

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held via video link on **Wednesday 16 September 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 (minutes 124 – 126 only)	Cllr S Prutton
Cllr S Beadle	Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou	Cllr S Riley
Cllr N J Brennan	Cllr K Leggett	Cllr J M Ward
Cllr J F Fisher		

Also in attendance were the Assistant Director – Planning, the Area Team Managers (NH & MR) and the Democratic Services Officers (DM & LA).

121 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

None made.

122 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R Gratton and Cllr I N Moncur.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following minutes, 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 subject to the final determination of the Director of Place.

123 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201193 – PLOT 7, BROADLAND GATE BUSINESS PARK, POSTWICK

The Committee considered an application for the erection of an electric vehicle charging station with ancillary uses at first floor level to include Class E (retail and a coffee shop), plus associated electrical infrastructure, car parking and landscaping (amended description).

The application was reported to Committee as the proposal complied with the principle of Policy GT10 of the Area Action Plan, however it was contrary to the precise wording which specified acceptable uses because it was Sui Generis (i.e. it did not fall into any Use Class)

The Committee heard from Raoul Tufnell – applicant in support of the proposal.

The key considerations were, the principle of the use, the character and appearance of the area, the impact on neighbouring units and residents and on highway safety.

Members were satisfied that the proposed use was in line with the general employment uses envisaged by Policy GT10, was an appropriate location for the proposal and was in accord with the Development Plan for the area. Members also felt that the proposed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring units/residential properties nor highway safety, nor the character and appearance of the business park or the surrounding area as a whole. It was in accordance National Planning Policy Framework and members welcomed the proposed use which was in accord with the government aims to reduce reliance on petrol/diesel and reduce carbon emissions.

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 application 20201193 with the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (TL01)
- (2) In accordance with submitted drawings as amended (AD01)
- (3) Contamination (AM14)
- (4) Parking (SHC21)
- (5) Construction workers parking (SHC 23)
- (6) Construction management plan (SHC24A)
- (7) Construction management plan compliance (SHC24B)
- (8) Landscaping – provision/timing/maintenance (L07)
- (9) Landscaping – Protection (L09)
- (10) Landscape management plan (L13)
- (11) Details of plant (AM11)
- (12) Ecology (bespoke)

124 APPLICATION NUMBER 2020 0861– ADAM AND EVE HOUSE, LITTLE HAUTOIS, COLTISHALL

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a two bedroom detached dwelling with associated access and parking at Little Hautbois, Coltishall.

The application was reported to Committee at the request of the local member for appropriate planning reasons.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report. They also noted the typographical error detailed in the supplementary schedule requiring the word “acceptable” be changed to “unacceptable” in paragraph 6.2 (page 37) of the report.

The Committee heard from Mark Thompson (agent) and Thea Charmley (applicant) in support of the application.

Key considerations were, the principle of development, whether the design sufficiently outweighed the location of the development, the character and appearance of the area, the setting of the listed building and the impact of the development on highway safety.

Members agreed with the view that the proposal did not affect the listed building, the amenity of neighbours nor highway safety. A comment was made that the merits of the design were finely balanced and subjective and some members were sympathetic to the view that the proposal was innovative, being the first PassivHaus Premium of its kind in the Country and the design was of a high standard. The proposal had received much support locally.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the application was made under paragraph 79 (e) of the NPPF which allowed for residential development in the countryside where the design was of exceptional quality. The requirements of paragraph 79 required the design of the proposal to meet four defined tests: to be truly outstanding or innovative – reflecting the highest standards, to help raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, to significantly enhance the immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. When assessing this application against this criteria regard had also been given to the outcome of appeals on similar applications. It was noted that, to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 79 (e), the highest of standards needed to be met including meeting all four of the key tests.

Some members were of the view that the proposed design did not satisfy these high level requirements and did not meet the requirements of paragraph 79 (e) of the NPPF as set out above and as such represented an unacceptable form of development that was contrary to Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy GC4 of the DM DPD and also the aims of Policies 1 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy GC2 of the Development Management DPD.

A proposal to approve the application having been made and lost following a vote, it was then proposed, duly seconded, that the officer recommendation, together with the additional conditions, be supported. On being put to the

vote, by way of a roll call, it was

RESOLVED:

to refuse application 20200861 for the following reasons:

1. The application site was outside any defined settlement limits and was contrary to Policies 1 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy GC2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2015).
2. The proposed dwelling did not accord with all the criteria set out in Paragraph 79(e) that required a dwelling that was truly outstanding or innovative, that reflected the highest standards of architecture, that would help raise the standards of design more generally in rural area, and would significantly enhance the immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area and therefore the application failed to comply with Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy GC4 of the DM DPD.

[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.]

125 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201143 – UNIT 7 AVIAN WAY, SALHOUSE ROAD, SPROWSTON

The Committee considered an application for change of use from B8 to D2.

The application was reported to Committee as the proposal would result in the loss of a B8 employment use on a Strategic Employment Site.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report. Members also noted the changes to use classes following recent new Regulations as set out in the supplementary schedule. Class D2 was now referred to as E (d).

The main issues for consideration were the principle of development, the impact on a strategic employment site, the character and appearance of the area, the impact on neighbouring units and the impact on highway safety.

The proposal was to re-use a current vacant unit with no external works to the building and minimal internal alterations. The building could therefore revert to a warehouse in the future should the need arise. A question was raised about the length of time the unit had been empty mindful of the impact of COVID

but it was noted that other units were still available and the unit had been empty for some time before COVID. Members agreed that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring units or the character and appearance of the unit or the surrounding area. It therefore accorded with the relevant Policies and Development Plans and was an acceptable form of development.

RESOLVED:

to approve application 20201143 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (TL01)
- (2) In accordance with submitted drawings (AD01)
- (3) Specific use (R03) – Specific use as a football training facility only and no other E (d) use and also that unit will revert back to employment use once the proposed use ceases to operate.
- (4) Limited hours of use (R01)
- (5) Highways provision of parking areas (HC 21)

126 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201017 – HELLESDON HOSPITAL, DRAYTON HIGH ROAD, DRAYTON

The Committee considered an application for 5 no: 16 bed en-suite non-secure wards (C2) one of which was a potential transition ward for 18-25 year olds. The total number of beds proposed is increased to 80 from 65 (Outline).

The application was reported to Committee at the request of Cllr Gurney for appropriate planning reasons.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report.

The Committee heard from Peter Burton on behalf of the applicant, supporting the application. Cllr Gurney had registered to speak but due to unforeseen circumstances on the day had sent her apologies.

The main matters for consideration were the principle of development, the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on trees and ecology, the impact on residential amenity and the impact on highway safety, drainage/flood risk.

It was noted that detailed matters regarding the safety of the infiltration ponds and boundary treatments to Low Road would be considered as part of the reserved matters on any subsequent detailed application.

Members welcomed the application which would provide much needed facilities within the County and close to the existing facility. They supported the view that there was an identified need for the new ward accommodation in view of the limitations of the existing accommodation. The site was in a relatively accessible location and, subject to conditions, the proposal would maintain the character of the area, the Hellesdon Green Grid, residential amenity and highway safety. The proposal included arrangements for dealing with its own surface water and would deliver modest ecological enhancements. The application therefore complied the relevant Policies and was considered acceptable.

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 application 20201017 with the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit – outline planning permission
- (2) Submission of reserved matters
- (3) In accordance with submitted drawings
- (4) Tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement to be submitted with reserved matters application
- (5) Lighting strategy to be submitted with reserved matters application
- (6) Development to proceed in accordance with submitted drainage strategy details
- (7) Provision and retention of visibility splays
- (8) Submission of scheme detailing on-site parking for construction workers
- (9) Construction traffic management plan and access route to be submitted along with details of wheel cleaning facilities
- (10) Construction traffic management plan and access route to be complied with for the duration of the construction period
- (11) Detailed drawings of pedestrian improvement works at junction of access into site and Hospital Lane to be submitted for approval
- (12) Pedestrian improvement works to be completed prior to first use of the development
- (13) Ecological mitigation measures
- (14) Ecological enhancements
- (15) Previously unidentified contamination

The meeting closed at 11:55am