

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held via video link on **Wednesday 17 June 2020 at 9.30am.**

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

Cllr S Lawn – Chairman

Cllr A D Adams	Cllr R R Foulger	Cllr I N Moncur
Cllr S C Beadle	Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou	Cllr S Riley (minute no:s 92-96 only)
Cllr J Fisher	Cllr K S Kelly	Cllr J M Ward

Also in attendance were the Assistant Director - Planning; the Development Manager (TL), the East Area Team Manager (NH) and the Committee Officer (DM).

92 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

The following declarations were made during a roll call:

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Cllr Adams	97 Application no: 20200212 – 5 Aston Road, Hellesdon	Dog owner - non-disclosable local choice interest.

93 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Clancy.

94 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following Minutes (nos: 88 to 90), 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.

95 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200345 – LAND AT DAWSON'S LANE BLOFIELD

The Committee noted that this application had been deferred for consideration at the next available meeting in order to seek clarification on the proposed flow rate that had informed the surface water drainage strategy.

96 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191598 – SEQUOIA RISE MILL LANE WITTON (POSTWICK)

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 no: detached dwellings and garages on land adjacent to Sequoia Rise, Mill Lane, South Witton.

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. Although the site was remote in terms of its location to services, Members noted the location of properties surrounding the site and the nearby settlement. Revised plans had been submitted as referred to in the supplementary schedule to include land for the southern access (previously edged in blue) which was now included as part of the application site (edged in red).

The Committee heard from Debi Sherman – One Planning Consultants - agent for the applicant in support of the application.]

Members were mindful that the application needed to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

Some members considered that the site in the open countryside with poor access to local services and facilities other than by private car was not a sustainable location in terms of connectivity and was therefore contrary to a number of policies and guidance. They drew attention to the Planning Inspector's dismissal of the appeal against the refusal to grant planning permission on land adjacent to Old Rectory, Mill Lane, where the Inspector had concluded that development on that site was not sustainable development and raised highway safety concerns and was contrary to the development plan. The only difference between that site and the current application site was the application site was now regarded as a brownfield site and the appeal site was a greenfield site but the same argument relating to connectivity applied to both sites with both having inadequate access to services and facilities.

Other Members supported the view that, having regard to the planning history of the site and its current lawful commercial use, the site was a brownfield site and a clear distinction could be made with the greenfield appeal site referred to. The highway issues associated with the appeal site were also different in terms of traffic movements and access arrangements. There was also no objection to the application from the Highway Authority. The volume and nature of the traffic associated with the commercial use of the application site and the current commercial activities taking place were not favourable to a

rural location and were detrimental to residential amenity. Developing the site for residential use would remove the harm to the character and amenity of the locality and would enhance the site and surroundings. There would be materially beneficial changes to the volume and nature of traffic from the site, and use of the site for residential rather than a commercial use would materially benefit the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers. It was noted that the existing permitted commercial use of the land was not personal to the applicant but related to use of the land and would transfer with any change of ownership and the conditions and legal agreement proposed for any approval would secure the cessation of the commercial use.

Having regard to these material matters, some Members were satisfied that, notwithstanding the concerns about connectivity, development in a rural location could be justified in this particular case despite being contrary to the development plan. It was proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendations 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, subject to the following conditions and successful completion of a Section 106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms:

- (1) Cessation of current timber/forestry business uses including those authorised by planning permission [20091242](#)
- (2) Use of outside space for residential purposes only

and subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (TL01)
- (2) In accordance with plans and documents(AD01)
- (3) External materials (D02)
- (4) Hard and soft landscaping (L06 amended)
- (5) Boundary treatments (L01)
- (6) Highways – access improvements and drainage (HC09)
- (7) Highways – gates/obstructions (HC11)
- (8) Highways – visibility splay (HC17)
- (9) Highways – provision of parking and turning areas (HC21)
- (10) Contamination Investigation (AM12)
- (11) Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement (EC01 amended)
- (12) Tree Protection (L09)

[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. Cllr Riley had not re-joined the meeting and took no part in the remaining business.]

97 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200212 – 5 ALSTON ROAD HELLESDON

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from B1 industrial unit to use as a swimming pool for dogs (D2).

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, the internal layout and the detailed proposals. The unit was currently empty.

The Committee heard from Emma Griffiths of Brown and Co. - agent for the applicants in support of the application.

Members supported the officer's conclusions that the proposal would maintain employment and support a new business, parking arrangements were acceptable and the development would not have any adverse impact on any other users of the industrial estate or the character of the area. Whilst the proposal would not be an employment use and would conflict with Policy E1 of the DMDPD, the proposal was in a sustainable location and would bring an empty unit back into use. The proposal therefore met the requirements of Policy E2. There had also been no objections to the proposals.

It was proposed, seconded and, by way of a roll call,

RESOLVED:

to approve, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) TL01 – 3 year time limit
- (2) AD01 – In accordance with submitted drawings
- (3) HC21 – Provision of parking
- (4) R03 – Specific use as a swimming pool for dogs only and no other D2 use and also that unit will revert back to employment use once the proposed use ceases to operate.

98 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted that no appeal decisions had been received and no appeals lodged for the period 7 May to 5 June 2020.

The meeting closed at 11:03am