

## **31 JANUARY 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)  
Mrs V Uprichard (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs S Arnold	N Pearce
Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds	Mrs M Prior
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	R Reynolds
Mrs A Green	R Shepherd
Mrs B McGoun	B Smith

Mr E Seward – substitute for B Hannah

Mrs J English – Briston Ward

J Rest – observing

### **Officers**

Mr P Rowson – Head of Planning  
Mr N Doran – Principal Lawyer  
Mrs S Ashurst – Development Manager  
Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager  
Mr R Parkinson – Major Projects Team Leader  
Mr N Westlake – Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects Team)  
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

#### **147. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B Hannah and N Lloyd. There was one substitute Member in attendance as shown above.

#### **148. MINUTES**

The Chairman stated that the minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 4 and 17 January 2019 would be considered at the next meeting.

#### **149. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

#### **150. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Where appropriate the Planning Officers expanded on the planning applications; updated the meeting on outstanding consultations, letters/petitions received objecting

to, or supporting the proposals; referred to any views of local Members and answered Members' questions.

Background papers, including correspondence, petitions, consultation documents, letters of objection and those in support of planning applications were available for inspection at the meeting.

Having regard to the above information and the Officers' reports, the Committee reached the decisions as set out below.

Applications approved include a standard time limit condition as condition number 1 unless otherwise stated.

**151. BINHAM - PF/18/1524 - Proposed conversion of an agricultural barn to a dwelling; Westgate Barn, Warham Road, Binham, Fakenham, NR21 0DQ for Mr & Mrs Bruce**

This application was deferred at the request of the applicant to allow the submission of amended plans.

**152. FAKENHAM - PF/18/2081 - Extension to rear to provide coldroom and ambient goods storage space for foodstore; Morrisons, Clipbush Lane, Fakenham, NR21 8SW for Mr Darbyshire**

The Committee considered item 1 of the Officers' reports.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including photographs which showed the proximity of the extension to the nearby flats. He reported that amended plans had been received which fully enclosed the cold store and improved its appearance. The amended plans had not been subject to public reconsultation as they were considered to be an improvement to the scheme and no public objection had been received to the scheme as originally proposed. Local Members and Fakenham Town Council had been notified of the amended plans. Environmental Health had no objection to the amended plan subject to no additional plant or machinery being installed. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a mansard roof would not be required.

The Senior Planning Officer recommended approval of the application subject to the imposition of the conditions listed in the report.

Councillor R Reynolds, a local Member, requested additional screening to improve the visual amenity of the adjacent flats. He considered that trees or fencing would help to screen the site and reduce noise issues. He also requested a restriction on delivery times to avoid disturbance to nearby residents.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds, a local Member, stated that she could not recall receiving the amended plans. She was pleased that Environmental Health had withdrawn its objection and with the proposed conditions. She supported the request for additional screening.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that there was limited space on the boundary to increase the amount of vegetation. There were large, fairly mature trees in situ. A hedge would only reach 2 to 3 metres whereas the flats were much higher. He considered that it would be very difficult to screen the site any more than at present.

Councillor Reynolds stated that the trees provided some relief to the upper flats when in leaf but a 1.8 metre wooden fence would provide protection for the lower level flats.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that officers were confident that the noise issue would be resolved by the amended scheme. He considered that a 1.8 metre wooden fence would possibly reduce the effectiveness of the security fencing.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold suggested that a “fedge” which would allow ivy to grow up might be a solution. She referred to the proposed lighting condition and mitigation to reduce the amount of light going up into the night sky.

Councillor Mrs B McGoun asked what safety measures would be put in place for reversing lorries.

The Major Projects Team Leader stated that a banksman or white noise alarms could be used which would have less impact on local residents.

Councillor E Seward referred to a question by Councillor R Reynolds regarding delivery times. He asked if a time constraint already existed.

The Major Projects Team Leader explained that the proposed scheme would remove a large amount of the existing noise. There was a question as to whether it would be reasonable to impose additional restrictions such as additional screening, delivery times etc. which were not currently in place. The proposed conditions reflected the changes which would take place and make the operation more compatible with residential neighbours. He considered that it would be difficult to justify additional screening as there was concern as to how it could be installed and maintained satisfactorily, and the design of the building had been improved. He considered that an ivy screen would provide little benefit. An advisory note could be added to the permission regarding deliveries. Retrospective conditions could not be applied as the situation was being improved.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett asked if the store operated a continuous replenishment system as noise from refrigerated lorries could be a concern.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that there would be no change to existing delivery arrangements and it was possible that the number of deliveries would reduce given the increased storage capacity.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones asked if it would be possible to provide low level planting on the boundary.

The Major Projects Team Leader asked the Committee to consider that the existing white external cold stores were being replaced with a brick finish replacement. It would not therefore be reasonable to ask the applicant to install additional screening. He was sympathetic to the fact that a large gap in the hedge was exposed but did not consider that the applicant could resolve the matter without causing problems for maintenance or security. He considered that the proposal was acceptable without such a condition.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the applicant had considered withdrawing the application and retaining the status quo due to his frustration with some of the conditions. However, it had been explained to the applicant that the concerns related to the amenity of the neighbouring property and he had agreed to the conditions. He considered that it would be difficult to ask the applicant to provide additional screening.

The Principal Lawyer stated that the application related to an extension and not to the use of the site as a whole, the principle of which had been established and controlled by

conditions considered to be appropriate at the time.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs S Arnold, seconded by Councillor N Pearce and

**RESOLVED**

**That this application be approved subject to the imposition of the conditions listed in the report.**

**153. BRISTON - PF/18/1546 - Erection of 4 no. two storey semi-detached dwellings; The Spinney, 1 Grove Road, Melton Constable, NR24 2DE for Ms Tacon**

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Mr C Yardley (supporting)

The Development Manager presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site, including a landscaping plan indicating the trees which it was proposed to remove. She recommended approval of this application subject to the conditions summarised in the report.

Councillor Mrs J English considered that the proposed development did not reflect the railway village of Melton Constable. However, her main concern, and that of Briston Parish Council, related to access. Grove Road was narrow and residents parked along the road. Most of the visitors to the adjacent doctors' surgery also arrived by car. She referred to a lapsed planning permission for 38 dwellings on adjacent land which would create more traffic if it was developed in the future. She was pleased to see a time limit for development and requested assurance that the dwellings would be built if approved.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that this proposal was not overdevelopment in planning law. However, he was concerned at the loss of the trees and requested additional planting of hardwood trees.

The Development Manager stated that the conditions included the submission of a landscaping scheme.

Councillor R Shepherd considered that the dwelling types and density were acceptable and an attempt had been made to bring the design in line with old railway houses. The landscaping would be dealt with by conditions. He stated that this application had to be considered on its merits and previous and future applications could not be taken into account. He proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold asked if there would be a party wall issue with the chimneys, which appeared to be shared between two dwellings, or if they were false chimneys.

The Development Manager stated that chimneys were often shared, with separate flues. She was unaware as to whether they were false or functioning chimneys.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds requested confirmation that the Highway Authority did not raise an objection. She also requested confirmation as to the time limit.

The Development Manager confirmed that the Highway Authority did not object to this application, subject to conditions. All planning permissions were subject to a three year

time limit, after which permission would lapse if not implemented.

The Principal Lawyer stated that the application on the adjoining site had expired. Any proposals to develop the site would require the submission of a planning application and would be determined taking into account all material planning issues including adjacent development.

It was proposed by Councillor R Shepherd, seconded by Councillor Mrs S Arnold and

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That this application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.**

**154. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION**

None.

**155. NEW APPEALS**

The Committee noted item 5 of the Officers' reports.

**156. INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS**

The Committee noted item 6 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Manager reported that the appeals in respect of Tunstead PF/17/0428 and ENF/15/0067 and associated costs application had been dismissed. Details would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee. Discussions would now take place as to the way forward and the Economic Development Team would proactively support the businesses which would be affected by the decisions.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold congratulated the Development Manager and those who had supported her in this appeal.

**157. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND**

The Committee noted item 7 of the Officers' reports.

**158. APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES**

The Committee noted item 8 of the Officers' reports.

**159. COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS**

The Committee noted item 9 of the Officers' reports.

The meeting closed at 10.40 am.

---

CHAIRMAN  
28 February 2019