

**THURSDAY, 15 AUGUST 2019**

Minutes of a meeting of the **Development Committee** held in the Council Chamber - Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer, NR27 9EN at 9.30 am when there were present:

**Councillors**

Mrs P Grove-Jones (Chairman)  
Mr P Heinrich (Vice-Chairman)

Mr D Baker  
Mr P Fisher  
Mrs W Fredericks  
Mr N Lloyd  
Mr N Pearce  
Mr A Varley

Mr A Brown  
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett  
Mr R Kershaw  
Mr G Mancini-Boyle  
Dr C Stockton

**Officers**

Rowson, Head of Planning  
Mr N Doran, Principal Lawyer  
Mr G Lyon, Major Projects Manager  
Mrs S Ashurst, Development Manager  
Westlake  
Ms C Dodden  
Mr B Fraga da Costa  
Witton, Landscape Officer  
Mortimer

L Yarham, Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Regulatory)

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**26 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBER(S)**

None

**27 MINUTES**

The minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 11 April 2019 and 18 July 2019 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

**28 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

| <u>Minute</u> | <u>Councillor:</u>  | <u>Interest</u>                |
|---------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 35            | Mr J Punchard<br>(attending as local<br>Member for minute 34) | Pecuniary interest – applicant |

30

**BACONSTHORPE - PF/18/1921 - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL TO TENT-ONLY CAMPSITE FOR A MAXIMUM OF 63 UNITS OF TENTS-ONLY CAMPING WITH ASSOCIATED ELECTRIC HOOK-UP POINTS. CHANGE OF USE OF PART OF THE EXISTING CAMPSITE TO CREATE A WILDFLOWER MEADOW. USE OF PART OF THE EXISTING AGRICULTURAL FIELD FOR WILDFLOWER MEADOW. ERECTION OF 6 CAMPING PODS. RETROSPECTIVE ERECTION OF CAMP SITE RECEPTION/SHOP BUILDING, SHOWER AND WASH-UP BLOCK, TWO TOILET BLOCKS, UTILITY BLOCK AND CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA. [RE-CONSULTATION: AMENDED LAYOUT PLAN AND REVISED DESCRIPTION]; BACONSTHORPE MEADOWS CAMPSITE AT, PITT FARM, THE STREET, BACONSTHORPE, HOLT, NR25 6LF FOR A V YOUNGS FARMS LIMITED**

The Committee considered item 7 of the agenda.

Public Speakers

Objecting: Peter Cope, Valerie Purkiss, Sally Peel and Ben Dowman

Supporting: Nick Moyes

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report. He reported that two additional letters of representation had been received reiterating concerns previously raised by members of the public. He displayed plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area, and a map showing the location of nearby residential dwellings. He recommended approval subject to conditions. For clarification, he confirmed that the overall maximum number of people staying on the site would be 264, and that the applicant had requested 23 pitches in the western field and 40 in the eastern field.

Councillor P Bütikofer, the local Member, supported this application. He considered that by allowing two areas of wildflower meadow the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. He considered that it was important to note that Environmental Health had no recorded complaints in relation to the existing use of the site prior to the application, and that the proposed conditions would address the concerns which had been raised. He considered that the proposed extension was modest and would strengthen the tourist offer in that part of the District.

Councillor Dr C Stockton referred to the history of the site in terms of complying with conditions. He requested that the conditions should be unambiguous and that the applicant should be told that they would be enforced. On this basis, he proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor P Heinrich requested that the meaning of “tents only” should be clearly defined and there should be no folding campers, caravans or motor homes on the site. He seconded the proposal.

The Head of Planning confirmed that an informative note could be added to expand on condition 3.

Councillor N Lloyd asked for assurances that the conditions would be met. He requested that a requirement for recycling be added to condition 15.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that submission of details in respect of recycling would need to be agreed in advance of permission being granted. The condition would not be discharged unless it had been properly addressed. He stated that the Enforcement Team had not been notified of any particular breaches in the past but the application had highlighted problems. Any complaints would be investigated.

The Major Projects Manager added that it was important that conditions were clearly articulated for the benefit of the applicant and local residents and confirmed that this would be done.

Councillor N Pearce asked how the Committee could be kept informed regarding adherence with the new conditions and given assurance that further breaches would not occur.

The Head of Planning stated that no breaches had been reported to the Combined Enforcement Team. Conditions would need to be clearly worded, enforceable in law and clearly understood by all parties. Any reported breaches would be investigated, enforced and the complainants kept informed.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett referred to a request by the applicant to remove condition 17 which required the removal of stones from the roadway. She was concerned that the roadway would become a quagmire in a storm event.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the removal of the stones was to preserve residential amenity. The roadway was hard surfaced below the gravel layer.

Councillor D Baker stated that the site was a natural campsite which was quiet. The applicant was proposing a modest extension which would be mitigated by a wildflower meadow. He did not consider that it would have a huge detrimental impact on the local residents. Many conditions were being proposed, but he considered that condition 17 was unnecessary and should be removed.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle asked if the Highway Authority considered there would be an impact from extra traffic leaving the site on changeover day.

The Highways Officer stated that there could be a conflict if all vehicles left or arrived at the same time, but leaving and arrival tended to be staggered and it was unlikely that all vehicles would leave at the same time.

It was proposed by Councillor D Baker and seconded by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett that condition 17 be removed. On being put to the vote, the motion was declared lost with 3 Members voting in favour and 10 against.

It was proposed by Councillor Dr C Stockton, seconded by Councillor P Heinrich and

**RESOLVED** unanimously

That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application subject to the imposition of conditions listed in the report and any other conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning.

31 **EAST BECKHAM - PF/19/1009 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 OF PLANNING PERMISSION PF/15/1486 (A VARIATION OF PF/13/0772 FOR INSTALLATION OF A 10.15MW SOLAR DEVELOPMENT) TO EXTEND THE MAXIMUM OPERATIONAL LIFETIME OF THE SOLAR FARM FROM 25 YEARS TO 40 YEARS; SOLAR FARM, CHURCH ROAD, WEST BECKHAM, HOLT, NR25 6NX FOR HALL SOLAR LTD**

The Committee considered item 8 of the agenda.

Public Speaker

Philip Saunders (supporting)

The Major Projects Manager presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. He reported that the applicant had agreed to undertake further work in respect of the ecological conditions. He recommended delegated approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor P Bütikofer, the local Member, stated that he had no objections to the application.

Councillor N Pearce referred to the climate emergency and considered that this site was well placed. Provided there was to be no external lighting, he proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor N Lloyd seconded the proposal. He expressed disappointment that the biodiversity reports had not been forthcoming but understood that they would be provided.

Councillor Dr C Stockton requested clarification with regard to CCTV which had been approved under condition 4 of the previous application.

The Major Projects Manager explained that CCTV cameras were situated around the perimeter of the site for security purposes.

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application subject to**

- **emonstration by the applicant that the approved Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Scheme and Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan for the site is meeting its stated aims or, in the event this is not possible within a reasonable timeframe, to include the imposition of a planning condition to secure further biodiversity improvements on site through an updated Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Scheme and Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan LEMP with an additional monitoring period and**

•

he conditions listed in the report and any other conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning.

32 **RAYNHAM - PF/19/0893 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 4 OF APPLICATION REF: PF/13/1166 (INSTALLATION OF 49.9MW SOLAR FARM WITH PLANT HOUSING AND PERIMETER FENCE) TO EXTEND THE OPERATIONAL LIFETIME OF THE DEVELOPMENT FROM A MAXIMUM OF 30 YEARS TO 40 YEARS.; SOLAR FARM, BLENHEIM WAY, WEST RAYNHAM, FAKENHAM, NR21 7PL FOR WEST RAYNHAM SOLAR LIMITED**

The Committee considered item 9 of the agenda.

Public Speaker

Philip Saunders (supporting)

The Major Projects Manager presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. Confirmation was awaited from the applicants with regard to additional contributions but it was understood that they had no objection. The applicant was willing to carry out additional work with regard to biodiversity. He recommended delegated approval of this application as set out in the report.

The Major Projects Manager reported that Councillor N Housden, the local Member, supported this application, including the added conditions with regard to biodiversity, and continuing contributions to the benefit fund.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett, seconded by Councillor N Lloyd and

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application subject to**

- the completion of a S106 Obligation or Unilateral Undertaking to secure an additional £13,000 heritage contribution to be used for the purposes set out in the report;
- demonstration by the applicant that the approved Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for the site is meeting its stated aims or, in the event this is not possible within a reasonable timeframe, to include the imposition of a planning condition to secure further biodiversity improvements on site through an updated LEMP with an additional monitoring period and
- the imposition of conditions as listed in the report and any other conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning.

33 **TRIMINGHAM - PF/18/2051 - INSTALLATION OF 56 STATIC HOLIDAY LODGE BASES, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, SERVICES, VERANDA, CAR PARKING SPACES AND LANDSCAPING [RECONSULTATION - AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 10/06/2019]; WOODLAND HOLIDAY PARK, CROMER ROAD, TRIMINGHAM, NORWICH, NR11 8QJ FOR WOODLAND HOLIDAY PARK**

The Committee considered item 10 of the agenda.

### Public Speaker

James Harrison (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Developments) presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including photographs from a number of viewpoints. He recommended refusal of this application for the reasons stated in the report.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that she would speak as local Member but would not vote on this application as she had known and been friends with the applicant for many years. She commented that the report referred erroneously to "Blackberry Hall Cottage" whereas the property was "Blackberry Hall Farm". She stated that the holiday park was a top class holiday park which extended its facilities to local residents. The bar and restaurant were used by the Authority for tourism events. Woodlands Holiday Park had signed up to be an ambassador for the Deep History Coast project. However, she had concerns as the Council's representative on the AONB Partnership. It was necessary to balance the economic and social needs with the Council's duty to protect the AONB, and following lengthy negotiations she considered that the application could be approved. The applicant had agreed to screen the site with trees no less than 10 years old and to replace any that failed. Power cables would be buried where they crossed the site which she considered to be a planning gain. She considered that the application should be approved with conditions relating to screening and lighting, and that it would bring social and economic benefits to the east of the District.

Councillor P Heinrich requested further details of the proposed planting.

The Landscape Officer stated that the applicant had not supplied details of the size and nature of the planting. An indicative plan had been submitted showing where the woodland would be sited. She explained that there could be a problem if the entire woodland was planted with 10 year old trees given the rate of failure for such trees. Whips would establish more readily into the landscape.

Councillor P Heinrich stated that he could see the economic benefits of the scheme. However, he was not convinced that the proposed mitigation would screen the site sufficiently to prevent damage to the AONB for many years to come. He proposed that the application be refused as recommended.

Councillor N Pearce seconded the proposal.

Councillor A Varley asked for an explanation of exceptional circumstances and why this application was not deemed as such.

The Major Projects Manager explained that exceptional circumstances related to developments which were in the wider or national interest which might outweigh AONB policy. He acknowledged the economic benefit in this case but this was not considered sufficient to outweigh AONB considerations.

Councillor A Varley considered that the proposal was an exceptional circumstance in that the applicants were investing in the local economy, removing overground power cables and wanted the AONB to retain its qualities. He considered that the application should be approved with strict conditions relating to the planting of mature trees and the applicants working with the Landscape Officer.

Councillor N Lloyd congratulated the operators on how the site was run and laid out. The existing site could not be seen from many viewpoints. However, the new proposal would be visible and there was a need to protect the AONB or tourists would not visit. He could not support the proposal.

**RESOLVED** by 7 votes to 5 with 1 abstention

**That this application be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**

34 **FAKENHAM - PF/19/0729 - DETACHED CARTSHED AND STORE TO FRONT OF PROPERTY; 21 JUBILEE AVENUE, FAKENHAM, NR21 8DG FOR MR & MRS ANTHONY**

The Committee considered item 11 of the agenda.

The Planning Officer stated that the Human Rights section of the report was incorrect and should refer to refusal.

The Planning Officer presented the report. He displayed plans, including visualisations of the proposed building, and photographs of the site and surrounding area. He recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

The Development Manager read to the Committee a supporting statement from the applicants' agent.

Councillor J Punchard, a local Member, referred to two cartsheds of similar style and size which had been erected nearby. Photographs of the structures were displayed at the meeting. He did not support the recommendation.

Councillor N Lloyd asked if there were preferable materials for this application.

The Planning Officer explained that the proposed materials were considered to be more appropriate for a rural location and would transform the character of the street. The position of the structure would have an increased impact on the street scene and would contrast with the front of the existing dwelling.

The Development Manager explained that the main issue was the scale of the proposed cartshed, which was considered to be excessive. A smaller structure in brick to tie in with the existing dwelling would read as one palette of materials but the contrasting materials proposed would be prominent. However, the Committee had to determine the proposal as submitted.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett supported the Development Manager's comments. She considered that the cartsheds referred to by Councillor Punchard receded into their surroundings but the proposed building was too large and the materials did not tie in with the setting. She proposed that the

application be refused as recommended.

Councillor A Varley asked if the buildings referred to by Councillor Punchard had been approved and what the reasons were for doing so.

The Development Manager explained that Officers had not looked into whether the buildings were granted planning permission or if they had been erected under permitted development rights. The materials and scale of the buildings appeared to recede and the materials reflected the dwellings.

Councillor A Varley seconded the proposal for refusal.

Councillor N Pearce asked if the planning status of the two cartsheds could be confirmed. He considered that the proposed structure was excessive.

Councillor D Baker supported the recommendation. He considered that the proposal was inappropriate and out of character with the road. He commented that the photographs of the existing cartsheds clearly showed substantially different properties of a different scale and size.

Councillor Dr C Stockton considered that the purposes of the building could still be achieved if it was reduced in height and in materials to match the existing house.

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That this application be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**

**35 FAKENHAM - PF/19/0787 - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; 151 HOLT ROAD, FAKENHAM, NR21 8JF FOR MR PUNCHARD**

With the agreement of the Committee, Councillor Punchard remained in the Council Chamber during consideration of this application.

The Committee considered item 12 of the agenda.

The Planning Officer presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. He recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor N Pearce wished to place on record his congratulations to the Planning Department on the clarity of the applications, which he considered were improving at each meeting.

It was proposed by Councillor N Pearce, seconded by Councillor A Varley and

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That this application be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**

**36 LITTLE SNORING - PF/19/0404 - ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING; 3 PANTILE COTTAGES, KETTLESTONE ROAD, LITTLE SNORING, FAKENHAM, NR21 0JQ FOR MR R G DEARY**



The Committee considered item 13 of the agenda.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and stated that Little Snoring Parish Council supported this application. She displayed plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area. She recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

The Chairman considered that although the proposal was outside the development boundary, it was well tucked in, there was another development of 8-10 dwellings adjacent to the site and the proposal appeared to be a sensible addition. The Council was moving towards a new Local Plan which would consider appropriate infill development.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee that the existing Local Plan was the most important primary document and weight should be given to it and to the NPPF. The emerging Local Plan was in an early draft stage and had very limited weight. The relevant consideration in this case was the sustainability of the proposal and its relationship to existing development.

On the Chairman's proposal it was

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That this application be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**

**37 APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION**

None.

**38 APPEALS SECTION**

**(a) NEW APPEALS**

The Committee noted item 15(a) of the agenda.

**(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS**

The Committee noted item 15(b) of the agenda.

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

The Committee noted item 15(c) of the agenda.

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

The Committee noted item 15(d) of the agenda.

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

The Committee noted item 15(e) of the agenda.

**39 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The meeting closed at 12.20 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN  
Thursday, 12 September 2019