

25 JANUARY 2018

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 V Uprichard (Vice-Chairman) in the Chair

Mrs A R Green	Ms M Prior
Mrs P Grove-Jones	R Reynolds
B Hannah	S Shaw
N Lloyd	R Shepherd
N Pearce	B Smith

Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds – substitute for Mrs S Arnold
Mr V FitzPatrick – substitute for P Rice
J Rest – substitute for Mrs A Fitch-Tillett

Mrs S Arnold – attending as Portfolio Holder only

Mr N Dixon – Hoveton Ward
Mr P Moore – North Walsham (East) Ward

Mrs S Bütikofer - observing

Officers

Mrs S Ashurst – Development Manager
Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager
Mr J Wilson – Environmental Protection Manager
Mr N Doran - Solicitor
Miss J Medler – Development Management Team Leader
Mr R Parkinson – Major Projects Team Leader
Mr J Dougan – Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

106. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs A Fitch-Tillett and P Rice. Councillor Mrs S Arnold attended the meeting in her capacity as Portfolio Holder only. Three substitute Members attended the meeting as shown above.

107. MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 20 December 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

108. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

109. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
110	J Rest	Shareholder of Broadland Housing.
111	B Smith	Had spoken to the applicant and agent regarding this matter.
112	S Shaw	Pecuniary interest as landowner of the land required to build any new access road along The Fairstead
112	B Smith	RAF Coltishall was his parent station during service with the Royal Air Force.
112	All Members	Received correspondence in respect of this application
113	All Members	Received correspondence from Mr Roper (owner of Shannoeks).

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.

110. HOVETON - PF/17/1802 - **Erection of 25 dwellings with associated roads, landscaping and drainage, off-site highways works, extension to church graveyard, and construction of new 12-space church car park; Church Field for FW Properties**

The Committee considered item 1 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Objecting: Kerry Walker, Ron Pollin, Clive Wiltshire and Patricia Miller
Supporting: Andrew Savage, Ian Wilson and Julian Wells

The Major Projects Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area. He reported that further correspondence had been received, comprising 9 letters of objection, two questions in respect of the content of the report, emails sent by members of the public to Members, and an update email from the Broads Authority. No new planning issues had been raised but points regarding surface and foul water drainage, principle of development and impact on tourism had been reiterated.

The Major Projects Team Leader summarised and responded to representations in support of the application which had been received from Councillor N Dixon, the local Member.

Councillor Dixon had referred to the flooding issues which were of great concern to local residents. He had investigated this matter with Anglian Water, which had confirmed that it was a pre-existing problem related to operational maintenance and not sewer capacity. He had suggested a condition to prevent the new development being connected to the sewer until Anglian Water had carried out remedial work.

The Major Projects Team Leader stated that it would not be reasonable or possible to impose the condition as suggested. Anglian Water had advised that there was sufficient capacity, and whilst an additional load would add to the problem it was an operational and infrastructure issue which the developer could not be expected to solve.

Councillor Dixon considered that the Local Plan was out of date and that the site was likely to be allocated in the future. The Major Projects Team Leader advised that no weight could be given to the emerging plan and all site allocations would be considered on their merits. There was currently no confirmation as to whether or not this or any other sites would be allocated in Hoveton.

Councillor Dixon had referred to the economic and other benefits offered by the proposal. He considered that the economic benefits aligned with the Council's objective to promote business and considered that there were no reasons to suggest the benefits would not be delivered. He also considered that the housing mix was appropriate, the landscaping would improve the setting of the church, the graveyard extension and car park were urgently needed, pedestrian safety would be improved and the proposal would deliver recreation facilities within the scheme and funding for health and wellbeing facilities at the village hall.

The Major Projects Team Leader explained that the application was a departure from policy and had to be justified. The employment offer was important and no other sites were available or deliverable. The housing mix offered was not substantially different from the previous scheme and did not fulfil a need or niche, nor deliver 45% affordable housing. The church facilities were private to the church and did not address an identified need. The path would be of benefit but would have an impact on the heritage significance of the church. The recreation facilities and Section 106 contributions were required to address the impact of the scheme.

The Major Projects Team Leader outlined the concerns raised by the public in respect of surface and foul water drainage, the principle of development and other issues which were addressed in detail in the report.

The Major Projects Team Leader reported that the Broads Authority had not considered it necessary to alter its position on the development, but had suggested a condition for foul sewage proposals. Officers considered that such a condition would be unlikely to achieve anything more than already proposed as the applicant could not undertake work outside their control.

Anglian Water had not provided a definitive response in respect of the flooding issues and therefore the reasons remained speculative. However, efforts had been made to understand the situation and the Major Projects Team Leader gave an explanation as to likely causes. Whilst there would be additional load from the proposed development, it would be within the working capacity of the pumping station and would not add to the impacts on the network except during times of the highest water levels.

The Major Projects Team Leader responded to a number of options to address the flooding issues which had been suggested by the public. He explained that alternative sewage disposal methods would be costly and could affect the viability of the scheme. It would also be unjustified as there was capacity in the network and contributions would be unreasonable if they were intended to resolve existing problems. The extent of the works required was unknown and no known improvements were planned. It was unreasonable to prevent the connection of the scheme to the sewer unless Anglian Water addressed the problem as it would not meet the tests for conditions as it relied on a third party rectifying the existing situation.

The Major Projects Team Leader reported that the applicant had offered to undertake surveys of the sewer system and provide the results to Anglian Water for its use. This work could be conditioned as part of public benefits.

The Major Projects Team Leader recommended that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to approve this application, subject to

1) Section 106 Agreement (with phasing plan and planning obligations and contributions as listed in the report to Committee):

- Financial contributions
- Public open space and play equipment, allotments, green infrastructure, public rights of way connections, visitor impact mitigations, education, libraries.
- Employment development
- Progress at Littlewood Lane,
- Servicing and access,
- Submission of applications,
- Marketing of sites,
- Occupancy requirements.
- Affordable housing provision.
- 50% before 50% of market housing
- 50% before 80% of market housing
- Management & maintenance including public access
- On-site communal area, including south link, landscaping and footpaths
- Northern field Conservation Management Plan and biodiversity works
- Woodland to west and footpaths
- Car park.
- Graveyard extension and maintenance contribution.

2) Conditions:

- Time limit – commencement within 18 months
- In accordance with plans and mitigation proposals in reports
- Highways works, Traffic Regulation Orders, visibility splays, verge restoration, field access
- Landscaping – bolster eastern tree belt, all species, mix, stature, materials, planting tbc
- Hedging – northern and southern boundaries, along access road, mix and density
- Boundary treatments – less close boarded fencing, more hedges / softer appearance, hedgehogs
- Provide graveyard & boundaries prior to 20th house
- Provide car park & boundaries on all sides & restore verge prior to 20th house
- Car park tree protection, arboricultural method statement works
- Car park only for church use (amenity, heritage, highway safety concerns)
- Footpath provision to Horning Rd prior to occupation

- Footpath & cycle link to Meadow Drive prior to c. 10th dwelling
- Play area prior to c. 10th occupation
- Circular walks, recreation features and benches etc all by c. 10th dwelling
- Housing materials
- Foul drainage surveys
- Surface water drainage scheme construction details tbc, mitigation, protection
- Provision of bund and swale mitigation, oil, silt & petrol interceptors
- Archaeology, root protection and tree management details to south
- Final construction details to be agreed, and implemented, maintained & managed
- Foul drainage network surveys
- Ecology presence surveys – badger, bats, reptiles, owls, birds, protection measures
- Ecology enhancement proposals
- Archaeology – Informative trial trenching, evaluation & recording
- Fire Hydrants
- Contamination assessment, mitigation, precautions
- No external lighting without scheme to be agreed
- 10% renewable energy measures
- Air source heat pump details – noise, appearance, location, energy
- Trees protection & replacement as necessary
- Any other conditions deemed necessary and appropriate by the Head of Planning.

Councillor N Dixon, the local Member, in addition to his written statement, spoke in support of this application. He stated that this was a bespoke scheme which was needed to deliver growth. He outlined the history of this proposal, which had been reworked to overcome the objections. The most significant issues which had been raised related to policy and sewer capacity.

Councillor Dixon referred to the related application for the employment site which had been approved as a policy exception. He considered that the current application had similar benefits which outweighed the harm. The Meadow Drive sewer had a long-term defect which was affected by rainfall and river water. Anglian Water had a solution to the flooding issue which should have been carried out many years previously. He considered that the drainage issue was widely misunderstood by the public. Anglian Water had confirmed that the proposal was well within their capacity and would have no material effect. He considered that the proposal was appropriate in terms of location and scale, with more benefits than harm. Hoveton was desperately short of employment land for businesses such as Benthic Solutions to prosper.

Councillor R Shepherd considered that the benefits offered by the scheme far outweighed Policy SS2 in terms of providing much needed housing and 45 extremely valuable engineering jobs. He proposed delegated approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor R Reynolds referred to the amount of lobbying which Members had received. He stated that the application had to be considered on the information put forward by officers, objectors and supporters. He referred to the concerns which had been raised, the amount of work which had been put into processing the application, the benefits of the scheme which had been outlined by the Major Projects Team Leader with regard to employment. The scheme offered a good mix of dwellings in accordance with Policy HO1. There had been no objection from the majority of consultees. He asked the Committee to support the Officer recommendation and seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ms M Prior referred to the benefits to employment and housing which were set out in the report. She supported approval of this application.

Councillor N Lloyd stated that the site was in the Countryside in a beautiful part of the county. He commented that the employment site was also within the Countryside. There was no shortage of allocated land for housing. He considered that the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm which would be caused by the development.

Councillor S Shaw supported the application as he considered that the harm was outweighed by the economic benefits.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones expressed concern that the proposal was contrary to policy. It was not an exceptions site and would involve building on grade 2 agricultural land. She considered that the proposed housing was not necessary as there was a large Persimmon Homes development nearby, with an option to build further housing on an adjacent site. She referred to examples of development where problems had occurred despite a lack of objection from Anglian Water. The site was in an area which was liable to flooding and water and sewage could not be conditioned. She stated that there were only 11 definite jobs on the Littlewood Lane development. The remaining jobs depended on planning applications which were yet to come forward. She understood that other employment land was available elsewhere. She did not support the application.

Councillor V FitzPatrick stated that the application had to be considered on its own merits. It would deliver a high quality housing scheme, and he was pleased to hear that Broadland Housing would buy the affordable units. He was also pleased that two accessible homes would be provided. He considered that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the disbenefits.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds supported this application.

Councillor N Pearce stated that he understood the need for economic development but the proposal was contrary to a number of policies. He was extremely concerned at the addition of 25 houses with regard to water and sewage. He questioned the need for the enabling development for a successful business. On balance, he was opposed to this application.

Councillor Ms M Prior expressed concern that those Members who had spoken against the application on policy grounds had not specified the policies on which they based their objections. She considered that the Officers had addressed the points which had been raised.

In response to a question by Councillor B Smith, the Major Projects Team Leader explained that non-return valves were unlikely to provide a resolution to the flooding of affected properties and may lead to other problems.

Councillor B Hannah referred to comments by Hoveton Parish Council regarding reliance on the advice of technical consultees regarding flooding.

The Major Projects Team Leader stated that Hoveton Parish Council had requested that all details be reviewed by technical consultees. He confirmed that all technical consultees had been consulted and all were satisfied that the proposal would not have an additional adverse impact. He stated that the flood risk assessment was very comprehensive and offered a number of measures.

RESOLVED by 8 votes to 4 with 1 abstention

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

1. **The prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement to include a phasing plan and the contributions and obligations set out above.**
2. **The imposition of the conditions listed above and any other conditions considered appropriate and necessary by the Head of Planning.**

111. PASTON - PF/16/1743 - Demolition of existing Block 3 (16 units) and replacement with 8 units (6 no.2 beds and 2 no.3 beds) of holiday accommodation; Mundesley Holiday Centre, Paston Road for Mundesley Holiday Village Ltd

The Committee considered item 2 of the Officers' reports.

The Planning Officer presented plans and photographs of the site. He referred to the works which had been carried out on the site outside the coastal erosion zone. He outlined the proposals which were for permanent units. He drew attention to the key issue of coastal erosion and displayed photographs of the existing sea defences and annotated photographs showing the site in relation to the coastal constraints areas. He stated that the Shoreline Management Plan was a material planning consideration, under which the existing sea defences would not be retained or maintained. Whilst the cliffs currently appeared stable, the existing sea defences were at the end of their design life and parts of the holiday village would be lost to coastal erosion. Discussions had been held with the applicant to find a solution. The Planning Officer recommended that a time limited permission would be a pragmatic solution and drew attention to informative note 10 of the recommendation regarding the opportunity to apply for an extension of time if the rate of coastal erosion was less than predicted.

Public Speaker

Mr Hay (supporting)

In presenting his supporting statement, the applicant stated that he would now like to change the proposed units to lodges with wheels which could be moved when necessary and wanted to consider the option to fund renewal of the sea defences/groynes field to slow coastal erosion.

The Major Projects Manager explained that the current proposal related to permanent structures and the applicant was now proposing a different solution. He advised that the application should be determined as submitted, although the Committee could defer consideration if it wished to consider an alternative.

Councillor B Smith proposed deferral of this application to obtain further information regarding the applicant's proposal for lodges on the site. This was seconded by Councillor R Shepherd.

RESOLVED unanimously

That consideration of this application be deferred to obtain further information regarding the applicant's proposal for lodges on the site.

112. SCOTTOW - PF/17/1057 - Change of use of existing buildings within the enterprise park area from former military use and various commercial uses to a range of B1, B2 and B8 designations (light industrial/office/research and development, general industrial and storage/distribution uses). Use of former taxiways and hard standing areas for low-speed vehicle driver training. Indicative route shown as land reserved for second site entrance.; Scottow Enterprise Park, Lamas Road, Badersfield, Scottow for Norfolk County Council

Councillor S Shaw withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this application.

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Michael Graham (supporting)

The Major Projects Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site. He reported that one additional letter of objection and the updated response of the Highway Authority had been received. No new concerns had been raised but concerns relating to the use of areas of the track for driver training and precedent for more use of the airfield had been reiterated.

The Major Projects Team Leader reported that the applicant had provided a travel plan objectives document and not an interim travel plan as stated in the report. The Highway Authority was not satisfied that it contained sufficient commitments and detail and had requested further work. He recommended that conditions listed in the report be amended to require the submission of a full travel plan within three months, given that the site had been operating for some time.

The Major Projects Team Leader reported that an indicative footpath route from the Enterprise Park to Badersfield had been submitted. The Highway Authority was satisfied that this was a sufficient basis to require further details by condition. The Major Projects Team Leader recommended that the footpath be constructed and made available within three months.

The Major Projects Team Leader stated that clarification was needed as to the provision of the community woodland. He recommended delegated approval of the application as set out in the report subject to amendments to include:

- A recommendation that Officers liaise with the applicant over the status of the Community Woodland and include any outstanding elements as part of any permission and/or confirm how alternative actions will be taken to resolve issues.
- Conditions to require a schedule of uses and car & cycle parking to be agreed for each building.
- Submission of a full travel plan.
- Submission of a Traffic Management Plan for routing of vehicles to and from the site.
- All buildings to undergo photographic recording of the interior before use.
- Provision of a Heritage Advice Note to the applicant alongside any planning permission, setting out what the two LPAs and Historic Environment Service recommend as part of condition, site management and investment undertakings.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that he was very happy with the report and requested that the community woodland be conditioned. He proposed delegated approval of this application which was seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones commented that the site was formerly a military airfield and movements and noise would have been greater.

In response to a question by Councillor R Shepherd regarding possible future use by Swiftair, the Major Projects Team Leader explained that this was a separate issue which was not part of the current application.

RESOLVED unanimously

1. That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application, subject to:

(i) establishing community woodland position [Officers to liaise with the applicant over the status of the Community Woodland and include any outstanding elements as part of any permission and/or confirm how alternative actions will be taken to resolve issues],

(ii) imposition of a range of conditions listed in the report, and to include:

- Accordance with the submitted plans and amended documents, including driver training;
- Restricted uses of premises – schedule of uses, car & cycle parking to be confirmed;
- Opening hours restrictions 0800 – 1800 Mon-Fri; 0800 – 1300 Sat; No use on Sundays / Public Holidays
- No more than 60 HGV movements / day (30/Sat.) without alternative access & Traffic Regulation Orders;
- HGV and driver training monitoring, recording and submission of records;
- Restricted / removed Permitted Development rights on buildings and track;
- Controls on outdoor yard uses – heights, materials appearance, clearances;
- Internal site traffic restrictions & surveillance as per submission;
- Landscaping and screening proposals to be agreed, including north-east hedge, yard, and replacements;
- Pre-occupation ecology measures, surveys and mitigation;
- Heritage Investment Plan to be agreed – including Air Traffic Control Tower works and public access within 18 months;
- Conservation Area Management Plan to be agreed within 12 months, with implementation within 18 months;
- Pre-use/occupation building heritage recording and internal works to be agreed;
- Flood resilience measures, risk evaluation and emergency plans;
- Maintenance and provision of drainage;
- Noise protection / mitigation measures – limits, machinery, management;
- Footpath & bus stops to be provided within 3 months;
- Full Travel Plan within 3 months;
- Contamination and lighting precautions.
- Any other conditions deemed necessary and appropriate by the Head of Planning.

2. That a response be sent to Broadland District Council recommending approval of application 20171511.

113. SHERINGHAM - PF/17/0468 - Demolition of existing hotel and erection of mixed use building comprising 10 dwellings (Use Class C3) and 4 commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3/ A4/A5) with associated parking and highways works; Formerly The Shannoeks, 1 High Street for North Norfolk District Council

The Committee considered item 4 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Nicol Perryman (supporting)
Michelle Hughes (supporting)

The Major Projects Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site and surrounding properties. An amended drawing had been received in respect of the bin storage area. He drew attention to the comments of the Sheringham Town Council and consultation responses.

With regard to concerns raised in respect of the loss of the car park, the Major Projects Team Leader referred to the car parking survey which indicated that there was spare capacity within the town. He reported that the Leisure and Localities Manager had confirmed that two disabled parking spaces could be provided on the Cliff Road and Morris Street car parks. He added that the disabled car parking spaces were for blue badge holders who were permitted to park on double yellow lines and considered that disabled drivers would not be penalised unduly by the loss of spaces on Chequers car park.

The Major Projects Team Leader recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor B Hannah, a local Member, stated that the Chequers car park was widely used in the summer months. He considered that the comment regarding blue badge holders parking on double yellow lines encouraged inappropriate parking. He considered that it was preferable to retain the car park and three-dimensional building. He suggested that the owners should be encouraged to smarten up the existing building and bring the hotel back into use. He considered that businesses in the proposed commercial units would struggle for 8 months of the year. He proposed refusal of this application.

Councillor R Shepherd stated that it was important that people understood why the car park had been included in the proposal and requested the Solicitor to give further information on this issue. He referred to Policies EC6 and CT6 and considered that they had been addressed by the car parking survey which stated that the Chequers car park was often under-used. There was spare capacity even during Bank Holiday periods. Replacement parking for blue badge holders would be made available and they could also use the badges to park elsewhere. He considered that all objections had been overcome. He expressed frustration with the owner of the building and the impact of the lack of progress over the years. He proposed approval of this application as recommended.

The Solicitor explained that the proposed compulsory purchase of the existing building was not relevant to the current planning application. The application was for the overall site which was in multiple ownership. The purpose of including the car park was to find an optimum way to develop the site for the benefit of the locality and community. Land ownership was not a material issue.

Councillor Ms M Prior considered that the loss of the car park had been mitigated. She considered that the comments of Historic England were interesting but there was nothing to mitigate the condition of the site. She stated that Sheringham was busy for most of the year and considered that the correct choice of retail use would provide employment and a service to the community. She seconded the proposal to approve this application.

Councillor B Smith stated that the loss of the car park was regrettable but it was relatively small and had to be weighed against the loss of a dilapidated building. He considered that there was plenty of alternative car parking and on-street parking and that on balance he supported the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor R Reynolds supported the application.

Councillor V FitzPatrick considered that there was much to gain from the development. It would provide 10 dwellings, a mixed use facility with commercial space and would make a fantastic contribution to the built environment.

Councillor N Lloyd agreed that something had to be done to improve the area but he considered that the extent of the development into the car park detracted from the overall purpose of redevelopment. Whilst he supported the principle of redevelopment of the Shannoeks, he did not support the current application.

Councillor S Shaw considered that the design of the proposed building was very good, with a good balance between commercial and residential use. He considered it would be an asset to Sheringham.

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 4

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

114. BRISTON - PF/17/1681 - Erection of two semi-detached houses to include a detached single garage and new vehicular access.; Land rear of 157 & 159 Fakenham Road for Mr K Lawrence

The Committee considered item 5 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Management Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area. She stated that the application referred to in the Highways and Parking section of the Officer's Appraisal on page 91 of the agenda should read PF/17/1504 and not as stated. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that although he was not speaking for the local Member, she had spoken to him in the past when he was Chairman of the Committee. He explained that he had called in the application as Chairman due to the uncertainty with regard to residential amenity. He stated that the principle of development was acceptable. Both he and the local Member considered that the dwellings would not be detrimental to residential amenity and he therefore proposed that the application be approved.

In response to a question by Councillor R Shepherd, the Development Management Team Leader explained that the boundary of the proposed dwellings was adjacent to

the garden of the neighbouring dwelling. Councillor Shepherd seconded the proposal to approve this application.

Councillor V FitzPatrick considered that the existing dwellings were already overlooked by properties at the rear. The Development Management Team Leader explained that these were some distance away. The proposal would introduce two additional dwellings and increase overlooking and loss of privacy.

Councillor V FitzPatrick considered that overlooking would not be significantly detrimental.

Councillor B Hannah asked if there was an issue with the size of the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings.

The Development Management Team Leader explained that the issue was one of overlooking rather than garden depth, although 10m deep rear gardens would be preferable.

The Development Manager explained that loss of amenity of private living spaces was a planning consideration. Overlooking would be significantly detrimental to the private amenity area of the existing dwellings as the first floor windows would directly overlook the gardens. She considered that the proposal was contrary to Policy EN4 and would set a dangerous precedent.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that he lived in an area where gardens were overlooked and considered that the policies could be satisfied.

The Chairman proposed a site inspection, which was not seconded.

The proposal to approve this application was put to the vote. 5 Members voted in favour and 5 against. The Chairman cast her vote against the proposal.

It was proposed by Councillor J Rest, seconded by Councillor B Hannah and

RESOLVED by 6 votes to 5

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

115. NORTH WALSHAM - PF/17/0902 - Conversion of stable/barn to create dwelling; Agricultural Building, Adjacent to Bells Cottage, Holgate Road, White Horse Common for Mr F Knights

The Committee considered item 6 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Management Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site. She drew attention to the Environmental Health objection. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor P Moore, a local Member, stated that he knew the agent as he was a near neighbour and had worked with him in the past. The agent had obtained records of complaints which had been made to Environmental Health. None of the complaints had resulted in action against the farm. He considered that refusal would be inappropriate. He referred to possible inaccuracy in the noise survey. He requested that the Committee approve the application.

The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that a number of complaints had been received over the years, predominately from one source. These had been either resolved informally or no statutory nuisance found. He explained that the noise survey had not clarified the number of fans in operation at the time of recording.

Councillor Moore referred to a petition in support of the application. He considered that the noise survey should be repeated.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds stated that she had lived on a poultry farm and from experience they could be very noisy, dusty and smelly. She proposed refusal of this application.

Councillor B Smith stated that he had worked close to a poultry farm they could be very smelly. He seconded the proposal.

Councillor V FitzPatrick stated that he would be very concerned if the business had to close because of the residential unit.

Councillor R Reynolds expressed concern at the close proximity of the proposed residential unit to the farm.

Councillor N Lloyd stated that on the day of the site inspection the poultry unit was silent and there had been no odour. He was reluctant to go against such a strong Environmental Health objection. There were dwellings nearby and he would have expected more complaints if there was a problem. However, the proposed dwelling was very close to the farm.

In answer to a question by Councillor Mrs A Green, the Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that complaints had been received in respect of both noise and odour. The most recent complaints related to noise.

Councillor Mrs Green considered that noise could be mitigated by the direction of the fans. She lived close to a large poultry unit and whilst the odour could be very strong it only lasted for a maximum of 24 hours.

RESOLVED by 10 votes to 2

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

116. WEYBOURNE - PF/17/1740 - Removal of conditions 3, 4 & 5 of planning permission PF/09/0029 to allow residential occupation as a dwelling; The Roost, Bolding Way for Mr Harrison

The Committee considered item 7 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Charles Harrison (supporting)

The Development Management Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site and outlined the main issues for consideration. She referred to comments in support of this application from the local Member, Councillor D Young, which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Development Management Team Leader reported that a plan had been received to address the car parking issues at the site. However, nothing had changed in terms of amenity space and highway safety. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor R Reynolds considered that approval of this application would set a dangerous precedent. He proposed refusal of this application as recommended, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

117. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

The Committee considered item 11 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Manager recommended additional site inspections in respect of Bacton PF/17/0630 in order to expedite processing of this application which would be reported to the Committee in February, and Dunton PF/17/0613 to allow Committee Members who have not previously done so to visit the site.

RESOLVED

That the Committee undertakes the following site inspections:

BACTON – PF/17/0630 - Contractor's site compound including the siting of container style temporary buildings for use as offices, storage and staff facilities; car parking area, lighting towers, areas for materials storage and storage tanks. Perimeter fencing; J Murphy & Sons Site Office, Paston Road for J Murphy & Sons Ltd

DUNTON – PF/17/0613 - Equestrian business with stabling and teaching facility including formation of riding arena with floodlighting, new building to provide stabling; Cannister Hall Barns, Swaffham Road, Toftrees for Mr Donohue

RAYNHAM - PF/17/0729 - Erection of 94 dwellings with associated infrastructure; conversion of former NAAFI building to provide community centre; new allotments (within Kipton Wood); new play area (within The Orchard); Kipton Wood and The Orchard, Former RAF Base, West Raynham for Mr Fox

WORSTEAD - PF/17/1510 - Alterations and conversion of former wood yard barns to wedding venue with associated car parking and landscaping; The Wood Yard, Worstead Park for Mr Paterson

118. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE – QUARTER 3 2017/18

The Committee noted item 9 of the Officers' reports.

The Portfolio Holder considered that the performance figures were a great credit to the Planning Department and requested that thanks and congratulations be passed on to the staff.

119. 8 WIVETON ROAD, BLAKENEY – JUDICIAL REVIEW RESULT

The Committee noted item 10 of the Officers' reports.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that she had attended the Court proceedings and whilst there was some learning from the case, she was delighted that the view of the Committee and Officers had been upheld. She requested that thanks be passed on to the staff involved.

The Major Projects Manager reported that consultants had been engaged to undertake a review of some of the District's Conservation Areas, including Glaven Valley. The resulting Conservation Area appraisal and management plans would provide a sound basis to make judgements on the demolition of buildings in those areas.

120. NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 4 of the Officers' reports.

121. INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 5 of the Officers' reports.

North Walsham PO/17/0549

The Major Projects Manager reported that a Public Inquiry had been requested in respect of the refusal of this application. He considered that a public inquiry was not necessary as the Council had a 5 year land supply which had been debated at length during the Sculthorpe appeal. Representations would be made to deal with this matter through the Written Representations or Informal Hearing procedure.

Sculthorpe PF/15/0907

The Council would be seeking to defend the original Inspector's decision in the High Court. If unsuccessful, a further Public Inquiry would need to be held.

Wind Turbine applications at Bodham and Selbrigg

The Major Projects Manager explained that the Council had successfully challenged the Inspector's decision to allow these applications and the matter had been remitted back to the Planning Inspectorate to consider the appeals again. The Planning Inspectorate had decided to deal with the matter under the Written Representations procedure. Representations were made to the Planning Inspectorate that this would deny the objectors the opportunity to make their representations again, but the Inspectorate had insisted on the Written Representations procedure. A pre-action protocol letter would now be sent stating the Council's intention to challenge this decision in Court. A press release would be issued and a further report submitted to the next meeting.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold expressed her strong support for this course of action.

122. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 6 of the Officers' reports.

123. APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

The Committee noted item 7 of the Officers' reports.

124. COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 11 of the Officers' reports.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1.15 pm, resumed at 1.55 pm and closed at 2.30 pm.

CHAIRMAN
22 February 2018