

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 5 February 2020** at **9.30am** when there were present:

Miss S Lawn – Chairman

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

Mr J F Fisher
Mr R R Foulger
Mrs C Karimi-Ghovanlou

Mr S Riley
Mr J M Ward

Also in attendance were the Assistant Director of Planning; Area Team Manager (MR); Senior Planning Officer (CR) and the Senior Governance Officer (SU).

71 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mrs Karimi-Ghovanlou on behalf of all Members present	74 (Glebe Farm, Holt Road, Horsford)	Been lobbied by the applicant. Non-disclosable non-pecuniary interest.
Mr Ward and Mr Fisher	75 (286 Blue Boar Lane, Sprowston)	Sprowston Town Councillors. Had attended the Town Council meeting when the application had been discussed but had not participated or voted. Local choice non pecuniary interest.

72 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Clancy, Ms Grattan and Mr Moncur.

73 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following Minutes (nos: 74 to 76), 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.

74 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191788 – GLEBE FARM, HOLT ROAD, HORSFORD

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of land from agricultural to a self-storage facility, including installation of new storage container units, creation of car park area and associated works at Glebe Farm, Holt Road in Horsford. The proposal would involve the siting of 25 storage containers, each measuring 2.5m in width by 6.1m in length and approximately 2.6m in height, sitting on wooden sleeper bases approximately 200mm above ground level. A total of five car parking spaces was proposed, together with a 3.1m high green mesh security fencing to the south, east and west boundaries and a 2.14m high soil bund along the site's western boundary to provide screening. Finally, 2.4m high security gates and CCTV were proposed at the site, with 7 lighting columns, each 4m high, in proximity to the access and containers. Access was proposed from the existing vehicular access off Brewery Lane, to the north of the site, which currently served the adjacent agricultural building.

The application was reported to committee (1) at the request of one of the Ward Members for the reasons given in paragraph 4.7 of the report and (2) as it fell outside the scheme of delegation.

The Committee received comments from the Council's Economic Development Officer and the applicant (including suggested hours of operation), together with the officer's response, all as reported in the Supplementary Schedule. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of the applicant at the meeting. The Area Team Manager read out a statement on behalf of Mr Thomas, one of the Ward Members, who was in support of the application but unable to attend the meeting.

The site was located outside of the settlement limit and had not been allocated for any purpose. Members noted that Policy GC2 of the DM DPD permitted development outside settlement limits provided it did not result in any significant adverse impact and where it accorded with a specific allocation and / or policy of the development plan. Policy 5 of the JCS supported jobs and economic growth in both urban and rural locations in a sustainable way as well as rural diversification but preferably through the re-use of appropriate non-residential buildings for commercial uses. It was acknowledged that the design and access statement, submitted with the application, stated that two full-time and two part-time jobs would be created. It was also stated that the proposal would help to support existing businesses by providing them with a new storage facility or base in the area from which they could store stock and tools etc. Members noted that the proposals would generate some limited job creation but considered that the number of jobs quoted which would be created could be regarded as ambitious, given the fact that only 25 storage containers were being proposed on the site. Furthermore, the proposals were not considered to be sustainable development and therefore, did not accord with Policy 5 of the JCS. The

Committee also gave consideration to the Horsford Neighbourhood Plan and concluded that the proposals did not comply with the aims of Policy BUS1 which was to support applications for new businesses and employment which fitted in within the surroundings and which were appropriate both in scale and environmental impact.

In terms of the design and impact on the character and appearance of the area, Members noted that the site was currently of a rural appearance and retained a strong countryside character, even though there was a recently erected potato packaging building to the north of the application site. The proposals within this application were considered to be of a more industrial appearance which would be heavily at odds with the prevailing character. Furthermore, the development would constitute a significant intrusion into the countryside which, together with the associated paraphernalia, would intensify the scheme's harmful impact on the rural character and appearance of the area. Members acknowledged that the application included hedging and a soil bund to screen the site but this would only be partially, given the height of the storage units, CCTV apparatus and external lighting and furthermore, the screening of the development by landscaping was not considered to be a sound basis upon which to justify an otherwise harmful visual impact. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to conflict with Policy GC4 of the DMP DPD, Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy HBE3 of the Horsford Neighbourhood Plan as well as Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF.

In terms of the impact on residential amenity, it was considered that the application would not result in any significant light pollution to neighbouring residents, given the degree of separation (The Homestead was approximately 85m from the nearest proposed container) and Members noted that the Environmental Health Officer had raised no objection to the application. Furthermore, given the small scale of development and its nature, which meant it was highly unlikely for the site to be regularly attended during the more unsociable hours, it was considered that it would not result in any significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of existing properties.

The Committee noted that the Highway Authority was not objecting to the proposals, subject to the imposition of four conditions and Members concurred that there would be sufficient parking and manoeuvring space within the site. Accordingly, the proposals were not considered to result in any detrimental impact to highway safety and the application was considered to comply with Policies TS3 and TS4 of the DM DPD.

In terms of all other matters raised, Members concurred with the officer's appraisal addressing these in the report including the imposition of conditions, as appropriate.

In conclusion it was considered that the development would cause significant harm to the general character and appearance of the area and would not protect or enhance the natural environment or make effective use of the land

as required by the NPPF. On balance, the economic and social benefits would be of very limited value, given the scale of development proposed, and when taken cumulatively would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the substantial environmental harm to the area. Therefore, the proposals were contrary to the policies of the development plan and government guidance. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

To refuse application number 20191788 for the following reasons:

The site is located outside of the defined settlement limit and as the development is considered to result in significant adverse impacts in relation to the harm caused to the environment, character and appearance of the area, the application is considered to conflict with Policy GC2 of the Development Management DPD.

The proposed development would result in a substantial change to the countryside character of a site in a prominent location. It is considered that the development would constitute a significant visual intrusion into the countryside, which would, by reason of its appearance and associated paraphernalia, intensify the scheme's harmful impact on the rural character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the proposed development would be discordant and harmful to the general character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policies HBE3 and BUS1 of the Horsford Neighbourhood Plan and Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Furthermore, the proposed development does not constitute economic growth in a sustainable way and conflicts with Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy.

75 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191368 – 286 BLUE BOAR LANE, SPROWSTON

The Committee considered an outline application for the sub-division of an existing residential curtilage and the erection of two new, semi-detached dwellings at 286 Blue Boar Lane in Sprowston. The application sought approval for the access and layout with all other matters reserved for later approval. An existing single storey entrance lobby and carport at no: 286 was proposed to be demolished and the two new dwellings would be linked to the existing dwelling at no: 286 by a new, single carport (to serve 286). The access was proposed off Blue Boar Lane via an existing access which was to be widened as part of this application and would be shared by all three dwellings.

In presenting the application, the Senior Planning Officer amended the officer recommendation by the inclusion of a further condition relating to the removal of Permitted Development Rights for side extensions and outbuildings for plot 2 to limit future pressure on the nearby trees in the adjoining woodland.

The application was reported to committee as it fell outside the scheme of delegation as the applicant was related to an employee and an objection had been received to the proposals.

The Committee received the verbal views of the agent at the meeting.

The site was located within the settlement limit and in a sustainable location, close to a range of services and facilities. Accordingly, the principle of development was considered to be acceptable and complied with Policies GC1 and GC2 of the DM DPD, Policies 1 and 6 of the JCs and Policy 3 of the Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan.

In terms of the design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area, it was noted that the new plots would be of a similar size to the existing neighbouring plots and all three properties would have a good amount of rear amenity space. Overall, it was considered that there was sufficient space within the site to accommodate the additional two dwellings without resulting in a cramped form of development and still leaving sufficient room for parking and manoeuvring. The proposed dwellings would follow the same building line as the dwellings immediately to the south and therefore, it was considered that the layout would not be at odds with that seen in the surrounding area. Finally, whilst the proposal would be partially visible, it was not considered that they would be discordant feature in the street scene or cause harm to the general character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Regarding the impact on trees within and adjacent to the site, it was considered that the proposals, in their amended form, would not result in any significant detrimental impact, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to comply with Policy GC4 of the DM DPD, Policy 2 of the JCS and Policies 1 and 2 of the Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan.

In terms of the impact on residential amenity, the Committee was mindful that the proposals were in outline form only but considered that two additional dwellings could be located as shown on the plans without resulting in any overlooking issues or appear dominant and overbearing. Therefore, at this stage, it was considered that the application would not result in any detrimental impact upon neighbour amenity and, accordingly, complied with Policy GC4 of the DM DPD.

It was noted that the Highway Authority was not objecting to the application, subject to the imposition of three conditions and the Committee concurred that the proposal would not give rise to a severe detrimental impact on the public highway. Overall, it was considered that there was sufficient room within the site to accommodate parking and manoeuvring space and the application complied with Policies TS3 and TS4 of the DM DPD.

In terms of all other matters raised, including the objection raised by Sprowston Town Council, Members concurred with the officer's appraisal addressing these in the report including the imposition of conditions, as appropriate.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development in a sustainable location which would not result in demonstrable harm to the general character and appearance of the area, the adjacent woodland at Cottage Plantation, residential amenity or highway safety and therefore, it was

RESOLVED:

To approve application number 20191368, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) TL04 – Application for “reserved matters” must be made to LPA within 3 years
- (2) RM01 – Details of what reserved matters application shall include
- (3) AD01 - In accordance with plans and documents
- (4) HC09 – Access to be widened
- (5) HC11 – no gates or means of obstruction across access
- (6) HC21 – access, parking and turning area to be laid out as on plans
- (7) L09 – All works to be carried out in accordance with the TPP and AMS
- (8) DR04 - Surface water drainage details to be submitted with reserved matters application
- (9) Removal of Permitted Development Rights for side extensions and outbuildings for plot 2.

The Committee adjourned at 10:20am and reconvened at 10:26am when all of the Members listed above were present for the remainder of the meeting.

76 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191879 – STILLWATER FARM, RABBIT LANE, GREAT WITCHINGHAM

The Committee considered an application for the conversion, renovation and extension to a historical barn, to include extensive landscape rehabilitation programme and works, at Stillwater Farm on Rabbit Lane in Great Witchingham. The application had been submitted under Paragraph 79 of the NPPF Access to the site was from Rabbit Lane and the proposal was for

the dwelling to be set back from the road via a long drive running approximately 300m in length. The barn was currently in a poor state of repair and had partially collapsed during a storm in 2017. The proposal sought to restore and preserve the historical barn and to create a residential dwelling, also with contemporary designed extensions. A former wall which had ran through the building was proposed to be reinstated and constructed from gabions with locally sourced small field flint.

The application was reported to committee as the recommendation for approval was contrary to current development plan policies.

The Committee received the verbal views of the architect at the meeting

The Committee noted that the site was outside of the settlement limit in a rural location and, accordingly, the application had been submitted as an example of a dwelling that met the guidance set out in Paragraph 79 of the NPPF which was a material consideration in the determination of applications outside of the settlement limit. Paragraph 79 stated that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there were special circumstances such as the exceptional quality of the design of the dwelling. All four aspects of Paragraph 79(e) had to be met.

- Be truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards of architecture
- Helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas
- Significantly enhance its immediate setting
- Be sensitive to the characteristics of the area

The Committee concurred with the Senior Conservation and Design Officer's comments detailed in the report and concluded that all four tests had been met and accordingly, the application complied with Paragraph 79.

In terms of the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area, it was considered that the proposed improvements to the site would enhance and improve the appearance of the area as a whole as the site was previously overgrown and had not been maintained for many years. The appearance of some elevations would remain in the style of the agricultural building which existed on the site and it was considered these would not have a detrimental impact on the overall character and appearance of the area.

Regarding residential amenity, given the isolated location of the site and the fact that the nearest neighbouring property was over 300m away with natural screening around the site, it was considered that there would not be any

issues of overlooking. Furthermore, the proposal, in terms of its size and scale, was considered appropriate for the site and should not appear overbearing. Accordingly, the proposal was not considered to result in any detrimental impact upon neighbour amenity and therefore, accorded with Policy GC4 of the DM DPD.

In terms of all other matters raised, Members concurred with the officer's appraisal addressing these in the report including the imposition of conditions, as appropriate.

In conclusion it was considered that the application met the requirements of Paragraph 79 by virtue of its outstanding design, it reflecting the highest standards in architecture, significantly enhancing its immediate setting and being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. In addition, it would have an acceptable impact on the landscape character of the area and not cause harm to any residential amenity or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. Therefore, the proposal represented an acceptable form of development. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

To approve application number 20191879 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (three years)
- (2) Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans.
- (3) Removal of permitted development rights for Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A (Gates, Fences, and Walls etc.) and Class C (Exterior Painting).
- (4) Removal of permitted development rights for Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A (Extensions), Class B (Additions to Roof), Class C (Roof Alterations), Class D (Porches), Class E (Outbuildings), Class F (Hard Surfaces) and Class G (Chimneys).
- (5) Works shall be carried out in accordance with AIA, TPP and AMS
- (6) Ecological Assessment, mitigation measures (bats).
- (7) Prior to the installation of solar panels, details to be submitted and approved
- (8) Prior to commencement, Biodiversity Enhancement Plan to be submitted and approved
- (9) Prior to commencement, Details of external materials to be submitted and approved
- (10) Prior to first occupation, details of the materials to be used in the laying of the track between Rabbit Lane and the site shall be submitted and approved
- (11) Within two months of completion of the dwelling, the mobile home shall be removed from the site
- (12) Notwithstanding the approved plans, this application does not give permission to the outbuilding shown on Dwg No 18005_03_004 Proposed Site Plan. Details of this are to be submitted and approved.

77 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted details of the planning appeals decisions which had been received and details of the appeals lodged for the period 21 December 2019 to 24 January 2020.

In response to a question on the appeal for land east of Memorial Hall, Brundall, the Assistant Director of Planning advised that this would be considered via a Public Inquiry scheduled to take place 21-24 April 2020. The Principal Planning Officer (Charles Judson) would be representing the Council, assisted by legal representation, together with specialist officers in landscape, heritage and land supply issues. The Inquiry would be held in public at Thorpe Lodge and she recommended Members attend.

The meeting closed at 11am