

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held via video link on **Wednesday 12 August 2020** at **9.30am**.

A roll call was taken and the following Members were present:

Cllr S Lawn – Chairman

Cllr A D Adams
Cllr S C Beadle
Cllr N J Brennan

Cllr R R Foulger
Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou
Cllr I N Moncur

Cllr S Prutton
Cllr S Riley
Cllr J M Ward

Also in attendance were the Assistant Director – Planning, the Development Manager (TL), the Area Team Manager (MR) and the Committee Officer (DM).

104 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

No declarations were made.

105 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr J Fisher.

106 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

107 MATTERS ARISING

In response to a question, officers confirmed that any necessary conditions relating to application no: 20191370 – land at White House Farm, Salhouse Road, Sprowston, in so far as they affected aviation matters raised would be accommodated in the detailed conditions which were still being finalised pending completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following minutes (no: 108-110), conditions or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and based on standard conditions where indicated and were subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

108 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200429 – ACORN FARM, NEWTON ROAD, HAINFORD

The Committee considered an application seeking retrospective planning permission for the siting of a mobile home for use as a residential annexe. An existing mobile home was on site housing the family and the additional accommodation would provide for a further family member.

The application was reported to Committee as there were exceptional circumstances which warranted consideration of the proposal by Committee. Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report and officers answered questions from Members.

Members supported the view that, whilst the application site lay outside the defined settlement limit, it did not result in any significant adverse impact and accorded with paragraph 77 of the NPPF in relation to local circumstances and housing development that reflected local need.

It was proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendation be supported. On being put to the vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve temporarily application no 20200429 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) In accordance with plans and documents(AD01)
- (2) Temporary structure/use (expiry date 4 Nov 2025) (TMT01)
- (3) Annexe (O04 amended)

109 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200998 – OLD SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD, GREEN LANE WEST, RACKHEATH

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two detached houses on land originally forming part of the old school playing field.

The application was reported to Committee as it was being recommended for approval contrary to the current Development Plan policies.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report. An amended drawing of the site layout had been received as part of the supplementary papers circulated to Members showing all trees on site being retained in accordance with the tree protection plan and the Conservation Officer had confirmed he was content with the changes. An amended ecology report had also been received covering a range of issues and comments from the County Ecology team were still awaited.

Officers answered Members' questions and it was noted that the provision of two dwellings on the site provided for an acceptable level of spacing between the two properties and the site boundaries and an acceptable amount of space for the parking of cars which had not been achievable with the previously refused application for four units of accommodation. Members supported the view that, although outside the settlement limit and the Council could demonstrate a 5.89 year land supply for housing, the site benefitted from an extant planning permission for one dwelling which established the principle of residential development. The proposal was contrary to policy but the scheme to provide two dwellings would make best use of the site, contribute positively to the housing requirements of the village, was in a sustainable location and therefore there were material considerations that outweighed the conflict with the Development Plan.

It was proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendation be supported. On being put to the vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to delegate authority to the Director of Place to approve application no: 20200998 subject to receipt of satisfactory details in relation to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and subject to the following conditions:

- (1) TL01 Statutory Time Limit
- (2) AD01 In accordance with submitted drawings
- (3) AM14 Unexpected contamination on site
- (4) HC05 New Access
- (5) HC17 Visibility Splay
- (6) HC21 Provision of Parking
- (7) Construction in accordance with the revised AIA
- (8) Ecology – to be informed by further consultation with the NCC Ecologist and on-site mitigation measures, including landscaping, to be advised.

Informatives:

- (1) INFO01 NPPF Statement of conformity
- (2) INF43 – CIL Full Applications
- (3) INF27 – Building Regulations
- (4) SHC INF 02 – Highways (offsite road improvements)
- (5) NS – Waste Management

[The Committee adjourned for a 5 minute comfort break following which a roll call was taken to confirm that all members as recorded above were in attendance.]

110 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201081 – HAWTHORNES, HINDOVLESTON ROAD, FOULSHAM

The Committee considered an application for outline planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings and a new vehicular access on land to the north of the dwelling known as Hawthornes, Hindolveston Road in Foulsham.

The application was reported to Committee at the request of the local Member.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report. An additional arboricultural impact assessment and amended visibility splay access plan had been received and included in the supplementary papers circulated to Members. The amended visibility arrangements now included a new access for the proposed and existing dwellings and revisions to the visibility splays. The Highway Authority still had concerns despite the changes and the comments of the Conservation Officer were still awaited on the potential impact of the revised location of the access on existing trees and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Committee heard from Adam Griggs agent for the applicants in support of the application and Cllr Peck, local Member.

The principle of the proposed two dwellings in a countryside location outside of the defined settlement limit was not considered to be acceptable and as the proposal did not meet any of the special circumstances in paragraph 79 of the NPPF; with the Council able to demonstrate in excess of a 5 year housing land supply, the proposal was not considered to be justified or sustainable.

The proposals as submitted failed to comply with Policies 1, 2, 6 and 17 of the JCS, Policies GC1, GC2, GC4, EN2 and TS3 of the Development Management DPD, the NPPF and The Planning Practice Guidance.

It was proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendation be supported. On being put to the vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to refuse application no: 20201081 for the following reasons:

- (1) This application has been considered against the Development Plan for the area, this being the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011) as amended (2014) and The Development Management DPD (2015). Other material considerations include The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and The Planning Practice Guidance (2014).

- (2) The policies particularly relevant to the determination of this application are Policies 1, 2, 6 and 17 of the JCS and Policies GC1, GC2, GC4, EN2, TS3 and TS4 of the Development Management DPD.
- (3) Critical to the determination of the application is whether or not the principle of development is acceptable. Policy GC2 of the DM DPD states that the settlement hierarchy seeks to focus residential development in settlements which are well-linked and well-related to existing development, services, facilities and employment opportunities. Although the application site is located within the parish of Foulsham which has a settlement limit, the application site is outside of the defined settlement limit, therefore in a countryside location in planning terms. The application site does not have good access to public transport and is not well linked to local facilities and it is considered that future occupiers would be dependent upon the use of the car for everyday travel. Residential development at this location is therefore contrary to sustainability objectives.
- (4) The site is located within the Greater Norwich Area where there is in excess of a five year land supply and therefore the additional dwellings on the site are not required to help to address any recognised shortfall.
- (5) Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning polices and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.
- (6) The application has been submitted in outline format with details relating to the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are to be submitted as reserved matters. The dwellings are not required to house a rural worker; the proposal does not make use of a heritage asset; the proposal is not to re-use redundant or disused buildings or enhance its immediate setting. It is also considered that the proposal is not a design of exceptional quality. Therefore it is considered that the proposal does not comply with the requirements of paragraph 79 of the NPPF and two dwellings in this unsustainable location is not justified.
- (7) The proposed development includes a new vehicular access onto Hindolveston Road (C227) where visibility is severely restricted by the adjacent hedges, vegetation and road alignment. The additional traffic use of the substandard access suggested by this proposal would therefore be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to Policy TS3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2015.

- (8) The development is not supported by any specific Development Management policy which allows for development outside of the settlement limit and nor does it represent overriding benefits when having regard to the harm identified above. The application does not represent sustainable development and is contrary to Policies GC1 & GC2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2015 and Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy 2011 as amended 2014.
- (9) Insufficient arboricultural information has been submitted in respect of the implications and impact of the proposed vehicular access, and it is considered that the development proposed will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would have a negative visual impact on this rural setting which is contrary to Policies GC4 & EN2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2015 and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy 2011 as amended 2014.
- (10) In light of the above information, the application is considered to be in an unsustainable location, outside of any defined settlement limits, contrary to Policies GC1 and GC2 of the Development Management DPD 2015. The application is also considered to conflict with the aims of Policies 1, 2, 6 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2014 and Policies GC4, EN2 and TS3 of the Development Management DPD with regard to the detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area and highway safety.
- (11) The Local Planning Authority has taken a proactive and positive approach to decision taking in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, in this instance it has not been possible for the proposal to overcome the in principle reasons for refusal associated with the proposed development.

111 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions received and appeals lodged for the period 1 July to 4 August 2020.

The meeting closed at 11:18am