

Agenda Item: 4

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held remotely on Thursday, 28 January 2021 at 10.00 am.

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

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (T Lincoln), the Principal Planning Officer (C Curtis) and the Senior Planning Officer (B Skipper).

544 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
2020/1416/F (Item 1)	COLNEY	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Parish Council
		D Bills and L Neal	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Parish Council
		T Laidlaw	Other Interest A Member of Costessey Town Council who own a burial ground of a similar type
2020/1925/F (Item 2)	PORINGLAND	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors
		L Neal	Other Interest Related to Cllr John Overton
		L Neal	Other Interest Member of Poringland Parish Council but did not take part in any Parish planning discussions.

545 MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 13 January 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

546. 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 application listed below.

APPLICATION	PARISH	SPEAKERS
2020/1416/F (Item 1)	COLNEY	B Korn – Parish Council J Elbro – Objector E Cass – Agent for the Applicant Cllr W Kemp – Local Member
2020/1925/F (Item 2)	PORINGLAND	R Blackham – Applicant Cllr J Overton – Local Member
2020/2042 (Item 3)	CHEDGRAVE	R Seel – Parish Council R Warminger – Objector D Fradgley – Agent for the Applicant Cllr K Mason-Billig – 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.

547. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting concluded at 12.50 am)



Chairman

Appendix A

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 28 January 2021

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 2020/1416	<p>3 photos submitted by Colney Parish Meeting have been circulated to Members.</p> <p>Additional comments have been received from the Environment Agency;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A number of gauging stations reached their historic maximum levels during recent flooding events but there is no evidence to indicate that the risk level has changed and therefore their response remains unchanged.	11
Item 2 2020/1925	<p>3 additional letters of objection</p> <p>Raising the same issues as set out in the agenda with the addition of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As a development for over 20 dwellings, and being a major development, should this application be automatically refused?• The Neighbourhood Plan sought the views to suggest that there should not be a major development to the south of the existing village settlement• It is curious that the Parish Council objected so strongly to the previous application, but appear to be content with the current application where many of their previous concerns remain and are considered to be well founded reasons for objection• The community infrastructure levy does not appear to be paid on these dwellings, what are the benefits to the residents of Poringland• St. Lawrence are deeply concerned with regard to the mixing of individuals of care with private residential• It is considered that SNDC are under pressure to meet their targets for Care based Accommodation. This could make this proposal appealing• A number of mature trees are planned in close proximity to the St. Lawrence builds. These will cause overshadowing, which will increase over time. The siting of these	20

	<p>trees in such proximity could cause structural issues to the planned houses & drainage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of ability to enjoy the land • Loss of key views from St. Lawrence and local PROWs • Create a precedent for further development in the village • All the comments made by the Planning Inspector under the appeal for the 3 dwellings at St Lawrence are considered pertinent to this application. • In terms of the residential amenity of the properties of St Lawrence, the proposal would, as amended, be overwhelmingly dominant and overbearing. The properties would feel dwarfed due to the overbearing nature of the proposed development through its sheer presence, scale, form and massing with multiple rooms overlooking • It is noted that rooms within the proposed care home are indicated as being obscure glazed where they face towards St Lawrence presenting an oppressive and poor standard of living conditions for the proposed occupiers • The change in the ridge levels between the dwellings on the two sites will be more than 2.5m with further roof mounted features to 3.9m, it is considered, result in a detrimental impact, the proposal therefore does not relate well to the existing development and will be seen to dwarf the St. Lawrence site • The nearest bus stop to the application site is greater than 400 metres from the application site with the main facilities of shops, doctors, pharmacy and others over a kilometre away. Too far for those, even where more active, living in a care village to walk to • The numbers of employees stated on the application form appears to be slight/low for the range of facilities that are to be offered on site • It is suggested that the Council need to acquire a greater understanding of how each and all of the facilities will be staffed, including self-employed/contractors and service operators 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Design Crime Officer expresses concerns regarding the lack of adequate boundaries that are essential for the security of the development. This does not appear to have been addressed as part of the application submission • The harm to the character and appearance of the area including the countryside, due to the sheer magnitude, scale and mass of the proposal does cause significant and demonstrable harm that is not outweighed by any other considerations contrary to NPPF <p>In addition to the above a request for a formal comment from NHS STP prior to determination by committee. (if not the NHS STP formal comment from Burgate Lane should be a material consideration be a matter for material planning consideration, where little capacity is evidenced)</p> <p>The NHS STP have been consulted twice on this application and no comments received, however under the previous application they commented as follows: There is sufficient capacity in the local GP practice to accommodate this development and therefore we have no comments or mitigation requests (April 2019).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, NHS STP have been advised by South Norfolk Council that Healthcare is not currently contained on our CIL123 list, consequently, it is confirmed mitigation cannot be obtained for primary healthcare. Officers consider that the responsibility for health provision remains with the health providers, primarily with NHS England who provide funding for doctors based on the population / number of patients in an area. The residents in new development will contribute to this national funding through taxes in the same way as existing residents. Consequently, in general terms the impact of a new development on existing medical facilities is managed by health providers and it is not considered that obligations can reasonably through S106.</p> <p>Caistor St Edmund and Bixley Parish Council fully supports this application taking into account the amendments that have been made since the refusal of the first application. The Parish Council</p>	
--	---	--

	feels that there is an unmet need within the area for places which care for the elderly.	
Item 3 2020/2042	3 additional letters of objection 5 additional letters of support Raising the same issues as set out in the agenda Chedgrave Parish Council – Parish Council voted to approve this application	44

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** : **2020/1416/F**
 Parish : **COLNEY**
 Applicant's Name : Mr Roger Vail
 Site Address : Land adjacent to Colney Woodland Burial Park Watton Road
 Colney NR4 7TY

 Proposal : Change of use of land for extension of existing burial ground to
 provide up to 3,600 additional burial plots, extension to existing
 access road and construction of comfort building.

 Decision : Members voted 4-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 In accordance with submitted drawings
- 3 Landscape and woodland management plan
- 4 Implementation of L&W management plan
- 5 Plot markers
- 6 Hours of opening to public
- 7 External lighting
- 8 Groundwater monitoring
- 9 Foul water
- 10 Surface water
- 11 Emergency flood and evacuation plan
- 12 Access road - details
- 13 Provision of parking – revised scheme
- 14 Ecology

2. **Appl. No** : **2020/1925/F**
 Parish : **PORINGLAND**
 Applicant's Name : Mr Robert Blackham
 Site Address : Land South West of Bungay Road Poringland, Norfolk
 Proposal : Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a 41 bed care home (with 10 extra care apartments on ground floor, Use Class C2) and 44 extra care lodges (All Use Class C2), together with vehicular access, landscaping and communal facilities including, restaurant, cafe, bar, gym, therapy rooms, hair salon, shop and bowls green.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Place to **Approve** subject to a Section 106 agreement relating to the extra care provision.

Approved with Conditions

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 In accordance with submitted drawings
- 3 Boundary treatments to be agreed
- 4 Materials to be agreed
- 5 Written scheme of archaeological investigation
- 6 Provision of fire hydrants
- 7 Water efficiency
- 8 Renewable energy
- 9 Detailed design of surface water drainage to be agreed
- 10 Foul Water to main sewer
- 11 Landscaping scheme
- 12 Long term landscape management plan
- 13 Tree protection (implementation only)
- 14 Details of no/minimal dig construction to be submitted
- 15 Retention of tree and hedgerows
- 16 No additional external lighting without details
- 17 Noise management plan for refuse bins to be agreed
- 18 Construction Management Plan
- 19 Noise and mitigation plan
- 20 Cooking fume extraction system to be agreed
- 21 No generators/air plant without consent
- 22 Contaminated land - Investigation
- 23 Implementation of remediation scheme
- 24 Contaminated land during construction
- 25 Ecology Mitigation
- 26 Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
- 27 Lighting design for light-sensitive biodiversity
- 28 Construction Traffic (Parking) management plan
- 29 Existing Access, Widen or Improve
- 30 Visibility splay, approved plan
- 31 Access Gates - Restriction
- 32 Access - Gradient
- 33 Traffic Regulation Orders
- 34 Provision of parking, service
- 35 Highway Improvements Offsite
- 36 Highway Improvements Offsite implementation
- 37 Air Source heat pumps
- 38 No PD for Classes ABCD&E
- 39 No PD for fences, walls etc
- 40 Restricted use of the restaurant/café
- 41 Details of the access road/drive surfacing

3. **Appl. No** : **2020/2042**
 Parish : **CHEDGRAVE**
 Applicant's Name : Telefonica UK Limited and CTIL
 Site Address : Telephone Exchange, Langley Road, Chedgrave, NR14 6HD
 Proposal : Electronic communications base station comprising a 17.5m high
 monopole mast, shrouded antennas, two 0.6m diameter
 transmission dishes, two equipment cabinets, an electric meter
 supply cabinet, and ancillary electronic communications
 apparatus.
- Decision : Members agreed unanimously that **Prior Approval is not
 required**