

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 8 January 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 S M Clancy
Mr J F Fisher
Mr R R Foulger

Ms R M Grattan
Mrs C Karimi-Ghovanlou
Mr J M Ward

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

63 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Miss Lawn on behalf of all Members	66 (land east of Holt Road, Horsford)	Lobbied by the applicants. Non-disclosable non-pecuniary interest.
Mrs Karimi-Ghovanlou	66 (land east of Holt Road, Horsford)	Had met with the applicant to discuss play equipment for the children's play area. Non-disclosable non-pecuniary interest.

64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Moncur and Mr Riley. Miss Starling had also sent an apology for not being able to attend the meeting, having called-in plan no: 1 (Minute no: 66 below).

65 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following Minutes (nos: 66 to 69), 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.

66 APPLICATION NUMBER 20190999 – LAND EAST OF HOLT ROAD, HORSFORD

The Committee considered an application for the erection of 304 dwellings together with associated public open space, landscaping, internal roads, drainage and infrastructure works on land east of Holt Road in Horsford. This was a revised application following approval for 259 dwellings for the same application site. The proposed development comprised 110 dwellings previously approved under planning permission 20161770 granted in October 2017 and 194 units on the second part of the site which equated to an additional 45 units. The first phase of the approved application was currently under construction and largely completed. A total of 91 of the dwellings would be provided as affordable housing (30%) comprising a mix of affordable rent, discount market and shared ownership units. The main vehicular access and pedestrian access to the site would continue to be from Holt Road via Green Lane and the newly constructed roundabout on Holt Road at the junction of Green Lane. The secondary access to the south would provide pedestrian, cycle and bus access only. A series of small green spaces would be provided across the site totalling 14,733m² with the largest area of public open space (2,926m²) proposed in a central location and designed as a multi-function space used as a location for play equipment, open playing field and landscaping. Included would be an area of 400m² as an equipped play area.

The application was reported to committee as (1) it was being recommended for approval contrary to the current development plan policies and (2) at the request of one of the Ward Members for the reasons given in paragraph 4.2 of the report.

The Committee noted the comments of the occupier of 356A Holt Road as reported at the meeting by the Area Team Manager. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of Christopher Brown of Horsford Parish Council; Graham Johnson of North Farm, Green Lane and Sandra Lumbard of Oakdene, all objecting to the application and Chris Webber of Barrett David Wilson Homes (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 unable to attend the meeting.

The site was located outside of the settlement limit and the original planning permission was granted contrary to Policy 1 of the JCS and Policy GC2 of the DM DPD. Members noted that as the site already had planning permission for 259 dwellings, the impact of increasing the number of dwellings on the same site was now the key consideration. It was acknowledged that there was currently a 6.54 years' housing land supply within the Greater Norwich Area and therefore, the application must be considered in the context that it was contrary to Policy GC2 of the DM DPD.

Although Horsford was identified as a Service Village, a significant amount of residential development had been granted planning permission in Horsford both on allocated sites and outside of the settlement limit. If planning permission were to be granted for these additional 45 dwellings, this would bring the total housing commitment to 545 dwellings, a figure commensurate with a Key Service Centre. The Committee noted, however, that Horsford was one of the larger Service Villages and contained a level of local services associated with a Key Service Centre, the majority of which were located within 1.1km of the site. Furthermore, the site was served by regular bus services throughout the day and early evening providing good public transport links to the centre of Norwich. Accordingly, whilst there was no demonstrable deficit in the supply of housing land within the Greater Norwich Area, it was considered that Horsford was a suitable location for additional residential development on this site of the scale proposed. The Committee also took into consideration Paragraph 122 of the NPPF which reinforced the approach that decisions should support development that made efficient use of land taking into account the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services.

In terms of the impact on the highway, it was noted that the Highways Authority had no objection in principle to the increase in housing numbers, stating that it considered the local highway network to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the development. However, Members noted the concerns raised by local residents that the roundabout alignment was causing restrictions to visibility and thereby a danger to road users. Furthermore, the Highway Authority also had concerns with the configuration of the roundabout, advising that it did not pass the necessary safety audit as currently constructed and required modification. Accordingly, the applicant had been working on a technical solution to the safety issues associated with the roundabout and the Highway Authority had now formally agreed a final design and, subject to a planning condition being added to any planning permission requiring remedial works to be completed before any of the new dwellings were occupied, the Highway Authority had removed their holding objection. Notwithstanding these assurances, Members remained concerned about vehicles approaching the roundabout from the Haveringland Road but it was accepted that it would be difficult to justify a refusal on highway grounds.

Accordingly, it was agreed that a letter be sent to the head of the Highways Authority from the Chairman on behalf of the Committee on its concerns regarding the roundabout and, in particular, access from Haveringland Road.

Regarding the open space provision, Members noted that the main area of open space had been reduced in size but overall, this had been compensated for by smaller areas of open space distributed throughout the development forming more localised green space. Whilst acknowledging the objections raised by the Parish Council, Members noted that the development was providing a range of green spaces and equipment on-site together with a significant contribution to off-site provision. Accordingly, it was considered that the proposal complied with Policy COM2 of the Horsford Neighbourhood Plan and Policy RL1 of the DM DPD. It was noted that the Section 106

Agreement for the previous planning permission had already secured the maintenance and management of the on-site open space and also off-site contributions for formal recreation provision (eg pitches) in the region of £370,000 and £17,000 for allotments. A new Section 106 Agreement would be required to take account of the additional properties and to secure increased financial contributions as a result (approximately £46,000 for off-site formal recreation provision and approximately £1,500 for allotments). In terms of informal open space, it was noted opportunities had already been identified to improve provision around Horsford, which would benefit both existing and future residents and these would be secured through a previously agreed Section 106 Agreement (approx. £560,000 through a commuted sum). As part of this new application, a further £96,000 (approximately) would be required, via a new Section 106 Agreement, to take account of the increase in housing numbers and ensure compliance with Policy EN3 of the DM DPD.

The Committee acknowledged that the provision of affordable housing was slightly below the requirement under Policy 4 of the JCS but as three of the affordable units would be delivered as wheelchair accessible, this was considered to be acceptable and recognised that the proportion of affordable housing may be reduced in special circumstances.

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, although it was noted that the proposal was contrary to Policy GC2 of the DM DPD, it was considered that Horsford was considered to be a sustainable location for new development and the development would contribute towards housing delivery, notwithstanding that it had been demonstrated there was a five year supply of land for housing in the Greater Norwich Area. Furthermore, the application would not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity, flood risk or highway safety and whilst it increased the density of development, it made more efficient use of the land without encroaching further into undeveloped or unallocated land; these were considered to be material considerations to be weighed against the conflict with policy. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

To delegate authority to the Director of Place to approve application number 20190999 subject to the following conditions and successful completion of a Section 106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms:

On-Site Affordable Housing

- (1) 15 Affordable rent
- (2) 13 Shared ownership
- (3) 9 Discount market housing

Open Space

- (1) Provision and maintenance of on-site open space
- (2) Provision of a commuted sum for off-site formal recreation
- (3) Provision of a commuted sum for off-site informal open space

Conditions:

- (1) Time limit
- (2) In accordance with plans and documents
- (3) External materials
- (4) Hard and soft landscaping
- (5) Landscape management
- (6) Boundary treatments
- (7) Tree Protection
- (8) Ecological mitigation measures
- (9) Renewable energy
- (10) Highways
- (11) Construction management
- (12) Revised roundabout design
- (13) Drainage
- (14) Provision of fire hydrants
- (15) Minerals management plan

The Committee adjourned at 11.17am and reconvened at 11:28am when all of the Members listed above were present.

67 APPLICATION NUMBER 20190597 – ST MICHAEL’S HOSPITAL, CAWSTON ROAD, AYLSHAM

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of a former NHS care home and the erection of 16 dwellings at St Michael's Hospital, Cawston Road in Aylsham. Parking areas for 34 vehicles would be provided for residents and visitors with vehicular accesses from the existing access road serving Donthorn Court, which also served existing car parking areas allocated to surrounding residential development. The main vehicular and pedestrian access to the site would be from Cawston Road.

The application was reported to committee at the request of one of the Ward Members for the reasons given in paragraph 4.2 of the report.

The Committee received the verbal views of Sue Lake, Clerk to Aylsham Town Council; Jonathon Dempsey of 20 Mill Lane; John Robinson of 14 Donthorn Court and Dr John Grocott of 45 St Michaels Avenue, all expressing

their concerns on the application and Amy Ferguson of Richard Pike Associates (the agent) at the meeting.

The application site was located within the settlement limit and Policy 13 of the JCS identified Aylsham as a main town that would be expected to accommodate housing as it had a high level of shops, services and employment within the town. Furthermore, the site was a previously developed site and Members noted that paragraph 118 of the NPPF required local authorities to give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and to support appropriate opportunities to remediate derelict land. Accordingly, the principle of development was considered to be acceptable.

Notwithstanding the objections raised by neighbours and the Town Council, the Committee considered that the scale and density of the proposed dwellings would be in keeping with existing development. It was noted that existing mature trees along the eastern edge of the access drive already restricted views of the Listed Building and none of these trees were to be removed. The new development would not result in any additional loss of the key view of the Listed Building and, being only two-storey development, the new houses would still appear subsidiary to the Listed Building which was a prominent building on the site, comprising a two and three storey winged building. It was noted that the aim of the design was to create the appearance of blocks to replicate the form and density of the Listed Building and beyond and this was considered to be appropriate for this site.

The Committee was required to have regard to S16(2) and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in doing so, noted the comments of the Historic Environment Officer who had been heavily involved in pre-application discussions in relation to the design and layout of the scheme, as well as instrumental in amendments during consideration of the application. The Committee concurred that the proposed layout, design, scale and materials were acceptable, resulting in an enhancement of the site which would not significantly harm the setting of the Listed Building.

In terms of the impact of the proposals on the surrounding trees, Members noted the revised layout showed that all of the significant trees on the site could be retained with only some smaller, less important trees requiring removal.

Regarding highway safety and parking, the Committee noted that the Highway Authority had raised no highway safety issues, acknowledging that the former use of the building as a care facility generated its own vehicular traffic and parking requirements. Members acknowledged Policy 1 of the Aylsham Neighbourhood Plan which required development to provide off-road car parking adjacent to, or in front of, new dwellings and Aylsham Town Council had objected to the development on this basis. However, the

Committee agreed that it was not possible to comply with this aim on this particular site and noted that car parking areas were being provided to the north and west of the development, within short walking distance. Furthermore, providing parking “on-plot” for each dwelling would create a development out of keeping with the character of the area and there was evidence of communal parking elsewhere locally. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to comply with Policy TS4 of the DM DPD.

In response to a point raised by one of the public speakers, it was agreed that the proposal should allow for the charging of electric vehicles and therefore, a condition should be imposed to secure the identification of suitable positions for charging points.

Members noted the concerns raised about neighbour amenity but, whilst the proposed housing would alter the view from properties in Donthorn Court, it was considered that the layout of the development would ensure that occupants of existing dwellings would not be overshadowed or experience any significant loss of outlook.

The Committee noted the requirements of Policy H4 in the JCS for a proportion of affordable housing on site of five or more dwellings. However, it was also noted that Paragraph 63 of the NPPF (amended in 2016) provided for affordable housing contributions to be reduced by a proportionate amount where vacant buildings were being redeveloped or reused to encourage the effective use of previously developed land. This was based on a calculation of the existing gross floor space of the vacant building and ultimately, as the floor space of the existing building was greater than the floor space of the proposed new housing, no affordable housing contribution would be sought for the development.

It was noted that requirements for informal open space, formal recreation, children’s play space and allotments would all be met through financial contributions via a Section 106 Agreement.

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, although it was noted that the proposal was contrary to Policy 1 of the Aylsham Neighbourhood Plan, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in its revised form, subject to the imposition of conditions and a legal agreement. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

To delegate authority to the Director of Place to approve application number 20190597 subject to the following conditions and successful completion of a

Section 106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms:

Open Space provision

- (1) Equipping and maintenance of play space
- (2) Equipping of allotments
- (3) Offsite contribution for formal recreation
- (4) Offsite contribution for Green Infrastructure

Conditions:

- (1) Time limit
- (2) In accordance with plans and documents
- (3) External materials
- (4) Hard and soft landscaping
- (5) Boundary treatments
- (6) External lighting scheme
- (7) Accordance with AIA, TPP and AMS
- (8) Ecological mitigation measures
- (9) Highways – Parking area provision
- (10) Drainage strategy
- (11) Foul and surface water drainage
- (12) Contamination Assessment
- (13) Removal of Permitted Development walls and fences
- (14) Removal of Permitted Development alterations to front elevations and front roof slopes
- (15) Identification of positions for electric vehicle charging points

The Committee adjourned at 12:26pm and reconvened at 12:28pm when all of the Members listed above were present.

68 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191655 – LAND TO THE REAR OF 41B & 41C THE SREET, FELTHORPE

The Committee noted that this application had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

69 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191678 – PERRYS LANE FARM, PERRYS LANE, CAWSTON

The Committee considered an application to merge two dwellings into one larger dwelling with a rear extension and extension of residential curtilage at Perrys Lane Farm, Perrys Lane in Cawston. The site currently consisted of two residential properties linked via an existing agricultural plant room.

The application was reported to committee as it was contrary to policy. In presenting the application, the Area Team Manager advised that, since the

report to committee had been written, the Scheme of Delegation had been amended by Council so that similar applications such as this would be determined by officers (but including the ability for a Member call-in).

The site was located outside of the settlement limit where the principle of new development was not normally considered to be acceptable unless the proposed complied with a specific allocation and / or policy of the development plan. The proposed extension of residential curtilage into the countryside conflicted with Policy GC2 of the Development Management DPD. It was considered that the extension of curtilage was not unduly excessive and did not represent a significant incursion into the countryside to a degree which would cause harm to the general character and appearance of the surrounding area. Given that there were already two units on this site, it was considered that having one larger dwelling should have less of an impact on the surrounding area. Only minimal external changes were being proposed, with the exception of the single storey rear extension, to enable the buildings to become one single residential property. It was considered that the alterations would have a minimal impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Furthermore, given the degree of separation from the nearest residential properties and the scale of development being proposed, it was considered that the proposal would not result in any significant adverse impact to the amenity of any adjacent residents. However, it was considered reasonable to remove Permitted Development Rights for the addition of extensions, roof alterations and porches on the basis that two existing dwellings, which were previously barns associated with Perrys Lane Farm, were being amalgamated into one larger unit and could potentially be the subject of further extensions. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority would retain control of the appearance of the dwelling in the interests of neighbour amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

In conclusion it was considered that the lack of harm associated with the proposal was a material consideration which justified approval of the application. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

To approve application number 20191678 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit
- (2) Plans and Documents
- (3) Removal of Permitted Development Rights
(Class A, B, C & D

70 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted details of the planning appeals decisions which had been received and details of the appeals lodged for the period 16 November to 20 December 2019.

The meeting closed at 12:33pm