not give sufficient working margin to guarantee the required tree protection.
- Potential shading issues at garden of plot 134, with whole area affected by shading pattern. This could result in on-going management pressures.
- Design code states that existing hedgerows that cross the Green Spine will be utilised to create natural pinch-points – landscape-led traffic calming approach, but this does not appear to have been done (e.g. near plots 51, 46, 8 & 88)
- Street tree provision does not appear to meet the minimum standards of the design code and much of that that is proposed potentially appears to be within private

areas (we need to have a plan show areas that are to be maintained as 'public realm', I would like to see some planting within the roadside verges as well as those set inside the cycle/foot paths; this style of planting is illustrated within the Design Guide.

- Some concern about species selection and positioning for trees within the corridor alongside existing dwellings (.e.g. Hornbeam may be too large in the long-term to be to the south of gardens).
- Note, on-plot planting is not yet fully-detailed, so this will need to be conditioned.

Comments on amended scheme (18 February 2021):

- I would like clarification, as I do not understand what has actually been done here; are all species with a mature height of 5metres removed? If so, why?
- Concerned that the selection of trees offered will not result in a sufficiently substantial landscape contribution for the scale of spaces in which they are proposed. The arrangement and distribution of species is quite eclectic, and there are very few ultimately large trees (this is also an issue within the public open spaces. Many of the chosen specimens are relatively small and shorter-lived species (e.g. the flowering cherries at the Dereham Road entrance. Whilst a formal avenue is not required, my view is that there could be benefit from more repetition along the spine route.
- My interpretation was that the road was to narrow in order to facilitate minimal loss of hedgerow and at the same time create a traffic-calming feature. There is no 'pinch point' as such on the scheme, so I would argue that this part of the Design Code is not met either.
- The AIA refers to ground protection, but it is not explicit what will be done
- I am concerned by the weak proposed treatment along the eastern boundary. I accept that a hedgerow within the gardens will be hard to maintain in the long term, but this will be the case too for the proposed fruit trees. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the fruit trees will provide the green effect that it desired along this key boundary, and to my mind does not meet the expectations of Code 4.2 (F) of the Design Code. Whilst I have no objection to fruit trees to be part of the on-plot planting offer, my view is that there is something more substantial here, to be useful both for a range of wildlife and for visual effect.
- Notwithstanding the submitted ecological and GI management plans, I consider that we need to have landscape management details for all the public realm landscape works. This will include all long-term operations and set out parameters for the ultimate sizes of hedgerows, new trees etc. I am happy for this to be a condition of the RM (not pre-commencement)
- The submitted details do not fully specify the proposed planting works, nor the on-plot planting – so we will need to condition these too

Comments on amended scheme (March 2021):

- No further comments received

Vision Norfolk

Comments received (5 January 2021):

- I am writing to advise that Vision Norfolk/NNAB (Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind) will be responding to the above in due course; unfortunately the pandemic and staffing issues have resulted in us being unable to comment in December. We will be in contact as soon as we possibly can.

Comments on amended scheme (March 2021):

- No comments received

NFBUK – The Voice of Blind People

Comments received (7 January 2021)

- The UK Government statutory Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee carried out a wide-ranging review of shared space forms of street design in June 2018, and looked into what it means for blind and a range of other disability groups. The Review is published on gov.uk , and it concluded, among other things, that shared space conflicts with the duty to adjust any built environment design to anticipate safe use by all blind and disabled people. See: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dptacs-position-on-shared-space>

- These findings have been taken on board by the government, with cancellation of its previous guidance about shared space, and public webinars for road design professionals drawing attention to the disability adjustment duty. In July 2020, a new requirement for all new cycle infrastructure schemes came into force, stating that they should be independently audited for access, covering both existing and proposed new features, and thereby ensure that no blind and disabled people are excluded from use of any street or public place as pedestrians.
- The Parish Council will be aware of new neighbourhood planning options for local communities to gain more control over how their localities are affected by local planning. The Planning Aid England charity can be asked by Parish or community groups if there are particular types of planning threat which they need professional help with. Enclosed is a copy of recent guidance issued by Planning Aid England on the general topic of required disability adjustments.

National Planning Casework Unit

- No comments received

Norwich & Norwich SEND Association (Nansa)

- No comments received

NCC Public Health

- No comments received

Norwich City Dementia Action Alliance

- No comments received

NHS England

- No comments received

SNC Environmental Waste Strategy

- No comments received

South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group

- No comments received

Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council

- No comments received

Equal Lives

- No comments received

Other Representations

1 letter of objection received, summarised as follows:

- 890 houses will almost double the size of the village and have a huge impact
- Roads cannot cope
- Will cause a significant increase in road traffic in the village and particularly along Marlingford Road, speed and noise concerns
- College traffic and HGVs should be controlled, and use the newer access road

Assessment

Following comprehensive feedback and input from South Norfolk Council and Easton Parish Council (EPC) during the application process, the application has been amended to reflect the comments and suggestions summarised in the first sections of this report. This has involved changes that assist in improving the site layout and detailed design, as well as taking in to account the impacts of the proposals on groups with protected characteristics as defined by the Equalities Act 2010.

Following these amendments and receipt of Easton Parish Council's further updated consultation responses and resident's comments, additional minor amendments have been made to the proposals to further update the application.

Key considerations

Having regard to the fact that the principle of residential development has been established by the outline approval and that the land is allocated for development, the following assessment focuses on the site specific planning issues and how the scheme complies with the requirements of the outline consent and development plan.

The Development Plan for the area comprises the National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy for South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich 2011 (amendments adopted 2014); the South Norfolk District Local Plan 2015; and the Easton Neighbourhood Development Plan (ENP).

The main issues for consideration of this application are:

- highways issues;
- layout and appearance;
- landscaping and open space;
- ecology;
- drainage;
- residential amenity; and
- Public Sector Equality Duties

Highways issues

The principle of the development being served off a number of roads; Church Lane off Dereham Road, Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Lane, was considered acceptable at the outline stage subject to a number of off-site highway and transport improvements. Subject to the development being carried out in accordance with these details and the conditions of the outline planning permission, the access arrangements continue to be considered acceptable.

With regards to the detailed road layout of the site, the Highway Authority have made a number of comments with regards to the technical specifications of the scheme to comply with highway standards. Following revisions, the Highway Authority have raised no objections to the application. Streets are now proposed in general accordance with the approved Street Hierarchy Plan as detailed in sections 3.6-3.9 of the design code, comprising a mix of Secondary Streets, Lanes and Shared Private Drives, served by the Green Spine Road.

Where shared roads and private drives are proposed, these have been amended to address comments in respect to the safety of potential user groups and concerns raised by EPC. Where it has not been possible to receive comments from the various user groups in relation to these, it is noted that the general position is that disabled groups, and other organisations representing people with disabilities, are generally not in favour of shared surface roads.

Having regard to the comments received and insight from the completion of an Equalities Impact Assessment, this has resulted in some of the shared surfaces being amended to include a carriageway with a single footway alongside the length of the road edge. Consequently, fewer shared surfaces are now proposed across this phase of the development than originally submitted.

Where shared surfaces are proposed these are on relatively short lengths of road, serving a limited number of dwellings. Having regard to this, and the road types proposed within the development, which have been designed to try and create a sense of place and also to encourage low vehicle speeds, it is considered that on balance the amended proposals satisfactorily address the previous concerns raised and have had due regard to the impacts of this proposal and on those groups with protected characteristics.

In respect of parking provision, amendments have been made in response to comments to ensure car parking is better integrated into the development. All dwellings are provided with off-street parking as required by the ENP, the majority of which are provided in direct association with the plots that they serve, either located to the side of dwellings with individual parking spaces and garages set back from the building line, or in parking bays in front and close to dwellings. Visitor parking is also provided and is located throughout the development. Whilst concerns have been

raised by EPC regarding the distribution and positioning of some of the visitor spaces, it is considered that on balance the distribution of car parking and visitor spaces is acceptable when having regard to the overall parking provision throughout the development which is considered to be in accordance with the Highway Authority standards.

In terms of garages and those that count towards parking spaces, it is noted that there remain some minor conflicts with regards to the sizes of garages (some being short by approx. 15mm in length and 45mm in width). Having considered this and taken into account the technical information received from the Highways Authority, I am satisfied that parking provision is acceptable in this regard.

Turning now to walking and cycle routes, these connect to the wider network of routes within the development. The location of new and enhanced walking and cycle routes provide connections beyond the site which were established as part of the approved outline consent.

In conclusion and having taken into account the technical information received from the Highway Authority and comments from EPC, I am satisfied that on balance the application accords with the requirements of policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Whilst some conflicts are noted with regards to the ENP, it is considered that on balance that the scheme as amended delivers an acceptable highways solution.

Layout, scale & appearance

Following ongoing negotiations with the applicant and EPC, additional information has been submitted that helps to explain how the scheme has responded to the original outline consent and approved Design Code.

The amended layout is now in general accordance with the approved block structure and density plan in the approved Code. Development blocks front on to the public realm and focal buildings are located in prominent locations/vistas throughout the development. The locations of the density parcels have been redistributed throughout the site through discussions with the Council's Senior Heritage and Design Officer and EPC. The lower density areas are positioned towards the periphery of the development and the existing open countryside beyond, transitioning to medium density and to higher density closer to the 'core' of the development.

The use of different building heights throughout the development helps to define streets and focal points in accordance with the approved Building Heights Plan.

The layout consists of three main character areas: Village, Rural and Contemporary. The development generally accords with these areas, the only departure being in the northeast corner of the development adjacent to the Pocket Park Area, which assists in maintaining the Pocket Park identity and the character of the shared private drive mews area adjacent to the eastern boundary.

In terms of the materials used within each Character Area, these are in accordance with those detailed in section 6.1 of the Code, consisting mostly of mix of red and buff multi stock bricks, render and cladding.

An assessment of the individual house types has been undertaken and the plans amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties. The position of house types and building lines has also been reviewed, which has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces, which is considered acceptable.

As noted above a combination of different parking types is proposed that ensures the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking and helps create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Where courtyard parking has been proposed, this has been kept to a minimum and is well overlooked and broken down with landscaping to help provide a high level of natural surveillance and enhance the character of the street.

With regard to bin storage, each dwelling has space within their rear gardens to store refuse bins for both convenience to the householder and to minimise visual detriment to the external street scene. The layout has been designed to provide each property with direct access from the rear gardens to either the adopted highway or to bin collection points. Where properties are accessed off private drives, bin collection points (BCPs) have been positioned where the private drives meet the adopted roads and are identified as paved areas intended for use on bin collection days only.

In response to concerns raised by EPC and Norfolk Constabulary regarding the placement of certain collection points and the distance between BCPs and the properties they serve, the locations of some of the bin storage areas and designated collection points have been amended. Whilst it is acknowledged that some BCPs continue to exceed guidelines in terms of drag distances, it is considered that on balance, the distances are acceptable when having regard to their general positioning and the fact that the vast majority of households will not need to carry refuse more than 30m to storage areas and that these are mostly within 25m of waste collection points.

Concerns have also been raised regarding 'bin blight' and BCPs becoming unofficial parking or dumping areas. The applicant has amended the positioning and design of some of these areas to try and overcome these concerns. BCPs are also designed so that they cannot accommodate a car, by virtue of their size and layout.

On balance, whilst acknowledging the concerns raised from EPC regarding whether bins will realistically be stored in rear gardens; drag distances and 'bin blight', it is felt that the scheme provides a satisfactory arrangement in the context of the requirements of the above policies. It is considered that to refuse this application on the grounds noted above could not be substantiated as reasonable grounds for refusal.

Overall, the scheme, as amended, results in a development with its own character that relates positively to its surroundings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 12 of the NPPF and policy DM1.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, as well as the requirements of the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD and ENP have been met. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals have been designed to comply with the principles of the approved Design Code.

Landscaping and open space

A landscape scheme has been received that address the original comments and questions raised by the Landscape Architect relating to the existing hedgerows that cross the Green Spine, street trees and the proximity of dwellings to Root Protection Areas. The updated plans and amended Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement have addressed these points and no further concerns are raised.

It is noted that some concerns have been raised by the Council's Landscape Architect with regards to replacing the mixed hedge along the eastern site boundary with fruit trees in rear gardens as set out above. The applicants rationale for replacing the hedge along this boundary with trees is that any hedge to be planted along this boundary would be located within the individual gardens and owned by numerous different people, making it difficult to ensure that the whole length of the hedge was managed consistently, or even retained, to ensure it remained as a continuous wildlife corridor.

The County Ecologist has considered the above reasoning and has no objection to the proposed treatment on this boundary from an ecological perspective.

Whilst not an ideal situation and noting the Landscape Architect's concerns, it is considered that the replacement of the hedge with fruit trees along this boundary will go some way to meeting the expectations of the Code 4.2 (F) of the Design Code and that the proposals are acceptable in this regard. Furthermore, it is considered that a hedgerow in this location would not necessarily add significantly to the existing boundary given it sits behind an existing landscape bund and to the rear of the site boundary.

As such it is considered that the landscaping plans generally correspond with the Code and that the Green Infrastructure Principles as established by the Landscape Framework Plan have been met.

It is noted that EPC continue to seek that the Buffer zones are established early to allow time to establish and would look for this to form part of the planning consent. Whilst this is supported, it is not considered appropriate to impose such a condition on this application, which will form part of the details under condition 44 of the outline consent.

With regards to the proposed planting works and detailed on-plot planting, the Council's Landscape Architect has requested further details of these to be conditioned as part of this application. As these details are required as part of Condition 44 of the outline consent, it is not considered necessary to add a further condition requiring these details. As such subject to details of both hard and soft landscaping works, including details of implementation, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority as part of Condition 44, the proposals are considered acceptable.

Notwithstanding the submitted ecological and GI management plans, the Council's Landscape Architect has recommended that a condition is added that requires details of landscape management for all the public realm landscape works. Given no such condition exists on the outline consent, it is considered appropriate that a suitably worded condition is added to this application, requiring long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas in the interest of the satisfactory appearance of the development, in accordance with Policy DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

In terms of open space, a Local Area of Play (LAP) is proposed to the north-west and planted informal open space incorporating SuDS with a second LAP to the south-west, which is connected through a Green Spine along the southern boundary to a Local Equipped Area of Play and public open space between proposed housing areas.

Play areas within the public open space are proposed with minimum distance buffer zones to the nearest dwellings in accordance with the approved Code. Further details for the play areas will need to be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of development in accordance with the S106 Agreement. The Parish Council's comments regarding being involved in the design of the formal play areas and their preferred supplier are noted.

It is considered that the proposal would accord with the aims of Policy DM3.15 and DM4.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 15 and the ENP.

Ecology

The ecology assessments required by the outline approval have been submitted with additional information in order to provide adequate assessment and management plans as part of this application.

The subsequent amendments and additional information received shows that the proposals are acceptable with regard to ecology and protected species.

The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the revised information and amended documents containing information in respect of the location of hedgehog holes within the development, are acceptable.

Therefore subject to the above, it is considered that the reserved matters application as amended is acceptable and would accord with the aims of the NPPF, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets and the ENP.

Drainage

In terms of surface water drainage, a package of measures was proposed at the outline stage to adequately control drainage within the site. The strategy was supported by the Lead Local Authority

(LLFA) subject to a condition requiring details of a surface water drainage scheme to be submitted as part of any reserved matters application for the phase to which it relates.

Following further updated information provided by the applicant to address missing evidence in support of the drainage strategy for the development, the LLFA have removed their objection and subsequently confirmed that the proposals are acceptable in terms of the overall surface water drainage strategy. As such the Council is satisfied that surface water drainage from the site is adequate to prevent flooding in accordance with the NPPF and SuDS Technical Standards.

The Lead Local Flood Authority notes the comments of the Parish Council regarding the shallow SUDS features and swales but has emphasised that the surface water drainage has multiple benefits of having shallow green surface SuDS to manage flooding, increase biodiversity, amenity and water quality to waterbodies (including groundwater). It is also noted that the application has widespread use of source control where possible and permeable paving on private drives, which also will manage roof water. This means that water is effectively managed close to where it falls to maximise the benefits to reduce flood risk to the area.

In terms of whether the features will hold water or not, these have been designed as shallow infiltration features with water draining through the surface.

In summary, whilst it is acknowledged that concerns have been raised by residents and the Parish Council regarding the drainage scheme and safety of some of the drainage features, it is noted that the LLFA considers that the above strategy provides an acceptable approach to surface water management in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and JCS Policy 1. As such it is considered that the proposals are acceptable in this regard.

Residential amenity

Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby resident's amenities or the amenities of new occupiers.

Having assessed the site layout it is considered that the development has been designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or adverse impacts in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties. Proposed properties are located an acceptable distance away from existing neighbouring dwellings to avoid any unacceptable loss of sunlight. In terms of the density, form and scale of development this is considered to be in accordance with the approved Code for the reasons set out in this report.

The design and position of the properties along the boundaries helps to minimise any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. In a similar way, where the development backs and sides on to existing properties it is felt that there is an acceptable distance between the existing properties and the proposed development.

With regards to the amenities of the future residents, the relative position of the dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity. Furthermore, gardens are of sufficient size and shape for their intended purpose are proposed and there is adequate space for on-site parking.

In terms of noise, an Acoustic Technical Memorandum has been submitted with the application which uses noise data obtained by AECOM during the 2014 Sundown Music Festival. The report concludes that the noise data would not unreasonably impact on future residents of the development. The Council's Senior Community Protection Officer has assessed the information and does not disagree with the conclusions in the Acoustic Technical Memorandum and has recommended that where possible/practicable dwellings are orientated, designed and built to minimise the exposure of residents to noise from the Norfolk Showground.

As such, subject to a condition requiring details of noise mitigation measures to be agreed in consultation with the Council's Senior Community Protection Officer, it is considered that the proposals comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity and the ENP.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)

An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken which has taken in to account the impacts of the proposals on groups with protected characteristics as part of the development proposals.

Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council has had due regard to the impacts of this proposal, in respect of layout, design and connectivity, on those groups with protected characteristics. It is considered that the benefits of this proposal outweigh any negative impacts.

Other considerations

Secured By Design

The scheme has been revised to address concerns raised by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer. Amendments relate to the location and positioning of bin collection points and car parking, as well as security and natural surveillance along shared pathways and between properties.

Where possible the layout has been revised to remove the rear parking courts. Where this has not been possible, the rear gardens of properties adjacent to the rear parking courts have 1.5m high fences with 300mm high trellis tops. In the case where two parking courts are positioned adjacent to each other, a landscape buffer has been introduced to prevent pedestrian movement between the two areas.

Norfolk Constabulary have raised security concerns around the creation of the green buffer between the proposed development and the existing village. The creation of this buffer was a result of the approved outline consent and subsequent Design Code. It is proposed that the buffer zone will be fenced to prevent access and suitably located locked gates will be provided to enable access for maintenance purposes. Having regard to the approved Code, these measures are on balance considered acceptable.

Together these measures are considered acceptable and are in accordance with 'Secured By Design' principles.

Condition 22 of outline consent

It is noted that the Parish Council has commented that Condition 22 of the outline consent ref 2014/2611 should be addressed as part of this reserved matters application.

Condition 22 is worded as follows:

"Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works above slab level shall commence on PHASES U, V, W, X, OR Y as set out in the approved phasing plan under condition 4 of this permission unless otherwise agreed in writing until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works as indicated on Drawing Nos:

SK01-TR-01 B (Sheet 1), SK01-TR-02 A (Sheet 2), SK01-TR-03 A (Sheet 3) and Drawing No: Figure 9.2 but EXCLUDING THOSE works along the frontage of Phase T or the road narrowing works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority."

The purpose of the condition is to ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.

As such, and given that the details of the highway improvements are not required to be submitted at this stage of the application process, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to require that this application addresses Condition 22 prior to the approval of this reserved matters application nor could this be substantiated as a reason for refusing this application.

Condition 22 will continue to be applicable as part of outline consent and will be addressed as part of the detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

The outline application to which this reserved matters relates was Schedule 2 development under the EIA regulations and was therefore accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion has been undertaken through the course of the application. Consideration has been given as to whether this reserved matters application as proposed would have any adverse impact on the environment. Having taken into account the selection criteria in the 2017 Regulations, it is considered that the development as proposed is not considered to give rise to any adverse impact on the environment.

Furthermore all potential impacts of the development as a whole were considered by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application. The main characteristics of the potential impact of the development for consideration are the physical scale of the development, increased traffic, noise, emissions to air and water. These impacts were fully considered with the submitted Environmental Statement for the outline application. There is no evidence to suggest that the delivery of this reserved matter application on this particular phase of the approved outline would increase the impact of the development on the environment over and above that already identified by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline. This reserved matters as proposed is not therefore considered to give rise to significant impacts and the reserved matters application itself is not EIA development and nor does it merit any amendments to the original Environmental Statement.

COVID as a material planning consideration

The need to support the economy as part of the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic is also a material consideration. This application will provide employment during the construction phase of the project, through the development itself and future occupiers will also contribute to the local economy e.g. when maintaining and servicing their properties and spending in the local area. This weighs in favour of the proposal.

Financial considerations

Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Conclusion

The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent.

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout and is consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

All matters relating to residential amenity, design, layout, landscape, drainage, ecology, highways and residential amenity are considered therefore considered acceptable.

It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission continue to be applicable and will require to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s which the Local Planning Authority has full control over.

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the development plan and all material planning considerations, which include the NPPF, JCS, and South Norfolk Local Plan, Easton Neighbourhood Development Plan and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

- 1 - In Accordance with Outline Permission
- 2 - In accord with submitted drawings
- 3 - Landscape Management Plan
- 4 - Noise mitigation

1. In my opinion, this proposal satisfies the scheme of delegation (effective from 01.06.15) and does not need to be reported to committee.
2. All periods of publicity (Site Notice, Press Notice and Consultee response time limits) have expired.

Case Officer: Chris Watts

Authorised Ben Burgess

Dated : 17 March 2021

Officer:

Dated: 17/03/2021