

06 JULY 2017

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

R Reynolds (Chairman)

Mrs S Arnold
Dr P Butikofer
N Coppack
Mrs A R Green
Mrs P Grove-Jones

P Moore
N Pearce
S Shaw
R Shepherd
B Smith

V Uprichard

Ms M Prior – substitute for Mr P Rice
Mr E Seward – substitute for Mrs S Butikofer

Mrs G Perry-Warnes – Corpusty Ward

Mr J Rest

Officers

Mrs N Baker – Head of Planning
Mrs S Ashurst – Development Manager
Miss J Medler - Development Management Team Leader (JM)
Mr D Watson – Development Management Team Leader (DW)
Mrs M Howard – Committee Officer

20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs S Butikofer, Mrs M Millership (Waterside Ward), P Rice (Waterside Ward) Ms K Ward (Glaven Valley Ward). Two substitute Members were present as shown above.

21. MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 15 June 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

22. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
24	S Shaw	Knew the Applicant

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' report, the Committee reached the decisions as set out below.

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

24. HICKLING - PF/16/1032 - Erection of free range hen unit; Poplar Farm, Sutton Road for Norman Farming Partnership

The Committee considered item 1 of the Officers' report.

Public Speakers

Jo Belsten (Hickling Parish Council)
Ian Pick (supporting)
Rosalinde Stacey (supporting)
Robert Norman (supporting)

The application had been subject to a recent site visit.

The Development Management Team Leader (JM) outlined the application. It was not considered that the proposal would have a significant detrimental visual impact upon neighbouring properties.

In an update on the report, the Development Management Team Leader (JM) informed the Committee that the Applicant had provided more information which had resulted in the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) withdrawing their objections regarding potential surface water flooding, subject to a condition that the surface water drainage scheme is provided in accordance with the additional information submitted, and that any changes required would require details of a further surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved. A further letter of objection had been received from a resident who had previously objected. An email had been received from a resident who had previously objected and had withdrawn her objection. She was now speaking in support. The recommendation had been revised to reflect these updates.

The Development Management Team Leader (JM) recommended approval of this application.

Councillor R Shepherd commended the officer for an extremely well-written report. He had been unable to attend the site meeting but the comprehensive report had compensated for this. The objectors and consultees had been satisfied and he had no hesitation but to recommend approval. Mr N Pearce expressed his support of the application and commended the admirable way that outstanding issues had been dealt with.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones expressed regret that the Local Members had been unable to attend. As she lived in Stalham she knew the area and was pleased that everything had been done to allay objections. She had slight concerns about the road network. However, as lorry movements would be restricted, this should not be a problem.

Councillor P Moore had been unable to attend the site meeting but had since visited the site. He supported the application but wanted reassurance that the fans would be kept in good working order and requested that any relevant condition relating to noise attenuation be reinforced to include maintenance of the units.

Councillor Dr P Butikofer said that it had been helpful during the site visit that the proposed building had been marked out with posts. He considered that it would integrate very well with the surroundings.

It was proposed by Councillor R Shepherd, seconded by Councillor N Pearce and

RESOLVED unanimously

To approve subject to appropriate conditions as listed below and any other conditions deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning:

- 1. Time limit**
- 2. In accordance with the drawings and reports submitted**
- 3. Samples of colour finish to external cladding, fans, louvres, doors and silos**
- 4. Detailed landscaping plan**
- 5. Ecology mitigation (Biodiversity Method Statement),**
- 6. Details of external lighting**
- 7. Details of the mitigation measures proposed by the acoustic consultant**
- 8. Development to be carried out in full accordance with the FRA**
- 9. Development to be carried out in full accordance with additional information submitted in relation to surface water drainage.**

25. BLAKENEY - PF/17/0581 - Erection of single storey dwelling; 8 Langham Road for Mr & Mrs Ingham

The Committee considered item 2 of the Officers' report.

Public Speaker

Rosemary Thew (Blakeney Parish Council)

The Chairman explained that Councillor R Shepherd had not attended the site visit because he had been taken unwell. He had returned to the coach. However, he had full awareness of the site.

The Development Management Team Leader (DW) explained that outstanding issues regarding the windows in the roof space had been resolved and the recommendation revised accordingly. The previous application (now subject of an appeal) was refused because of the proximity of the northern elevation to the boundary with the dwelling known as 'Close By'. The current application has addressed this issue.

The matter had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Ms K Ward, the local Member, who was unable to attend. Cllr Dr P Butikofer read out a communication on her behalf. Councillor Ms Ward's objections were as follows:

- Policy EN 2, Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character: the application doesn't accord with this.
- Policy HO 1, Dwelling mix and type: it was within the Council's interests to maintain a sustainable mix and type of dwelling.
- Policy CT 6, Parking provision: there could be loss of 1 -2 on road spaces in a street that is already short of parking.

Councillor Ms Ward considered that to approve the application might give the wrong signal.

The Development Manager was asked to explain the policy considerations raised by Cllr Ward and responded as follows:

- Policy EN 2: officers considered that the application was in keeping with the character of the landscape and settlement. She explained that it was up to Members to decide if they were in agreement with this or whether the harm caused by the development was sufficient to warrant refusal.
- Policy HO 1: the dwelling would not hit the threshold of this policy.
- Policy CT 6: these points had already been addressed.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones observed that similar applications had been considered and refused in the past because they split properties and big gardens. She asked if the Council had a policy. The Development Management Team Leader (DW) explained that the site was within the settlement boundary of Blakeney and, on balance, the application was considered acceptable. The other sites raised by Cllr Grove-Jones were all situated in the countryside as defined by policy SS1.

Councillor B Smith said that the Committee had asked for their minibus to be driven through the estate to ensure that there were no access problems. He observed that County Council (Highway) had no objections subject to conditions in respect of access, gates and onsite parking and turning provision. He was pleased that the plan for windows in the roof space had been withdrawn. This would alleviate potential problems with overlooking. He supported the application.

Mr P W Moore said that the application was not against Council policies, had no planning objections and should be approved.

Mr E Seward said that Policy EN 2 was the relevant concern and it was for Members to decide if the application was in character.

It was proposed by Mr B Smith, seconded by Mrs S Arnold and

RESOLVED by 10 votes to 2, with 1 abstention

To approve subject to conditions deemed necessary by the Head of Planning.

26. CORPUSTY AND SAXTHORPE - PF/17/0427 - Variation of condition 2 of planning permission ref: PF/16/1086 to allow for alterations and design changes to the extensions and garage/store; Hill Cottage, Heydon Road, Corpusty for Mr Stenhouse

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' report.

Public Speaker (at Chairman's discretion)

Jason Parker (supporting)

The Development Management Team Leader (DW) outlined the application and reminded Members that the extension had been approved in December 2016 and that it was design changes that were being considered at this meeting. The concern was that the revised scheme was proposing design elements that were originally eliminated from the original proposal.

Councillor Mrs G Perry-Warnes, the Local Member, thanked Members for attending the site visit. She said that the property was secluded and private and couldn't be seen by the public. Planning decisions needed to be consistent and she didn't feel that Planning Policy reasons were valid in this case. The views from the balcony were outstanding and the applicant shouldn't be deprived of them. The outbuilding, which the applicant needed for business, could be easily screened and this could, if necessary be subject to a condition. She supported the application.

Councillor N Pearce proposed acceptance of the amendments. This was seconded by Councillor N Coppack.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold observed that the application concerned a beautiful cottage and site. There was already planning permission for the balcony and she considered the new design was better.

Councillor P Moore said there were no design grounds for refusal.

Councillor Ms M Prior was not in agreement and did not consider the amendments to the design to be minor. She observed that planning policies still applied, even if trees screened the proposed building. She proposed the officers' recommendation and was seconded by Councillor B Smith.

Councillor R Shepherd was concerned that the Committee might be acting against Planning Policies HO 8 and EN 4 and that this could set a precedent. He supported the officers.

Councillor B Smith, in support of the officers, said that it was important to preserve the appearance of buildings in the countryside. He considered that the garage would detract from the main building and the balcony would compromise its character.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones reminded Members that the original extensions had been approved and that the Committee was being asked to consider amendments to the original plans which, as Councillor S Shaw observed, were minimal.

The Head of Planning said that approval was contrary to the officer's recommendation and that reasons for approval would have to be clear, i.e. that the Committee had considered the amendments and decided that no detrimental harm would be caused.

A vote was taken on the first proposal.

It was proposed by Councillor N Pearce, seconded by Councillor N Coppack and

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 4

To approve and to delegate imposition of appropriate conditions to the Head of Planning.

27. APPLICATION RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

The Committee considered item 4 of the Officers' report.

RESOLVED

That the Committee undertakes the following site inspections:

FULMODESTON 17/0862 - Erection of 1 no. additional duck rearing unit and 1 no. straw barn at Clipstone Farm House, Clipstone for Ralph Harrison & Partners

OVERSTRAND 17/0222 - Formation of children's play area and erection of play equipment to rear of public house, White Horse, 34 High Street, Overstrand, CROMER, NR27 0AB

28. NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 5 of the Officers' reports.

29. INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 6 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Manager reported that the Inspector's decision in respect of Sculthorpe PF/16/0876 had been received and that the appeal had been dismissed on every ground. The Planning Policy Manager and Major Projects Manager would brief Members.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold asked that the Committee's thanks be conveyed to the Planning Policy Manager, the Major Projects Manager and the Local Government Lawyer.

In response to a question from Councillor P Moore, it was confirmed that – on legal advice – the Council had not applied for costs.

Weybourne ENF/16/0114: the inquiry had taken place on 20 June 2017 and the enforcement notice had been upheld.

30. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 7 of the Officers' reports.
Sheringham PF/16/1175: the Committee's decision had been upheld.

31. APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

The Committee noted item 8 of the Officers' reports.

Tattersett PF/16/1300: the appeal had been allowed and a summary had been provided for Members.

32. COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 9 of the Officers' reports.

Blakeney PF/16/1417: a Judicial Review had been set for 29 November 2017. In response to a Member's question it was explained that North Norfolk Planning Watch Limited was set up by the objectors.

The meeting closed at 11.00 am.

CHAIRMAN
3 August 2017