

28 MARCH 2019

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

Councillors

Mrs P Grove-Jones (Chairman)

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

J Rest – substitute for Mrs V Uprichard

Mrs S Bütikofer – The Runtons Ward
T FitzPatrick – Walsingham Ward
N Smith – Erpingham Ward
Ms K Ward – Glaven Valley Ward

Officers

Mrs S Ashurst – Development Manager
Mr N Doran – Principal Lawyer
Mr R Parkinson – Major Projects Team Leader
Miss J Medler – Development Management Team Leader
Mrs C Dodden – Senior Planning Officer (Development Management)
Mr J Mann – Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Mr C Reuben – Senior Planning Officer (Development Management)
Miss J Smith - Senior Planning Officer (Development Management)
Miss L Yarham – Democratic Services and Governance Officer

172. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DETAILS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs V Uprichard. There was one substitute Member in attendance.

173. MINUTES

The minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 28 February 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

174. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

175. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Councillor:</u>	<u>Interest</u>
176	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Applicant is personal friend
177	R Reynolds	Received email and telephone call

177	Ms M Prior	Received email and telephone call
177	Mrs A Green	Had met the applicants
179	All Members	Had been lobbied
180	R Shepherd	Applicant is personal friend

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.

- 176. NORTHREPPS - PF/18/1789 - Continued use of land as airfield on a permanent basis. Variation of condition 2 (aerobatic operations) of planning permission PF/11/0232 to state: There shall be no aircraft movements to or from the site by aircraft to be used for/within: Parachute operations; flying displays with aerobatics (except for the purposes of re-fuelling before or following a flying display) or; aerobatics training. No form of flying display organisation or aerobatics training school shall be located at or operated from the site. Banner towing shall be limited to six occasions during the year, and there shall be no more than two public displays or open days at the site annually. [Reconsultation: Further amended description of development]; Northrepps Aerodrome, North Walsham Road, Northrepps, Cromer, NR27 9LF for Mr Gurney**

The Committee considered item 1 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Guy Bartlett (Northrepps Parish Council)
 Jenny Musker (objecting)
 Tony Musker (objecting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report as updated by an addendum which had been circulated and published prior to the meeting. He drew attention to the amended condition wording contained in the addendum. He reported that two additional comments had been received since the publication of the addendum. He displayed plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area, including photographs showing the information displayed on site relating to flying restrictions with regard to European sites and circuit training routes. He also displayed a photograph of a fuel bowser and explained that separate planning permission would be required for additional permanent on site fuel storage. He recommended approval of this application subject to conditions as amended by the addendum.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that the applicant was a close personal friend so she would speak as local Member but would abstain from voting on this application.

She stated that this application related to a small change to the wording of condition 2 of the extant permission. She considered that it was very important to ensure that the wording of the condition allowed continued support to Cromer Carnival displays. In all other aspects there was no change from the permission granted in 2011. She stated that she was the Council's representative on the Norfolk Coast Partnership and the Wash and North Norfolk Marine Partnership, which considered Northrepps Aerodrome to represent best practice for operating in protected areas and an example for others to follow. There was another operational airfield in Northrepps which offered flying lessons during the summer months and a private pilot who regularly flew from Gunton Park, and many people assumed that these flights were from the application site, as well as air taxis which flew to the North Sea rigs from Norwich Airport. The training circuits from Northrepps Aerodrome did not fly over the villages of Roughton or Northrepps.

Councillor R Reynolds supported Councillor Mrs Fitch-Tillett's comments. He commented that it was normal practice for airfields to maintain a log book, aircraft other than helicopters were likely to be throttled back on approach to the airfield and some aircraft had variable pitch propellers which reduced noise due to pilot adjustment after take-off, pilots would be aware of the circuit height and the route was not over the villages, although it could appear to be depending on viewing angle and location. He proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold stated that although she lived within two miles of the airfield she had no financial interest in this application. She stated that she could occasionally see planes overhead but had experienced no disturbance from the airfield. However, she would not second the application due to her proximity to the site.

Councillor N Lloyd seconded the proposal. He asked who monitored the log book and whether the public had sight of it.

The Senior Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained that the Local Planning Authority was able to view the log book at any time and he had inspected it when he visited the site.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett confirmed that the log book was on public display.

Councillor N Pearce stated that the main concern was noise, which had been addressed in the report. He considered that this application should be approved given its importance to Cromer Carnival and the local economy.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds stated that it was an important point that there were other airfields in the vicinity. She supported the proposal.

RESOLVED by 11 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

That this application be approved subject to the conditions as listed in the report, amended condition 2 as set out below and any other conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning:

"2. There shall be no aircraft movements to or from the site by aircraft to be used for/within:

- parachute operations,*
- flying displays with aerobatics (except for the purposes of re-fuelling before or following a flying display) or*

- aerobatics training (For the avoidance of doubt this shall include an individual performing or practicing aerobatic manoeuvres)

No form of flying display organisation or aerobatics training school shall be located at or operated from the site.

Banner towing shall be limited to six occasions during the year, and there shall be no more than two public displays or open days at the site annually.

For the purposes of clarity North Norfolk District Council defines the terms of condition two as follows:

Parachute operations: Any flights where the intention is to deploy or rehearse the deployment of a parachute from an aircraft which leaves and lands at the site, except in the case of emergencies.

Flying Display: Any flying activity deliberately performed for the purpose of providing an exhibition or entertainment at an event that has been advertised and is open either to the public or private individuals, organisations or events.

Flying Display Organisation: An organised group of people with the purpose of organising or conducting flying displays.

Aerobatics training school: Any form of school, lesson or training program whereby a person is taught aerobatic manoeuvres.

Aerobatic Manoeuvres: Defined in line with Statutory Instrument 2016 no. 765 Civil Aviation Air Navigation Order (2016):

loops, spins, rolls, bunts, stall turns, inverted flying and any other similar manoeuvre intentionally performed by an aircraft involving—

(a) an abrupt change in its attitude;

(b) an abnormal attitude; or

(c) an abnormal variation in speed,

not necessary for normal flight or for instruction for licences or ratings other than aerobatic rating”

Aerobatics training: Teaching, instructing or practicing the flying of aerobatic manoeuvres in the air or instructing from the ground.

Located at: Permanent registered address related to the aerobatics display organisation or aerobatics training school.

Operated from: Permanent registered address related to the aerobatics display organisation or aerobatics training school.

Banner Towing: Banner towing is a form of aerial advertising whereby a long piece of cloth or other material is pulled behind a plane.

Public Display: A public display is considered to be defined as a flying display as per the Civil Aviation Authority’s terminology: “Any flying activity deliberately performed for the purpose of providing an exhibition or entertainment at an event that has been advertised and is open to the public”.

Open Days: Days in which the site is open to members of the public for the promotion of aviation.

Hosted at: Refer to the definitions of 'Located at' and 'Operated from' the site."

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

The Committee considered item 2 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Peter Gidney (supporting)

The Development Manager presented the report. She read to the Committee the comments of the Landscape Officer, who did not object to the principle of the development subject to conditions in respect of protected species. However, the Landscape Officer was concerned that the development proposal as amended would result in the loss of additional trees, and therefore an amended Arboricultural Impact Assessment would be required. In addition, additional landscaping was required to mitigate for the loss of additional trees: further detail should be submitted.

The Development Manager presented plans and photographs of the site. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report. She stated that an additional reason for refusal might need to be included, relating to the inadequacy of the information submitted with regard to the trees.

The Development Manager read to the Committee the comments of the local Members, who were unable to attend the meeting.

Councillor V FitzPatrick did not agree with the Officer's recommendation for refusal on grounds that the proposal did not respect the form of the existing building. He considered that the proposed dwelling was appropriate for the location and that it would enhance the immediate setting by bringing a redundant agricultural building back into use as a family home and should therefore be approved.

Councillor S Hester supported the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that she had sympathy with the applicant and the site was stunning. However, she was unhappy that the site was outside the development area and within the AONB, and very close to the dark skies area. She was concerned at the additional windows and light pollution. With regret, she proposed refusal of this application.

Councillor Mrs A Green considered that the proposal would make good use of a modest agricultural building of sound construction, which would not require additional extensions except for a small building to house a ground source heat pump. She considered that conversion would only be practical by incorporating the courtyard, and the proposed lantern would be hidden. She considered that issues regarding the windows could be resolved and moving the garage had avoided the need for an extension. She proposed approval of this application.

Councillor Mrs B McGoun seconded the proposal to refuse this application.

Councillor R Reynolds considered that the original proposal with an attached garage was overbearing and was pleased that the garage had been separated as it would retain the existing vista. He considered that the building should be retained and that the issue regarding the trees could be resolved.

The Development Manager confirmed that only the entrance and driveway to the barn were within the Conservation Area, but the setting of the Conservation Area was relevant to this application. She also confirmed that the site was not within the AONB.

In response to a question by Councillor Mrs S Arnold regarding measurements, the Development Manager stated that she could not give the exact square metreage but Policy HO9 included outbuildings as well as extensions to the main house.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold considered that the building could be converted to a very good family house. The overall increase in size was not overbearing. She supported the application with the proviso that the landscape plan for the woodland area was submitted and further consideration given to the windows and doors.

Councillor N Pearce supported the application. He considered that the location allowed for some flexibility and the proposal would bring the building back into use.

The Development Manager advised that if Members were minded to approve this application should be deferred for revisions to the design and submission of information regarding the trees and landscaping.

The proposal to refuse this application in accordance with the recommendation of the Head of Planning was put to the vote and declared lost with 5 Members voting in favour and 8 against.

It was proposed by Councillor J Rest, seconded by Councillor R Reynolds and

RESOLVED by 10 votes in favour, 0 against and 3 abstentions

That consideration of this application be deferred to seek revisions to landscaping and fenestration and an updated arboricultural assessment.

178. BLAKENEY - PF/18/2321 - Erection of summer house with roof terrace and raising height of existing garden walls; North Granary, The Quay, Blakeney, Holt, NR25 7NF for Mr & Mrs Palmer

The Committee considered item 3 of the Officers' reports.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. She recommended approval of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor Ms K Ward, the local Member, stated that she had been requested to call in this application by Blakeney Parish Council. It had not been clear from the plans as to which walls would be increased in height and by how much. There were concerns that the proposals would result in North Granary appearing to be a grander building than the original Grade II listed Red House. The Parish Council appreciated that the wall fronting the coastal path would be faced with flint, which was an improvement, but there was concern that the increase in height could be overbearing and affect the special character of the landscape and the AONB.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that as Coastal Portfolio Holder she welcomed anything which would strengthen the wall and help prevent flooding of properties along the coast. In terms of design it was an opportunity to replace the brick wall with flint. She proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold considered that the proposal would not have an impact on Red House and the wall would not be noticed when it had weathered down. She seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED unanimously

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

179. HANWORTH - PF/18/2286 - Demolition of pair of semi-detached dwellings and erection of detached two-storey dwelling, double garage and summerhouse; 24 The Common, Hanworth, Norwich, NR11 7HP for Mr M & Mrs Fowler

The Committee considered item 4 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Mr Goldsmith (objecting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Development Management) (CR) presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. He recommended approval of this application subject to the conditions listed in the report.

The Development Manager advised the Committee that an additional condition would be necessary to require demolition of the existing cottages prior to the first occupation of the new dwelling.

Councillor N Smith, the local Member, expressed concern that the new building would be taller and larger than the existing cottages, there were no details of the brickwork or joinery and the details of the porch had not been finalised. He requested a site inspection.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that a condition could be imposed to require materials to be agreed.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds stated that the cottages appeared to be derelict and she considered that the proposal would be a very good use of the site. She proposed approval of this application as recommended.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett considered that Hanworth was a very special area and the cottages were very typical of Hanworth Common. As an amendment, she proposed that the Committee visit the site.

Councillor B Smith considered that the design of the new building was very good and would enhance the area. He seconded the proposal to approve this application.

Councillor J Rest seconded the amendment for a site inspection.

The amendment was put to the vote and it was

RESOLVED by 8 votes to 4 with 1 abstention

That consideration of this application be deferred to allow the Committee to inspect the site.

180. **RUNTON - PF/18/2285 - Change of use of ground floor A1 (Retail) and A3 (Tea room) to C3 (Residential) and the subdivision of 17 and 19 High Street to create one 1-bedroom flat and one 3-bedroom flat (no:17) and one 3-bedroom house (no:19); East Runton Newsagents, 17-19 High Street, East Runton, Cromer, NR27 9AB for RW & TW Properties Limited**

The Committee considered item 5 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speaker

Erica Whettingsteel (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer (Development Management) (JS) presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. She recommended approval of this application subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Councillor Mrs S Bütikofer, the local Member, supported this application. The building was in a very poor state of repair and the proposal would make good and bring much needed housing into the community. She stated that the Parish Council supported the application in principle but could not understand why the shop front was being retained when it had not been insisted upon in West Runton.

Councillor Mrs S Arnold proposed approval of this application.

Councillor J Rest asked if there was provision for safe parking without causing issues for those who were already parking outside the premises.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that there was a shortage of parking, but the Highway Authority had not raised an objection given the existing use. There was a small area to the west of no. 19 which allowed for two parking spaces.

Councillor R Shepherd stated that the applicant was a personal friend and he would not be voting on the proposal.

Councillor Mrs S Bütikofer commented that there was a public car park in the vicinity in which the residents could park.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett seconded the proposal to approve this application.

RESOLVED by 12 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

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

181. SCULTHORPE - PF/18/1807 - Erection of single storey log cabin for use as annexe accommodation; Land Ancillary to Roshpinna, Fakenham Road, Sculthorpe, Fakenham, NR21 9NE for Mr Haller

The Committee considered item 6 of the Officers' reports.

The Senior Planning Officer (Development Management) (CD) presented the report and displayed plans and photographs of the site. She stated that the distance between the host property and proposed building was 65 metres and not as stated in the report. She recommended refusal of this application as set out in the report.

Councillor T FitzPatrick, the local Member, stated that he had spoken to the applicant and the neighbours. He stated that the road was separate from the main village, on the opposite side of the bypass in the stopped-up part of Fakenham Road. There was very limited traffic and no real highway objection which could not be addressed by shared access with the main dwelling. The applicant required the annexe for family members. North Norfolk had a high proportion of elderly people and he considered that such proposals should be encouraged to keep family members together. He considered that this application should be approved with conditions to ensure that it was ancillary to the main house and only for use by family members. He considered that the proposal was a good use of a large site.

Councillor R Reynolds considered that the proposal was acceptable provided it could be conditioned for family members.

In response to a question by Councillor Mrs B McGoun regarding precedent, the Development Manager explained that there had been a recent appeal decision for a similar site for an annexe which was both physically remote and had little functional relationship to the main dwelling. The Inspector had concluded that there was no link and Officers considered this application to be broadly similar. This application did not meet the criteria for annexe accommodation.

Councillor Ms M Prior stated that one of the biggest problems for the District was housing and care for the elderly. She considered that this was an ideal opportunity and requested that this application be allowed for that purpose only.

Councillor N Pearce considered that the proposed log cabin was out of character with its surroundings. He supported the Officers' recommendation.

The Development Manager explained that there was ample space within the curtilage of the main building to accommodate an annexe. The primary focus of the annexe building should be a much closer physical and functional relationship and it may have been recommended for approval if it had been proposed within the residential curtilage of the host dwelling. The proposed building was considered by officers to be an entirely separate planning unit, hence the recommendation.

Councillor Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds stated that the road had no traffic and she considered that the log cabin, made of natural materials, would be ideal for this situation.

Councillor R Reynolds added that the site was close to the Hawk and Owl Trust which also had wooden buildings.

RESOLVED by 9 votes to 4

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

182. APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR A SITE INSPECTION

RESOLVED

That the Committee undertakes the following site inspection:

HAPPISBURGH – PF/18/2188 - Variation of conditions 2 and 4 (approved site plans), 3 (original site's restoration plan), 8 (landscaping scheme) and 11 (new site's access entrance details) of planning permission PF/14/0120 (relocation of Manor Farm caravan park to form 194 space caravan site and camping area [Appeal Decision ref APP/Y2620/A/14/2228049]). Amendments to: Reduce the height and width of the perimeter bund from 2.5m to 1.5m height with a 1.0m Willow screen/fence above; Introduce lighting bollards; Introduce an enclosure for siting LPG tanks and site of an electricity substation; Amend landscaping scheme details; Amend site entrance design details, and propose a landscaping restoration scheme for the existing site [Reconsultation Amended Plans and Description];

HAPPISBURGH – PF/19/0103 - Installation and retention of an electricity substation and 4no. 3950 litre LPG tanks on a concrete pad for use within surrounding caravan park (retrospective);

HAPPISBURGH – PF/19/0350 - Variation of conditions 2 and 4 (approved site plans), 3 (original site's restoration plan), 8 (landscaping scheme), 11 (new site access entrance details) and 12 (drainage) of planning permission PF/14/0120 (relocation of Manor Farm caravan park to form 194 space caravan site and camping area [Appeal Decision ref APP/Y2620/A/14/2228049]). Amendments to: Provide an enclosure for siting LPG tanks and a new electrical substation/switch room; Amended landscaping scheme details to provide an earth bund of 2.5 metres height; Amend the hard surfacing within the site from an impermeable to a permeable surface type; Revise the detail of drainage for surface water to omit to the drainage ditch adjacent to the bund; Extend the bund eastwards from the north-east corner along the boundary adjoining the neighbouring approved housing development; Amend site entrance design details; and, Propose a landscaping restoration scheme for the existing site

Manor Caravan Park, North Walsham Road, Northrepps NR28 0PW for Happisburgh Estates Ltd

183. NEW APPEALS

The Committee noted item 8 of the Officers' reports.

184. INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS - PROGRESS

The Committee noted item 9 of the Officers' reports.

185. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEALS - IN HAND

The Committee noted item 10 of the Officers' reports.

186. APPEAL DECISIONS – RESULTS AND SUMMARIES

The Committee noted item 11 of the Officers' reports.

187. COURT CASES – PROGRESS AND RESULTS

The Committee noted item 12 of the Officers' reports.

The meeting closed at 12.18 pm.

CHAIRMAN
23 April 2019