

Agenda Item 4

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council, held on 30 June 2021 at 10am.

Committee Members Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, J Halls, L

Present: Neal and G Minshull (for Items 1-3).

Officers in The Assistant Director for Planning (H Mellors), the Area

Attendance: Planning Manager (G Beaumont) and the Principle

Planning Officers (T Barker & S Everard)

11 members of the public were also in attendance

564 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
2020/1533/F	CRINGLEFORD	All	Local Planning Code of Practice
			Lobbied by the Local Members D Elmer and W Kemp
		All	Local Planning Code of Practice
			Lobbied by the Parish Council
		L Neal	Other interest Cabinet Member involved with a parking scheme for Cringleford
		D Bills	Other Interest
			County Councillor covering Cringleford
2021/0400/F	HETHERSETT	All	Local Planning Code of
			Practice Lobbied by an Objector

		D Bills	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors and Supporters
		D Bills	Other interest Local Member for Hethersett
2021/0542/F	SHELTON AND HARDWICK	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by an Objector
		All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Local Member M Edney

565 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 2 June 2021 were confirmed as a correct record with the addition of Councillor Julian Halls added to Committee attendance list.

566 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
2020/1533/F	CRINGLEFORD	M Hill – Objector
		R Jones – Applicant
2021/0400/F	HETHERSETT	A Quinlan – Applicant
		M Stark – Supporter
		L Farrell (Written representation) –
		Objector
2021/0542/F	SHELTON AND	J Murgatroyd – Parish Council
	HARDWICK	L Matthews – Objector
		D Sherman – Agent
		Cllr M Edney (Written Representation)
		– Local Member

2021/0651/F	SHOTESHAM	H Jackson – Parish Council
		K Munro – Objector
		C Burton – Objector
		Cllr F Ellis – 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.

567 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting concluded at 12:33 pm)

Chairman

Update Sheet – Development Management Committee – 30th June 2021

Item	Updates	Page No.
1	None.	14-22
2	 One additional public representation setting out: Proposal would obstruct the right of way as the building and storage area will be constructed over part of the Route of Access to the Property and so as to block rear gate which provides access to the Property from the Site The Proposal is undeliverable as a result of the right of way which benefits our client's property. There are competing sites which would reduce the level of noise impact and also not restrict rights of way. Permission should be refused on this ground. This is set out within case law. A foul drainage strategy has not been provided contrary to DM4.2 The noise impact assessment is not accurate and has not been updated to reflect the larger number of noise sensitive receptors which had been identified. Land registry details have also been provided showing an application has been made to change the register to grant a right of easement from 10 Park Close. The documents are dated 18 June 2021. 	23-27
	Comments received from the Environmental Quality Team Recommended conditions: Hours of use Plant noise Noise Management Plan – including details of a noise limiter Verification testing Glazing specification Lighting	
	Officer comments on the additional updates In relation to the additional representation, consideration has been given to the deliverability of the scheme and the right of access for adjacent properties. This is considered to be private matter which does not prevent the Council from granting planning permission. In relation to competing sites, whilst it is understood that the applicants assessed alternative locations for the development, these have not been brought forward, and as such there is no competing sites available for the Council to consider. Consideration has been given to the case law set out by the objector and in this regards the questions around the right of access and competing sites is not considered to prevent planning permission being granted.	

	In terms of the noise assessment, the additional comments have now been received from the Environmental Quality Team including a list of proposed conditions. This has confirmed that the noise impact assessment is acceptable and that the noise impact of the development can be mitigated by way of condition. In terms of drainage, the agent has confirmed the intention to connect to the public sewer in recreation road. A condition is proposed to secure this. Subject to a condition the proposal is considered to meet the tests of DM4.2. Recommendation: Approval with Conditions.	
2		20.20
3	Comments received from NCC Highways:	30-36
	Recommend conditions on provision of access and parking area which are to be added as requested	
	Updated Ecological Assessment received	
	Recommends further mitigation and enhancement measures which can be incorporated into the existing conditions on the recommendation	
4	Comments received from NCC Highways.	37-42
	Unfortunately the visibility from the entrance to the property is poor in both directions. As such I don't think that we can support the application with the entrance as it stands. The main problem is lack of vision from the property entrance in both directions. If approved I would suggest that the front hedge should be lowered and maintained at 1m above road level. This will improve vision to the south although not to standard. The applicant does not appear to own the land to the north so not a lot can be done that way.	
	A parking plan would be useful, although there does seem to be a sufficient amount	
	You may also wish to consider limiting the number of persons that can use the office, in order to limit traffic movements and parking requirements.	
	Officer comment: The existing entrance is used by both the occupants of the dwelling and those who work at the outbuilding. Visibility is substandard with seemingly limited opportunity to improve this to provide the necessary splays and particularly to the north as the applicant does not appear to own land in this direction. The access is within the 30mph speed limit but close to the point at which The Common is subject to the national speed limit meaning that vehicles may be travelling at speeds greater than 30mph as	

they approach the national speed limit or slow down from it. This development is not an ancillary function to the dwelling and generates vehicular movements from those who work and do not live there. In light of all these factors, I consider that the application should be additionally refused on the grounds of highway safety as adequate visibility splays cannot be provided contrary to Policy DM3.11 of the SNLP.

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 : 2020/1533/F
Parish : CRINGLEFORD
Applicant's Name : Mr & Mrs Jones

Site Address : 1 Gurney Lane Cringleford NR4 7SB

Proposal : Alterations and extensions to existing bed & breakfast and

owners' existing living accommodation

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with Conditions

1 Time limit - full permission

2 In accordance with submitted drawings

3 Provision of parking area

4 Limit guest accommodation to 5 bedrooms

5 Guest accommodation not to be used as main residence

of occupiers

2. Appl. No : 2021/0400/F Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicant's Name : Hethersett Parish Council

Site Address : Memorial Playing Fields Recreation Road Hethersett

Norfolk

Proposal : Demolish existing changing rooms and construction of new

sports changing pavilion with community facilities and

extension to existing car park

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with Conditions

1.Time Limit

2. Submitted drawings

3.Materials

4.Surface Water Drainage 5.Foul Water Drainage

6. Noise remediation scheme including verification testing

7. Noise Management Plan- including details of a noise

limiter

9. Hours of Use

10. No plant/generators without consent

11. Lighting

12. Contaminated land during construction

3. Appl. No 2021/0542/F

> Parish SHELTON AND HARDWICK

Applicant's Name

Mr Christopher Penn Site Address Agricultural Building Rear of Street Farm Barn The Street

Hardwick Norfolk

Proposal Conversion of existing agricultural barn to one, two-storey

three bedroom dwelling and erection of two-bay open

carport with log store

Decision Members voted 4-0 with one abstention for Approval

Approved with Conditions

1 Time Limit - Full Permission

2 In accordance with submitted drawings

3 No PD for Classes ABCD&E

4 Balcony panel to be obscured glazed

5 No additional openings

6 Foul drainage -sealed system/package

7 Surface water

8 Landscaping scheme

9 No PD for fences, walls etc

10 External materials to be agreed

11 Ecology Mitigation

12 Biodiversity Enhancement

13 Water efficiency

14 Contaminated land during construction

15 Provision of access

16 Provision of parking area

Appl. No : Parish : 3. 2021/0651/F Parish **SHOTESHAM** Applicant's Name Mr J Carver

Site Address Glenview The Common Shotesham NR15 1YD

Extension to existing building and change of use to office Proposal

Members voted unanimously for Refusal Decision

Refused

1. Contrary to Policy DM2.1 2. Unsustainable location

3. Adverse impact on character and appearance of area,

including conservation area 4. Inadequate visibility splays