

17 MAY 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 A Fitch-Tillett (Chairman)
Mrs V Uprichard (Vice-Chairman)

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

E Seward – substitute for N Lloyd
T FitzPatrick – substitute for R Shepherd

N Coppack – Gaunt Ward
Mrs H Cox – Cromer Town Ward
A Yiasimi – Cromer Town Ward

J Rest - observing

Officers

Mrs N Baker – Head of Planning
Mrs S Ashurst – Development Manager
Mr G Lyon – Major Projects Manager
Mrs N Turner – Housing Strategy & Community Development Manager
Ms F Croxen – Locum Solicitor
Mr G Linder – Major Projects Team Leader
Mr D Watson – Development Management Team Leader
Mr J Dougan – Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Mr C Reuben – Senior Planning Officer (Development Management)
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N Lloyd and R Shepherd. Four substitute Members attended the meeting as shown above.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 19 April 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
5 6	R Reynolds Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds	Know supporting speaker as she had worked for NNDC but had not spoken to her in relation to the applications.
8	B Smith	Knows applicant. Had spoken to him before meeting but not in relation to the application.
8	Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds R Reynolds S Shaw	Know applicant
8	T FitzPatrick	Served on Cabinet with the applicant and received a degree of hospitality when he was Chairman.
8	All Members	Applicant known as former Councillor.
8	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Applicant known to her, minor pecuniary interest so would vacate chair and take no part in discussion or voting.
8	N Pearce	Lives adjacent to application site.

Members had also received correspondence in respect of applications on the agenda.

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.

5. **KNAPTON - PF/17/1675 - Erection of 14 dwellings, associated works and access; Land off School Close, Knapton, North Walsham, NR28 0SA for Victory Housing Trust**

The Committee considered item 1 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Mr A Young (Knapton Parish Council)
Mr A Robertson (objecting)
Mr M Herbert-Oakley (objecting)
Ms M de Vries (objecting)
Ms F Davies (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report, including plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area, and visualisations of the proposed development, and highlighted the main issues which were addressed in the report. He reported that the agent had clarified that the pond was not included in the application site. The issue of drainage was largely addressed in the report but officers wanted to make members aware of the localised surface water flooding on the public highway. Flooding on the public highway was a Highway Authority issue. A sustainable drainage scheme had been submitted which indicated that an acceptable surface water drainage scheme could be achieved without exacerbating flooding elsewhere.

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) reported that a petition containing 131 signatures had been received, which supported the principle of affordable housing but objected to the current scheme. A letter had been received from a member of the public expressing concern that the Officers had not given sufficient weight to the AONB, Highway Authority comments or impact on users of the village hall. However, these issues had already been addressed within the report. An additional letter had been received in support of affordable housing. He reported that second home ownership in the village was 5.9% and the average age of residents in the area was 49.5 years. The Public Rights of Way Officer had confirmed that no contribution was required.

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) recommended approval of this application in accordance with the recommendation in the report.

Councillor N Coppack, the local Member, spoke on behalf of local residents. He considered that the proposal was contrary to Paragraph 118 of the NPPF because of loss of habitat and the lack of biodiversity. He considered that the layout of the site did not meet green space requirements. He considered that although there had been some improvement to the height of the buildings, there was a lack of visual interest and local character, with anonymous buildings more suited to a suburban housing estate. He considered that the proposal did not comply with Local Plan Policy SS2 and HO3 as the location was unsustainable and proposed more than 10 dwellings. He stated that local residents wondered why the application was recommended for approval given the concerns of the Highway Authority, Parish Council and various breaches of planning policy. Concerns had also been raised regarding the loss of the memorial trees.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard referred to the lack of facilities in Knapton. She stated that residents of the proposed development would rely on cars and the roads were very poor. She was pleased that the proposal was for affordable housing but considered that a smaller number would be preferable. She was very torn over this application.

Councillor B Hannah referred to concerns raised by an objecting speaker regarding access for emergency vehicles.

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) stated that the section between the village hall and the site was deficient in terms of highway width. School Close appeared to suffer from parking on the highway but this stretch of road met the required highway standards in terms of width and access visibility splays. The internal layout of the site was of the required standard and exceeded the required amount of parking spaces in addition to a car park for the use of the village hall. The parking pressures in School Close were from people choosing to park on the road, which the Highway Authority could enforce. In the Officers' view the proposed layout would not cause problems.

Councillor B Hannah proposed refusal of this application.

Councillor R Reynolds referred to the policy issues under SS2 and HO3. He considered that the lack of flint in the designs could be addressed by a planning condition and suggested that flint walls could be considered. He considered that other concerns had been addressed. The highway issues were not considered to be severe. He stated that conditions could be imposed to help improve the scheme if it were approved, but if refused it was likely to go to appeal and could be approved as it stood. He proposed approval of this application.

In response to a question by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones, the Housing Strategy & Community Development Manager explained that the dwellings would be offered to people on the waiting list in Knapton and the surrounding parishes.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones expressed concern that there were very few services to support the community.

Councillor Ms M Prior stated that the speakers had made their points well and the Committee had a very full and detailed report, which included many conditions. Whilst the issues were finely balanced, the imperative was affordable housing for local people, including young people. She considered that the Fire Service would have raised an objection if access for emergency services had been an issue. She seconded Councillor Reynolds' proposal for approval of this application.

Councillor N Pearce expressed concern that the proposal, if approved, would make a material change to the village.

Councillor E Seward considered that there was a very balanced planning judgement in this case. There was a need for the Housing Association to increase the number of houses and there were 168 people in Knapton and the surrounding area in need of affordable homes. Knapton was an isolated village with a very limited bus service, no amenities and people in the village were car dependent. The proposal did not comply with policy and there were real concerns with regard to highways and parking. He considered that the application should be refused.

Councillor T FitzPatrick considered that the number of people on the waiting list for Knapton was high and affordable housing was the only way many of them could get a home. He considered that the dwellings should remain as affordable homes and not become private or second homes and that people should be helped to remain living locally if they wished to do so. He stated that the residents of the proposed dwellings would take into account the lack of facilities. He considered that flint panels could address the design concerns and that car parking for the village hall was a mitigating factor. He considered that need and demand for affordable homes outweighed most other considerations.

Councillor B Smith expressed concerns regarding the implications of the development on the highway and the removal of the hedge and memorial trees, which he considered should be retained. He considered that the provision of affordable homes was commendable but this was not the right location. He did not wish to see the character of the village spoiled.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds supported Councillor Ms Prior's views regarding the Fire Service.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that affordable housing was an extremely important objective of the Council's Corporate Plan. The ratio of average earnings in the area to average house prices was 12:1. Many working people could not afford to buy their own homes. She considered that the site could be the right place for affordable housing with an attractive design but in this case the design could be better. She considered that the proposal to replace the hedge with a wall should be revisited. She suggested that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to seek further design amendments, to be considered in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and Portfolio Holder.

The proposer and seconder indicated that they were happy to incorporate Councillor Arnold's suggestion into their proposal.

The Major Projects Manager explained that it was not possible to retain the memorial trees in situ but it might be possible to relocate them within the site.

It was proposed by Councillor R Reynolds, seconded by Councillor Ms M Prior and

RESOLVED by 8 votes to 5

1. That the Head of Planning be authorised to seek further design amendments to incorporate additional flint within a better design, the retention/relocation of the existing memorial trees on the site and retention of the boundary hedge, to be considered in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and Portfolio Holder, and subject to:

(i) No new grounds of objection being received following reconsultation on the amended plans.

(ii) Prior completion of a suitable section 106 agreement to secure:

- **The provision of affordable housing**
- **The provision of a commuted sum of monies for mitigation and monitoring of European designated sites**
- **To secure satisfactory management arrangements for the on-site open space (if not possible to secure by planning condition).**

(iii) The following conditions (summarised):

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with the approved plans
3. Details of external facing materials including detailed elevations
4. Details of all boundary treatment
5. In accordance with the AIA and AMS
6. Details of additional mitigatory tree planting
7. Details of an appropriate path between the footpath on the estate road to the SE corner of the site
8. Details of existing and proposed ground levels including finished floor levels
9. Submission of a revised Landscape Plan and Landscape Management Plan to include the Millennium Garden to the west of the site
10. Programme of archaeological investigation
11. Submission of a detailed Surface Water Drainage Scheme
12. Submission of details of parking for Construction workers

13. The village hall car park to continue to be made available for use by users of the village hall during construction
14. In accordance with the recommendations of Ecological Appraisal
15. Submission of a revised Biodiversity Method Statement
16. Details of disabled and cycle parking for the village hall car park

Any other conditions considered to be appropriate by the Head of Planning.

2. **That the application be refused if a suitable section 106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the date of resolution to approve and, and in the opinion of the Head of Planning, there is no realistic prospect of a suitable section 106 agreement being completed within a reasonable timescale.**
6. **SOUTHREPPS - PF/17/2082 - Erection of 20 no. dwellings with associated access, onsite parking provision, gardens and open space, & the demolition of existing garages to create additional residents/visitor parking; Land off Long Lane, Southrepps, Norfolk for Victory Housing Trust**

The Committee considered item 2 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Mr R Swift (Southrepps Parish Council)
Mr G McCabe (objecting)
Mr S Hall (objecting)
Ms F Davies (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report, including plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area, and visualisations of the proposed development, and highlighted the main issues which were addressed in the report. He stated that the proposed car parking was in excess of the requirement and not as stated in the report.

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) reported that the Public Rights of Way Officer had confirmed that no contribution was required towards the Public Right of Way opposite the site entrance on to Long Lane. The agent had confirmed that the applicant was willing to contribute towards off-site works on Long Lane Estate. He stated that the provision of a fire hydrant could be dealt with by a condition rather than a S106 obligation. Condition 4 of the recommendation should read "Investigate the feasibility of a Traffic Regulation Order to deter parking on Long Lane Estate (double yellow lines)".

The Chairman stated that Southrepps was designated as a Service Village in the current Local Plan.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold, the local Member, stated that this application was finely balanced. The ratio of average earnings in the area to average house prices was 12:1 and there was a need for affordable housing. However, she considered that the doubling of the number of dwellings in the original allocation and the design of the development were unacceptable. She supported the Highway Authority's view that the highway impact was severe due to the substandard width of the road. She expressed concern at the safety of schoolchildren going to the school. Whilst the public right of way was a pleasant walk on a summer's day, it was not suitable as a route to school in adverse conditions and there was no feasible alternative. However,

there was concern that the school needed more pupils. She requested a tree preservation order on the existing trees and conditions in respect of soft landscaping. She emphasised the need for new development to address the issue of flooding of adjacent dwellings. The design needed to be addressed, in particular the perceived block of development to the north of the site and the two detached bungalows marooned in the centre of the development. She considered that any new affordable development should be something North Norfolk could be proud of.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard considered that the design of the proposed development was poor. Long Lane was substandard and she considered that double yellow lines would be ineffective unless parking was monitored. She considered that the needs of people who were less mobile had not been taken into account.

Councillor B Hannah proposed refusal of this application on highway grounds. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs V Uprichard.

Councillor R Reynolds referred to the proven planning need for this development, which would deliver 100% affordable housing. He accepted that there were highway issues but this was not uncommon in the county. However, he considered that the proposed density was acceptable but the layout of the development was very poor and should be redesigned.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that the increased site area would normally be suitable for 15 dwellings.

The Planning Officer (Major Developments) explained that the original allocation had incorrectly stated (on the Site Allocation Policy) that the area was 0.6 hectares, whereas the actual site area was 0.9 hectares. Therefore, this anomaly could have affected the estimate of the appropriate number of dwellings in the Site Allocation.

Councillor T FitzPatrick stated that as a service village, Southrepps was expected to take more homes. There was a large number of people who required homes, the proposal would help the village school where the number of pupils was falling. Given the amendment to the site area, the density as now proposed had only increased by one third over the original allocation. He considered that design issues could be dealt with by conditions.

Councillor N Pearce stated that he knew the area well and considered that the highway issues were sufficient to justify refusal of the application.

Councillor E Seward stated that the applicant was a not-for-profit organisation and it was necessary to increase the amount of housing because of the financial climate in which it operated. Southrepps was not isolated but there were highway issues. He considered that there were differences between this application and the previous application at Knapton.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Davies confirmed that the applicant would be willing to reconsider the design.

Following advice from the Locum Solicitor and Major Projects Manager, the proposer and seconder agreed to include additional reasons for refusal in their proposal.

It was proposed by Councillor B Hannah, seconded by Councillor Mrs V Uprichard and

RESOLVED by 7 votes to 5

That this application be refused on grounds that the amount of development proposed is significantly in excess of the quantum of development permitted by Site Allocations Policy SOU 02, compromising the layout of the development and the character of the surrounding landscape and as a consequence the development proposed would be significantly detrimental to the special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Core Strategy Policies EN1, EN2 and EN4 and Site Allocations Policy SOU 02.

As a result of the amount of development proposed the expected nature and volume of the traffic generated by the development would be detrimental to highway safety, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CT 5.

The unclassified roads and pedestrian links serving the site are considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of their restricted width and the lack of passing provision. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CT5 and Site Allocations Policy SOU 02.

- 7. STALHAM - PF/17/1524 - Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of retirement living housing for the elderly (category II type accommodation), including 30 retirement living apartments, 12 retirement bungalows, communal facilities, access, car parking, landscaping and ancillary development at Slaughter House, Upper Staithe Road; Slaughter House, Upper Staithe Road, Stalham, Norwich, NR12 9AX for McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd**

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Ms K Newman (objecting)
Mr N Martin (supporting)

The Major Projects Team Leader presented the report, including plans and photographs of the site.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones, the local Member, stated that she had been requested to report that the Town Council was in support of this application and preferred that access should be from Upper Staithe Road. As local Member, she was fully aware of the arguments for and against the application. The proposal was contrary to Policy SS5, but there had been no interest in the site for commercial use for the past 10 years. The existing buildings were not suitable for small scale use and were full of asbestos. There were concerns regarding the loss of the commercial land and the proposed access to the site. However, she considered, with reluctance, that there was no reason to object to the proposal. She proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor Ms M Prior stated that she was very pleased with this application. She considered that homes for the elderly and disabled who wanted their own property should be included in every application. She seconded the proposal.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold requested clarification with regard to balconies and solar panels.

The Major Projects Team Leader explained that the balconies were Juliette balconies and the exact position of the solar panels had yet to be decided by the applicant and would be subject to condition.

Councillor T FitzPatrick requested that the Economic Development Team try to bring forward the development of other sites in Stalham which were allocated for commercial development and did not wish to see any further commercial sites lost to residential use. However, he considered that if the application site was left it would deteriorate further and there was a danger that the buildings could collapse.

Councillor B Smith expressed concern regarding the use of the offloading bay for the adjacent supermarket.

The Major Projects Team Leader explained that the bay would not be used for parking and explained the arrangement for its use.

Councillor N Pearce asked if it was possible to install a pelican crossing to assist the elderly.

The Major Projects Team Leader explained that a zebra crossing was considered to be a safer arrangement.

RESOLVED

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

(i) Prior completion of a suitable section 106 agreement to secure:

- **Library provision (£2,250)**
- **Improving community facilities at Stalham Town Hall (£20,000)**

(ii) The specific conditions listed in the report and any additional conditions considered to be appropriate by the Head of Planning.

That the application be refused if a suitable section 106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the date of resolution to approve and, and in the opinion of the Head of Planning, there is no realistic prospect of a suitable section 106 agreement being completed within a reasonable timescale.

8. CROMER - PF/17/2124 - Use of land for camping for 40 days consecutively and not more than 60 days cumulatively per year; Beef Meadow, Hall Road, Cromer, NR27 9JG for Mr Cabbell-Manners

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett vacated the Chair during consideration of this application.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard (Vice-Chairman) in the Chair.

The Committee considered item 4 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Mr B Cabbell Manners (supporting)

The Planning Officer (Development Management) presented the report, including plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area. He reported that an amended plan had been received showing the correct site location, upon which it would be necessary to reconsult should the Committee decide to approve the application. He reported that the Highway Authority was adamant that motor homes/caravans were not acceptable because of the substandard access both at the site and at the junction of Hall Road with the wider road network. The application now related to camping only.

The Development Manager read to the Committee the comments of Councillor Mrs H Cox, a local Member, who supported the application.

Councillor A Yiasimi, a local Member, considered that the proposed campsite would be of enormous benefit to the town. There was no objection from local residents or the Town Council.

Councillor T FitzPatrick stated that the town, zoo, pier and promenade were visible and he questioned how this part of the coast could be considered “undeveloped”. He stated that the land was used for the Cromer Hall shoot in the off season and considered that the proposed use would have less impact on bats than shooting. He considered that the economic benefits could not be emphasised enough. 95% of tourists were day visitors and this proposal would help people to stay, spend money in the town and improve the economic diversity of the town and the area. He stated that camping was the most sustainable form of tourism and was an experience for people. He proposed approval of this application.

Councillor R Reynolds considered that the overriding factor was that the businesses in Cromer relied on tourism for their viability. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF “Supporting a prosperous rural economy” was relevant. He seconded the proposal.

Councillor S Shaw commented that the proposal was only for an additional 12 days over the 28 days the applicant was already allowed under permitted development. He considered that there would be economic benefits for Cromer.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds noted that the number of pitches had been reduced from the 2017 season. She supported the application but considered that camper vans and motor homes should be included. She stated that the Government allowed camping and caravanning exemptions for social clubs so, for example, scout groups would be welcome to come.

The Development Manager explained that the addition of motorhomes and caravans would be a different proposal to that being considered. The Committee could only consider camping.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that Hall Road was a rat run and requested signage directing people to turn right at the exit.

Councillor B Smith considered that the proposal would attract people to the area and Cromer would benefit from the footfall. He considered that most people would explore the area on foot rather than by car. He supported the application.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard asked if the welfare of bats could be monitored.

Councillor Ms M Prior considered that the proposal would absolutely benefit the economy. She considered that people staying in tents would do no harm whatsoever to the bats. She supported the proposal.

In response to a further comment regarding siting of motor homes, the Development Manager explained that the application was originally submitted for a caravan and camping site. Motor homes were removed to address a technical consultee objection which had now been withdrawn. She stated that this was a material consideration. If the applicant wished to include motor homes he would need to make a different application.

The Development Manager stated that there was a requirement under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) for NNDC as competent authority to determine the presence of a protected species. This would need to be established prior to granting approval, otherwise the Council could be seen as not complying with its statutory duties under the Regulations. In the event that the Committee wished to approve this application, she recommended that the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to approve subject to further bat activity survey work being carried out, and to no objections being received in respect of the amended plan.

Councillor T FitzPatrick confirmed that he was happy for a degree of monitoring to be carried out but wanted to know if motor homes would be allowed under the 2015 Permitted Development Regulations.

Councillor Ms M Prior referred to the biodiversity section of the report and requested clarification as to whether or not bats were present and if they would come to harm.

The Development Manager explained bats used the site and woodland for foraging but the conclusions in the applicant's Protected Species Survey report were not substantiated by evidence.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds requested clarification as to whether or not caravans could go on the site during the 28 days allowed under permitted development.

The Development Manager stated that she assumed that they may be allowed under the 28 day rule. However, the application under consideration was for camping only.

It was proposed by Councillor T FitzPatrick, seconded by Councillor R Reynolds and

RESOLVED by 12 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application subject to a satisfactory bat activity survey being undertaken, no objections being received in respect of the amended plan and the imposition of conditions considered to be appropriate by the Head of Planning.

Reasons: The economic benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the identified harm.

9. **NEATISHEAD - PF/17/1628 - Conversion of barns into 2 no. dwellings, erection of garages and alterations to and creation of new vehicular access; Allens Farm Barns, School Road, Neatishead, Norwich, NR12 8BU for Mrs M & Mr E Constance & Merrywest**
NEATISHEAD - LA/17/1629 - Conversion of barns into 2 no. dwellings and erection of garages; Allens Farm Barns, School Road, Neatishead, Norwich, NR12 8BU for Mrs M & Mr E Constance & Merrywest

The Committee considered item 5 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Mrs S Wild (objecting)
Mr B Bullen (supporting)

The Development Management Team Leader presented plans and photographs of the site and existing buildings. He summarised an additional heritage statement which had been received from the agent. He recommended approval of both applications as set out in the report.

Councillor Mrs B McGoun, the local Member, emphasised the importance of good design and the need for a sympathetic conversion which made a positive contribution to the setting of the farmhouse. She was concerned that the windows looked out over the old concrete farmyard and had previously asked why they could not be placed on the east side of the barns which had a countryside view. She referred to Policy EN8 and expressed concern that the proposal would not enhance the village or the setting of Allens Farm and considered that there was an opportunity to preserve the character of the original farm area. She was concerned that the integrity of the grouping of the buildings would be lost.

Councillor R Reynolds considered there was sufficient existing fabric to reinstate the buildings and the main walls remained standing. He considered that the proposal was compliant with policy and the buildings could be lost if these applications were not approved.

The Development Management Team Leader explained that whilst the number of windows in the southeast elevation was a concern, some of them re-used existing openings and the opposite elevation currently contained very few openings, which was why they were mainly in the southeast elevation.

Councillor T FitzPatrick considered that this was a perfect opportunity to bring a derelict building back into use. He considered that it was a very good conversion with the reuse of the existing openings, removal of the corrugated sheeting and use of thatch.

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

RESOLVED unanimously

1. **That application PF/17/1628 be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**
2. **That application LA/17/1629 be approved in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning.**

10. **NEATISHEAD - PF/18/0025 - Change of use of land from sewage treatment works to private recreational use, including erection of polytunnel, storage shed and siting of Shepherd's Hut; Anglian Water Authority Sewage Div Bt 4 and 5, King Street, Neatishead for Mr & Mrs Plater**

The Committee considered item 6 of the Officers' reports.

The Planning Officer (Development Management) presented plans and photographs of the site including examples of the types of structures to be erected. He recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor Mrs B McGoun, the local Member, expressed concern with regard to the proposed use of the shepherd's hut, She asked what washing, toilet and fresh water services would be available. She also queried the three year limit in the proposed conditions and what would happen after three years.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that the shed and polytunnel were temporary structures and the shepherd's hut was no more than a caravan. He proposed approval of this application as recommended.

The Locum Solicitor explained that the three year limit was for implementation of the permission. It was not a temporary permission.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold requested a condition to ensure that the polytunnel was removed when it deteriorated. She asked if bats were present.

The Development Manager explained that the Council's ecologist considered that a bat survey was unnecessary. She advised that it would be preferable to secure removal of the polytunnel through enforcement if necessary, rather than by condition.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ms M Prior asked if it was the applicant's intention to sell produce from the polytunnel on the roadside.

The Chairman stated that sale of goods was not part of the proposal.

Councillor T FitzPatrick considered that the proposal was an imaginative use of the site which would have minimal impact on the environment.

Councillor E Seward considered that the overnight use should be monitored to ensure it did not increase. He asked if amenities had been included in the application.

The Planning Officer (Development Management) stated that he understood that the applicant intended to install a composting toilet.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

11. **TRUNCH - PF/18/0432 - Single storey extensions to rear and new roof with roof lanterns to covered walkway between dwelling and garage (part retrospective); 7 Pyghtle Close, Trunch, North Walsham, NR28 0QF for Mrs Bailey**

The Committee considered item 7 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Management Team Leader displayed previously approved plans, proposed plans and photographs of the extension as built. He explained the discrepancy in the height of the garage.

Councillor N Coppack, the local Member, had left the meeting. Councillor J Rest spoke on his behalf. Councillor Coppack had called in the application as it was retrospective.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that the retrospective nature of the application was no reason to refuse it. She considered that the alterations to the approved plans were minimal.

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

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 4

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

12. **NEW APPEALS**

The Committee noted item 8 of the Officers' reports.

13. **INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS**

The Committee noted item 9 of the Officers' reports.

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

The Committee noted item 10 of the Officers' reports.

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

The Committee noted item 11 of the Officers' reports.

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

The Committee noted item 10 of the Officers' reports.

17. **RETIREMENT OF NICOLA BAKER, HEAD OF PLANNING**

The Chairman stated that this was the Head of Planning's last meeting of the Committee before she retired.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold, the Portfolio Holder, paid tribute to the Head of Planning and thanked her for assistance and her achievements in modernising the Planning Service.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that he had enjoyed working with the Head of Planning and had formed a good working relationship with her during his time as Chairman of the Committee.

Members wished the Head of Planning all the best for the future.

The Head of Planning thanked the Members for their kind words and paid tribute to the staff of the Planning Department.

The meeting closed at 2.32 pm.

CHAIRMAN
14 June 2018