

5 DECEMBER 2019

Minutes of a meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am when there were present:

Councillors

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

Mr A Brown
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

Mr N Dixon – Hoveton & Tunstead Ward

Officers

Mr P Rowson – Head of Planning
Mr N Doran – Principal Lawyer
Mr D Watson – Interim Development Manager
Ms E Capps – Environmental Protection Manager
Mr A Curran – Senior Planning Officer
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor D Baker. There were no substitute Members in attendance.

74 MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 7 November 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

75 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

76 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

77 BEESTON REGIS - PF/19/1315 - ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY DWELLING; LAND TO THE REAR OF, 4 MEADOW COTTAGES, BEESTON REGIS, SHERINGHAM, NORFOLK, NR26 8EX FOR MRS BARNES

The Acting Development Manager presented the report and displayed plans, visualisations and photographs of the site. He also presented a map showing the extent of the Scheduled Ancient Monument designation and the relationship of the site to it. He recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett expressed concern regarding the loss of trees. She considered that the landscaping conditions in the report were vague and requested a condition to retain the trees.

The Acting Development Manager explained that the report listed a bulleted summary of the conditions only and not the full wording. No landscaping conditions had been attached to the previous appeal decision.

Councillor N Lloyd asked why the previous permission which had been granted on appeal had not been developed and expressed concern that the application would come before the Committee again in the future if not built. He considered that the proposed dwelling was out of character but noted that the argument had been overruled by the Inspector. He asked whether the delay had rendered the previous permission void.

The Head of Planning explained that the planning policies had not changed since the previous permission and the Local Planning Authority was bound by the Inspector's decision. The only material change had been the designation of the Scheduled Ancient Monument but this did not impact on the site. Planning permission granted by the Inspector's decision had expired and a new application had been submitted. He considered that, on the balance of probabilities, an appeal against refusal of this application on the same grounds would have the same outcome. The Government had now reduced the time limit for implementation of planning permission from five years to three in order to speed up the planning process.

The Chairman invited the Applicant, who was present but had not registered to speak on this application, to explain why the previous permission had not been implemented.

The Applicant explained that the development had not been carried out due to her husband's sudden illness and subsequent death prior to being able to commence the development, which is why she did not proceed.

It was proposed by Councillor P Heinrich, seconded by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED unanimously

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

78 **BLAKENEY - ADV/19/1297 - ERECTION AND DISPLAY OF 1 X ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGN AND 1 X ILLUMINATED HANGING SIGN; 5A THE GRANARY, HIGH STREET, BLAKENEY, HOLT, NR25 7AL, FOR THE BLAKENEY COTTAGE COMPANY**

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

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that she was Vice-Chairman of the Norfolk Coast Partnership which promoted the AONB. She proposed refusal of this application as recommended.

Councillor A Brown seconded the proposal. He considered that the illumination would make the site much more visible from the coast and would set a precedent.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle considered that the sign was acceptable without illumination. He suggested that the light could be kept switched off.

The Head of Planning explained that the applicant did not wish to withdraw the illumination and the application should be determined as submitted.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

79 **BLAKENEY - LA/19/1560 - EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO FACILITATE 1 X ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGN AND 1 X ILLUMINATED HANGING SIGN; 5A THE GRANARY, HIGH STREET, BLAKENEY, HOLT, NR25 7AL, FOR THE BLAKENEY COTTAGE COMPANY**

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and displayed plans and photographs as shown under ADV/19/1297 above. He explained that this application related to the impact on the listed building only and not its impact on the wider AONB and Conservation Area. In this case, the application was recommended for approval, but the refusal of ADV/19/1297 meant the applicant could not undertake the work unless advertisement consent was obtained.

The Principal Lawyer explained that although the two recommendations appeared to be inconsistent, they considered separate matters and approval of both was necessary in order for work to proceed. Application ADV/19/1297 related to the impact of the proposal on the AONB, Conservation Area and street scene. Application LA/19/1560 considered the impact on the Listed Building. It was consistent and logical to refuse advertisement consent based on the impact on the wider area, but to approve the current application on the basis that the impact on the listed building was not so significant as to justify refusal.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett considered that the signs were attractive but should not be illuminated. She proposed approval of this application, which was seconded by Councillor P Fisher.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

80 **HOVETON - PF/19/1335 - ERECTION OF DETACHED CHALET BUNGALOW; 1 THREE ACRE CLOSE, HOVETON, NORWICH, NR12 8QL FOR MR BUNTING**

The Acting Development Manager presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. He also displayed a plan of the approved scheme for the adjacent industrial estate and a plan indicating the character of the area and location of the site in context with the remainder of Three Acre Close. He referred to the conditions which had been imposed on boat building operations on the industrial estate. He recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

The Environmental Protection Manager explained that no concerns had been raised

in respect of noise on the basis of a search of the complaints database. No complaints had been received in respect of noise but there had been a previous complaint regarding odour. The complaint had been investigated but no formal action had been required. The Officer response to consultation on this application had been based on a previous noise survey which had been carried out in respect of an application for 28 homes at the northern end of the site. One of the monitoring points for the noise survey had been in a garden on Three Acre Close and no impact had been shown.

The Acting Development Manager read to the Committee the comments of the Economic Development team, which expressed concern that the proposal could constrain the development of the industrial site and prejudice future uses.

The comments of Councillor N Dixon, a local Member, had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting. Councillor Dixon was in attendance at the meeting and presented his comments in person. He expressed concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site, given the subdivision of one of the smallest plots in Three Acre Close and resulting creation of two properties which were visibly out of proportion and character with neighbouring dwellings. He considered that this would not comply with NPPF Section 12 or Core Strategy policies HO1, EN2 and EN4, or support the need to retain a diverse range of housing stock in Hoveton. He expressed concern that the noise assessment referred to by the Environmental Protection Manager did not take into account the noise and vibration impact of all traffic passing close to the proposed dwelling along the new access road, which could only be determined by a new assessment once the road had opened. He stated that at least three businesses on the industrial estate routinely operated extended hours. He considered that the Environmental Protection comments were unreliable as its complaints log was incomplete. He had provided evidence of noise and odour complaints made by residents adjoining the industrial estate which had not been recorded on the log. With regard to economic development issues, the Economic Development team had highlighted the problems of residential development around industrial/employment sites in terms of operating constraints and reduction in the range of future uses and operating hours. He stated that Hoveton was very short of employment land options and the potential of the Tilia site should not be harmed by the proximity of new residential development. He considered that the proposal did not comply with Local Plan policies SS4 and EN13. He requested refusal of this application.

Councillor G Mancini-Boyle, a local Member, stated that he could not understand why anyone would want to build a dwelling so close to the industrial estate. He did not support the application.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett requested confirmation that the site was not within a flood zone.

The Acting Development Manager stated that the site was in Flood Zone 1 which was the lowest risk.

Councillor N Pearce was concerned that the Council could set a considerable precedent if this application were approved given the location of the industrial site, the size of the plot in a very secluded area and bearing in mind Councillor Dixon's comments.

The Head of Planning advised the Committee with regard to balancing the issues on the basis of the evidence put forward. Whilst he appreciated the concerns put

forward by Councillor Dixon, Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of layout, design and environmental health considerations.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor Dr C Stockton regarding the reasons for the removal of permitted development rights for further extensions, the Head of Planning explained that the condition related to the small size of the plot and was not reflective of amenity or disturbance.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett proposed approval of this application as recommended. She considered there were no planning reasons to refuse this application. Although she considered that future residents were likely to make complaints, it would be their choice as to whether or not to buy the dwelling.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor P Fisher.

On being put to the vote, 6 Members voted in favour and 6 against, and on the Chairman's casting vote it was

RESOLVED

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

Following the vote, Councillor N Pearce referred to the complaints log and raised concerns that the matter had been decided with incomplete information.

The Environmental Protection Manager explained that all complaints were registered on the database and updated with information relating to them. She did not consider that the database was incomplete and it was possible that complaints were made direct to the companies concerned.

Councillor Dixon responded that he had evidence of complaints being made to the Council and expressed concerns regarding the reliability of the complaints database.

The Chairman requested that the Environmental Health department take on board the concerns raised.

81 **LANGHAM - PF/19/0667 - CHANGE OF USE OF OUTBUILDING FROM USE AS FORMER GLASS FACTORY AND TOURIST ACCOMMODATION TO PURPOSES ANCILLARY TO THE USE OF THE ADJACENT BUILDINGS AS HOTEL (C1); SHED TO NORTH (ADJACENT TO ENTRANCE TO HOTEL), GLASS BARN, NORTH STREET, LANGHAM FOR PROWESS LTD**

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Councillor R Kershaw had called in the application due to the principle of the development. This information had been omitted from the report. He presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. He pointed out a slight discrepancy from the approved plans in terms of the position of the door and window facing North Street, but this was a minor alteration. He clarified that the Economic Development team considered that the proposed rent and details submitted were sufficient and the shop was not an attractive proposition, given the limited size of the unit and availability of online shopping and nearby shopping facilities.

The Senior Planning Officer recommended approval of this application as set out in the report and subject to additional conditions to require no deliveries to be made

from the main street, no external plant or machinery to be used in connection with the building and that the building should not be used independently from the hotel.

Councillor R Kershaw, the local Member, referred to the history of the site and the diversity of views expressed by members of the Parish Council. He referred to the marketing history of the building and the lack of interest which had been shown in it. There were other shopping facilities fairly close by and home deliveries were now commonly available. The shop unit was tiny, with no storage to support a village shop. He considered that the site was not viable and reluctantly supported the Officer's recommendation.

It was proposed by Councillor R Kershaw, seconded by Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED unanimously

That this application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the following additional conditions:

- **No deliveries from the main street.**
- **No external plant or machinery to be used in connection with the building.**
- **The building is not to be used independently from the hotel.**

82 APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

None.

83 APPEALS SECTION

(a) NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 14(a) of the agenda.

(b) INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 14(b) of the agenda.

(c) WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 14(c) of the agenda.

The Acting Development Manager reported that the appeal in respect of Runton ADV/19/0324 had been dismissed.

(d) APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted item 14(d) of the agenda.

(e) COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 14(e) of the agenda.

The meeting closed at 10.49 am.

CHAIRMAN
Thursday, 9 January 2020