

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held via video link on **Wednesday 7 October 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 Beadle
Cllr N J Brennan
Cllr J F Fisher

Cllr R R Foulger
Cllr S Holland
Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou

Cllr K Leggett
Cllr S Prutton
Cllr J M Ward

Also in attendance were the Development Manager, the Area Team Manager (NH) and the Democratic Services Officers (DM & LA).

127 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Cllr N Brennan	129 – application 20200302 – Land East of 35 The Hill, Ranworth	Ward member and had attended a parish council meeting when the application had been discussed but had not participated or voted. Non-disclosable – non-pecuniary interest.
Cllr S Lawn (on behalf of all Members)	130 – application 20181183 – Woodland Manor, Shack Lane, Blofield	Lobbied by objectors – non-disclosable, non-pecuniary interest.
Cllr N Brennan		Ward member – non-disclosable, non-pecuniary interest.
Cllr C Karimi-Gouvanlou	131 – application 20200981 – Walled Garden, Belaugh Green Lane, Coltishall	Lobbied – non-disclosable, non-pecuniary interest.

128 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R Gratton and Cllr S Riley.

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.

129 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 9 and 16 September 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

130 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200302 – LAND EAST OF 35 THE HILL, RANWORTH

The Committee considered an application for the change the use of agricultural land to a glamping / camping site including erection of four camping huts and a toilet / shower / storage block (part retrospective).

The application was reported to Committee as the proposal had potential to generate employment and the recommendation was for refusal. The Council previously owned the land and had a covenant on the land restricting its use to agricultural, horticultural, private open or public open space.

Members noted the location and context of the site as set out in detail in the report. They also noted that the recommendation on page 22 included provision for enforcement action if members were minded to refuse the application but that this would in fact if required, be dealt with by way of delegated powers and did not need specific resolution.

The key issues in the determination of the application were an assessment of the proposal against development plan policies and national planning guidance, in particular, whether the site constituted a sustainable location for tourist accommodation. Also, the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, neighbour amenity, highway safety and ecology/ designated sites.

In assessing these issues, members concluded that the key issues to be considered could not be satisfied. The felt that it had not been adequately demonstrated that there was a site-specific demand or financial viability for the type of accommodation proposed in a remote location with no designated car parking and the proposal was therefore contrary to Policy EC3 of the DM DPD. The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and contrary to policies TS3 and TS4 in the DM DPD. The elevated site would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area and views from the Broads Area, and would be contrary to policies 1, 2 and 18 in the JCS and Policies GC4 and EN2 of the DM DPD. The proposal would also result in unacceptable overlooking, which would result in loss of privacy contrary to Policy GC4 in the DM DPD.

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 20200302 for the following reasons:

- (1) The site is outside a defined settlement limit and a site specific demand or financial viability for the proposed type of accommodation in a location with poor public transport links and with no designated car parking has been not been adequately demonstrated and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EC3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
- (2) The proposal does not incorporate on-site vehicular parking and would therefore be likely to lead to an undesirable increase in on-street parking to the detriment to highway safety contrary to Policies TS3 and TS4 in the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document 2015
- (3) Inadequate visibility splays are provided at the junction of the access with the County highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway contrary to Policy TS3 in the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document 2015.
- (4) The site is elevated and the buildings along with any other associated paraphernalia would be an unattractive feature which does not reflect the local distinctiveness of Ranworth in terms of design and materials and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area and views from the Broads Area contrary to Policies 1, 2 and 18 in the JCS and policies GC4 and EN2 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document
- (5) The siting of the timber viewing platform will result in overlooking and a loss of privacy affecting the amenity of adjacent properties, in particular 34 The Hill, contrary to Policy GC4 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document

131 APPLICATION NUMBER 20181183– WOODLAND MANOR SHACK LANE BLOFIELD

The Committee considered an application for a private motor cross track and change of use of agricultural land to residential curtilage.

The application was reported to Committee as the development of the motor cross track within the extended curtilage did not accord with the development plan.

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

The Area Team Manager (NH) drew attention to the supplementary schedule which included comments of the parish council received since the report was published but prepared by the parish council at the time of the original submission in July 2018. The supplementary schedule also included comments made at the time in relation to the 2017 application. He also made reference to concerns raised regarding consultations on the proposal and reassured members that all the representations received to the current (2018) application had been included in the report/supplementary schedule and that this was not a new application but continued consideration of the 2018 application. It was noted that original engineering works had first commenced on site in 2016 and could potentially reach lawful use within 4 years of that timeframe.

The issues to be considered were the principle of the development and its impact on the landscape, noise to local residents and footpath users, ecology including the county wildlife site, highway safety, public right of way and flooding. Members noted the negotiations which had taken place since the application had been received in 2018 and were mindful of the efforts to manage noise and any adverse effects of this by condition or other legislation. It was noted that noise complaints had at times been received and indeed these had initiated the original application for planning permission to regularise the activity. Members were concerned about the impact of noise generated from the site on neighbour / local amenity and they felt the additional supporting acoustic information and the proposed use of conditions and other legislation would not overcome previous reasons for refusal relating to noise and the development was not appropriate for the location, having regard to the likely impact of noise. The application would therefore be contrary to Policies GC4 and EN4 in the DM DPD and paragraph 180a of the NPPF.

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

RESOLVED:

to refuse application 20181183 for the following reason:

The use of the motor cross track would result in unacceptable noise disturbance which would adversely affect the amenity of local residents and the enjoyment of the nearby public right of way, contrary to policies GC4 and EN4 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document 2015 and paragraph 180a of the National Planning Policy Framework.

[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.]

132 APPLICATION NUMBER 20200981 – WALLED GARDEN BELAUGH GREEN LANE COLTISHALL

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a dwelling, greenhouse, garage, landscaping and access.

The application was reported to Committee as it was being recommended for approval contrary to the current development plan policies and the local member had requested the application be determined by the Planning Committee for appropriate planning reasons.

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

Members' attention was drawn to additional information in the supplementary schedule stating that, whilst the application did not satisfy the test at paragraph 79 (e) of the NPPF as stated in the report, it did satisfy the test included within paragraph 79 (b) of the NPPF as it was considered to be appropriate enabling development which would secure the future of a heritage asset (the walled garden). The supplementary schedule also included the updated position relating to arrangements for foul drainage and confirmation that no condition was required relating to proposed foul drainage. Also, with regard to the removal of PD rights, it was noted in the supplementary scheduled that condition 8 needed to be extended to secure removal of PD rights as set out in Part 11, of Schedule 2 Class C of the GDPO, which would remove the right to demolish the walls making up the walled garden.

Members heard from Mike Chapman (applicant), Debi Sherman (agent) and Crispin Lambert (architect) for the application. They also heard from Cllr J Copplestone supporting the application.

In considering this application, the main issues were the principle of development, whether the design sufficiently outweighed the location of the development, material considerations, the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation area, nearby listed buildings and the Broads Authority National Park, residential amenity and highway safety.

Members were satisfied that the proposed development would secure the restoration of the walls and garden within the walled garden secure the preservation of an important non-designated heritage asset for future generations. The proposal therefore satisfied the requirement of paragraph 79 (b). The long-term retention of the walled garden as a non-designated heritage asset was a significant material consideration that outweighed the harms of the site being located outside the settlement limit. Members felt the development would not result in harm to either the character and appearance of the Coltishall and Horstead Conservation area or the setting of nearby listed buildings, residential amenity, existing trees, ecology or highway safety.

Members welcomed the proposal and agreed that the application should be approved.

RESOLVED:

to approve application 20200981 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) TL01 – 3 year time limit
- (2) AD01 – In accordance with submitted drawings
- (3) NS – In accordance with TPP, AMS and Landscaping Plan
- (4) HC09 – Vehicular access to be upgraded
- (5) HC14 – No structure or gate to overhang the highway
- (6) HC21 – Access and parking to be laid out as on the plans
- (7) D02 – Details of external materials and solar panels to be submitted prior to commencement above slab level
- (8) P01 – Removal of PD rights for Classes A,B,C,D & E [Part 1 of Schedule 2 of GPDO] & Class C [Part 11 of Schedule 2 of GDPO]
- (9) NS – A minimum of 1 bat box, 1 bird box and 1 bee brick to be installed on the dwelling prior to first occupation
- (10) NS – Restoration plan / long term management / maintenance plan of wall

133 APPLICATION NUMBER 20201320 – 6 ALSTON ROAD HELLESDON

The Committee considered an application for change of use from (Former B1 employment use) Class E – Commercial, business & service use to (Former D2 assembly & leisure) Class E (d) – Indoor recreation/fitness use for use as self-defence training facility.

The application was reported to Committee as the proposal would result in the loss of a former B1 employment use (now a Class E use) on a strategic employment site.

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

The Committee heard from Emma Griffiths (agent) supporting the application.

The main matters for consideration were the principle of the development on a strategic employment site and whether the loss of an employment unit was acceptable and whether there was adequate parking provision and the impact on highway safety.

Members agreed that the application would in itself create employment and support a new business and meet the requirements of Policy E2. A condition would ensure the unit would be returned to an employment use upon cessation of the proposed use. The parking arrangements were acceptable and the development would not have an adverse impact on any other users

of the industrial estate or the character of the area. In supporting the application, members suggested that there was no requirement for a condition to control hours of use.

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

RESOLVED:

to approve application 20201320 with the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (TL01)
- (2) In accordance with submitted drawings (AD01)
- (3) Specific use (R03) – Specific use as self-defence training facility only and no other Class E (d) use and also that unit will revert back to employment use once the proposed use ceases to operate.

NOTE:

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman asked to record her thanks and appreciation to Sara Utting who had recently left the Council to take up alternative employment. Sara had worked for Broadland Council for a considerable number of years and had supported the work of the Planning Committee for many years, always upholding the highest of standards. These sentiments were echoed by all members present.

The meeting closed at 11:40am