

Agenda Item 4

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council, held on 1 September 2021 at 10am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, J Halls, L Neal and G Minshull.

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (T Lincoln), the Area Planning Managers (C Raine & G Beaumont), the Senior Planning Officer (P Kerrison) and the Principal Planning Officer (S Everard)

one member of the public was also in attendance

572 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

Application	Parish	Councillor	Declaration
2021/0307/F	DISS	G Minshull	Other interest Local Member for Diss
2021/0365/F	FORNCETT	G Minshull	Other Interest Trustee of Norfolk Tank Museum who occupied land adjacent to the application site

573 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 28 July 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

574 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Place, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

Application	Parish	Speakers
2021/0307/F	DISS	E Taylor – Town Council Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member
2021/0365/F	FORNCETT	D Avery – Applicant Cllr B Duffin – Local Member

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of the minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

575 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting concluded at 11:45 am)



Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 1 September 2021

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	<p>2021/0307</p> <p>One additional representation has been received. This has set out detailed comments including concern with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Initial consent was for a pub and a hotel, why was the pub allowed to be built without the much needed hotel. – Unclear is key planning issues were discussed at the pre-application meetings – No reference to access from the Morrisons roundabout. – Bus station is a poor reflection on Diss, however it is a shame that there isn't a connection to it. – Why was there no discussion about cycle routes and provision for cycle storage? – Why do so many of the dwellings face north? Why are they single aspect with no cross ventilation? Why do so many of the units have no open private space? Why are the internal corridors so long and narrow and artificially lit? – Given these homes are for retirees and a population which will in most instances become more infirm, why is there no provision for mobility scooters close to the apartments? Why are they parked in a cluster at one end of the car park? – Why are there no footpaths alongside the road on the west side of the site? Are residents to be expected to walk in the road when collecting their order from the Fair Green Fish & Chip shop? Who owns and who will be responsible for the maintenance of the road and its lighting? – Is a site adjacent to a pub car park and overlooking an electricity sub-station a suitable place for retirees? – Diss needs better from the applicants and the SNC planning department. Let's try to improve design standards and not simply fall back on old layouts because they're cheap and simpler to implement 	Pages 16-32
Item 2	<p>Additional reason for refusal proposed based on appeal decision (attached) for adjacent site. Wording as follows:</p> <p>Accessibility of the Site: <i>By virtue of the works associated with this application, the unit will create a greater transport and traffic movements as an independent dwelling as opposed to an annex ancillary to a dwelling. The application site is approximately 930m outside of the development</i></p>	

	<p><i>boundary that has been defined for Forncett St. Mary. Given the nature of the highway network in the area and in light of the approximately 2.5km distance to Long Stratton and the frequency of the bus service, it is considered likely that residents will rely on the private car to access a wider range of services and facilities. The location of the site is not considered to encourage sustainable patterns of transport movements and the development will not minimise the need to travel or minimise greenhouse gas emissions. The application is therefore contrary to Policies 1 and 6 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM3.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015.</i></p>	
--	--	--

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS**NOTE:**

Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Place's final determination.

Other Applications

1. **Appl. No** : **2021/0307/F**
Parish : **DISS**
Applicant's Name : Churchill Retirement Living
Site Address : Land to the Rear of Thatchers Needle Park Road Diss Norfolk

Proposal : Redevelopment of the site to form 58 retirement apartments and 15 retirement cottages including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to advise officers that they are minded to refuse the application and to give delegated authority for officers to continue to negotiate on outstanding issues.

Minded to Refuse

1 Over development of site
2 Insufficient information – viability
3 insufficient information – drainage
4 Contrary to DM3.15 – Insufficient levels of open space

2. **Appl. No** : **2021/0365/F**
Parish : **FORNCETT**
Applicant's Name : Mr & Mrs Avery
Site Address : The Old Safety Valve Station Road Forncett St Peter NR16 1JA

Proposal : Proposed change of use and extension of existing annexe to create separate dwelling.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**

Refused

1 Building not suitable for conversion
2 Outside of Development Boundary
3 Accessibility of the Site