

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 6 March 2019** at **9.30am** when there were present:

Miss S Lawn – Chairman

Mr A D Adams
Mr G Everett
Mr R F Grady

Mrs L H Hemsall
Mr R J Knowles
Mr K G Leggett

Mrs B H Rix
Mr D Ward
Mr D B Willmott

The following Members attended the meeting and spoke with the Chairman's concurrence on the items shown:

Mr Peck 90 (Grove Farm, Blackwater Lane, Heydon)

Mr Proctor 88 (116 The Street, Brundall)

Mrs Vincent 89 (land to the north of Sprowston and Old Catton)

Also in attendance were the Development Manager; Area Planning Managers; Planning Projects & Landscape Manager (for Minute no: 89) and the Senior Committee Officer.

86 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Mallett and Mr J Ward.

87 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

88 APPLICATION NUMBER 20182021 – 116 THE STREET, BRUNDALL

The Committee considered an application for the removal of condition 5 of planning permission 20172094 relating to a hot food takeaway at 116 The Street in Brundall. The condition stated:

“The use hereby permitted shall be limited to producing hot food through the use of multi-deck or conveyor feed, gas or electric, pizza style convection ovens only, with no additional cooking (including chargrilling) or food reheating equipment being operated at the premises without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.”

In presenting the application, the Area Planning Manager recommended to Members that condition 5 be amended by including the requirements of the Environmental Health Officer relating to the cleaning of the Electrostatic Precipitator Unit (ESP) and replacement of the Carbon Filters within the proposed odour control equipment.

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

The Committee noted the receipt of a letter of objection from the owner of the Ram Public House as reported at the meeting. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of Dr Wade of 14 The Street, objecting to the application, at the meeting. Mr Proctor, one of the Ward Members, expressed his concerns on the proposal and requested the Committee to refuse the application.

It was noted that planning permission had been granted for the change of use from an existing opticians shop (A1) to a pizza takeaway (A5) on appeal, subject to certain conditions which included the type of cooking which would be permitted at the premises. The change of condition application proposed upgrades to the filtration and ventilation equipment including the use of an ESP which was used to filter out particulates such as smoke and liquid particles. Furthermore, Carbon Filters would be used to absorb the odorous gases in the filter media. The abatement equipment was also designed to deal with the smoke and odour from cooking such as chargrilling.

The Committee accepted that the principle of a takeaway establishment in this location had been set by the allowing of the appeal in November 2018. The comments from objectors concerning parking were acknowledged but Members took into account the fact that the Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal, together with the comments of the Inspector in his appeal decision. In terms of residential amenity, Members noted the comments of the Environmental Health Officer, who had scrutinised the risk assessment submitted by the applicant, concluding that this was robust. Although a high level of odour would be created, the proposed equipment would mitigate this sufficiently to ensure there would be no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of residents and businesses in the vicinity.

In conclusion, it was considered that it had been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development could be adequately controlled by conditions to ensure there would be no undue harm to the living conditions of nearby residents and businesses in terms of noise and disturbance, odour or highway safety issues. Therefore, the proposal complied with Policies GC4 (parts i and iv), EN4, TS3 and TS4 of the DM DPD 2015. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20182021 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun before the expiration of THREE years from 14 November 2018.
- (2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the plans and documents listed below.
- (3) The premises shall be open to customer between the hours of 11:00 hrs to 21:00 hrs Monday to Sunday.
- (4) Prior to the first operation of the use hereby approved, the floor construction recommendations as described in Section 2.2 of the Acoustic Design Review Report received 4 February 2019 and shown on the accompanying drawing REVD-TS-2711-2 received 4 February 2019, shall be implemented and retained unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- (5) The filtration, ventilation and sound insulation detailed within the Acoustic Design Review (received 4 February 2019), Purified Air Specification (received 11 December 2018) and Dwg No TS-2711-2 (received 4 February 2019) shall be:
 - (a) installed as proposed within the Acoustic Design Review (received 4 February 2019), Purified Air Specification (received 11 December 2018) and Dwg No TS-2711-2 (received 4 February 2019) prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted;
 - (b) maintained in accordance with the details contained within the Acoustic Design Review (received 4 February 2019), Purified Air Specification (received 11 December 2018) and Dwg No TS-2711-2 (received 4 February 2019) and in accordance with the Council's Environmental Health Officer's recommendations (monthly cleaning of the ESP and filter changes every 6 to 9 months) and
 - (c) retained as proposed within the Acoustic Design Review (received 4 February 2019), Purified Air Specification (received 11 December 2018) and Dwg No TS-2711-2 (received 4 February 2019) unless otherwise agree in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons:

- (1) The time limit is imposed in compliance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- (2) For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the satisfactory development of the site in accordance with the specified approved plans and documents.
- (3-5) To safeguard the amenities of adjacent residential properties in accordance with Policies GC4 and EN4 of the DMDPD.

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has taken a proactive and positive approach to decision taking in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and Documents:

- Site Location Plan received 11 December 2018
- Odour Control Specification received 11 December 2018
- Dwg No TS_2711_1 Proposed Floor Plans received 11 December 2018
- Design & Access Statement received 11 December 2018
- Additional Acoustic Design Review received 4 February 2019
- Additional Dwg No TS 2711_2 Proposed Elevations received 4 February 2019

89 APPLICATION NUMBER 20180708 – BEESTON PARK, LAND NORTH OF SPROWSTON & OLD CATTON

The Committee considered a reserved matters application for strategic infrastructure to phase one of the Beeston Park development. The application also sought to comply with relevant conditions attached to the outline approval (ref 20161058) – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35 and 36. Phase one covered the area to the north of Old Catton and between St Faiths Road and the Norwich Rugby Club / Norwich School land. The strategy for delivery of phase one of Beeston Park was to plan and deliver a package of strategic infrastructure costing approximately £13m which would enable the disposal of serviced parcels to housing developers.

This particular application included:

- the proposed East-West link road (EWLR) between St Faith's Road and Norwich Rugby Club incorporating new junctions with St Faith's Road and with Buxton Road;
- surface water drainage attenuation areas and connections to serve both the EWLR and future development parcels and
- utilities to serve future development parcels.

The application was reported to committee at the request of Mrs Vincent, one of the Ward Members, for the reasons given in paragraph 5.2 of the report.

In presenting the application, the Planning Projects & Landscape Manager advised the Committee that a bid was shortly to be made to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) for £60m to deliver the infrastructure upfront on phases 2 and 3 of Beeston Park and it would be beneficial in terms of the bid for phase 1 to have been granted planning permission. The deadline for submitting bids was end of March 2019 and that was why this application was for consideration at the current time. The Planning Projects & Landscape Manager reported that the response of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) which was expected the day before committee had unfortunately not been forthcoming. He explained that information was continually being submitted and amended and this could be the cause of the delay. However, he had spoken to colleagues at the LLFA yesterday and they had confirmed their acceptance in principle of the use of deep bore soakholes. However, discussions would need to continue between the LLFA and the applicant / agent. Therefore, it was accepted that not all the technical matters had been resolved but it was possible for the Committee to give its approval in principle. Accordingly, the officer recommendation was amended to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to approve, subject to the technical matters being agreed by the Highways Authority; Lead Local Food Authority and the Environment Agency. However, in the unlikely event that agreement could not be reached on the drainage and highways issues, then the matter would be referred back to committee for reconsideration.

The Committee noted the comments of the Highways Authority, which was raising no objection, as reported in the Supplementary Schedule. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of Mrs Leggett, Chairman of Old Catton Parish Council, raising issues of concern to the parish council and Mike Bodkin, Project Director of TOWN, the applicant/agent, at the meeting. In addition, Mrs Vincent, one of the Ward Members, expressed her concerns on the application, requesting the Committee to defer until all the information was available and presented to it in full.

It was considered that the principle of this reserved matters application was

acceptable and in accordance with Policy GT12.

In terms of highways issues, it was noted that the link road had been designed in such a way to allow for the free flow of traffic along it but also give just as much consideration to pedestrians and cyclists. Furthermore, parking bays would be incorporated along the northern and southern sides of the road, to allow for future housing to front onto the link road to enable residents to park their cars to the front of their properties. As reported above, it was noted that the Highways Authority had no fundamental objection to the proposals but wished to ensure that all of the plans and documents were fully representative of what would be built.

In terms of drainage, the application proposed a network of pipes, primarily underneath the EWLR and secondary streets, leading to surface water attenuation tanks and then onto deep bore soakaways. The Committee acknowledged that deep bore soakaways were the least favoured choice and both the Environment Agency and LLFA had raised concerns but there was no alternative means of drainage at this particular site due to the composition of the ground with the soil having a relatively low infiltration potential. Furthermore, the boreholes would not be adopted by Anglian Water. Therefore, they would need to be managed and maintained and it was proposed this would be undertaken by a management company, with residents contributing to the costs via a service charge. The Committee acknowledged the statement made by the Project Director of TOWN that the management company would most likely be a charitable trust which would maintain the SUDS and boreholes in perpetuity and they had responsibility for similar schemes elsewhere in the country. It was noted that, although significant and appropriate testing of the ground had been undertaken by the applicant, the LLFA was still asking for further testing to be done. This would add considerable delay to starting the development and cost to the applicant. The Committee took account of the fact that the use of deep bore soakaways had been agreed in principle at the stage of considering the outline planning application and Section 73 application (variation of conditions and phasing strategy) and testing had been carried out in the broad areas in which they would be placed.

In terms of all other matters raised by consultees, the Committee noted the officer response as detailed in the report.

Finally, in terms of concerns raised about the route to be used by construction traffic, it was noted that this would be the subject of a separate discharge of condition application and would include a Traffic Management Plan. The Planning Projects and Landscape Manager assured the Committee that this would be subject to the usual call-in procedure.

In conclusion, it was considered that the link road design and SuDS had been designed in an appropriate and desirable way which would result in the basis of a high quality, sustainable community. It was accepted that there were still

matters outstanding but agreement between the relevant parties was close and accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to approve application number 20180708 subject to the technical matters being agreed by the Highways Authority, Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency.

The Committee adjourned at 11:24am and reconvened at 11:31am when all of the Members listed above were present for the remainder of the meeting.

90 APPLICATION NUMBER 20190005 – GROVE FARM, BLACKWATER LANE, HEYDON

The Committee considered an application for the use of land as a camp site for four tents, the erection of a timber shower block with storage and honesty shop and the provision of a car parking area at Grove Farm, Blackwater Lane in Heydon. The tents would be sited and available for hire from March to October, and measure approximately 5m wide by 9m long with a pitched roof approximately 3.4m to the ridge, clad in heavy green and brown canvas and would sit on wooden floors supported by small concrete pads. Each could accommodate 6-8 people. The shower block would be a permanent construction of a wooden timber frame and clad building, measuring approximately 5m wide by 9.5m in length with a pitched roof approximately 3.3m high. The scheme proposed parking for up to 10 cars located at the southern end of the site.

The application was reported to committee at the request of Mr Peck, the Ward Member, for the reasons given in paragraph 5.3 of the report.

The Committee received the verbal views of Simon Pegg, the agent, at the meeting. Mr Peck, the Ward Member, expressed his support requesting the Committee to approve the application.

The site was located outside of any settlement limit, in open countryside. It was noted that Policies 5 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 83 of the NPPF all promoted development of new tourist accommodation as a form of farm diversification where a rural location could be justified and it would have no significant adverse impacts for the site or surroundings. In addition, Policy E3 of the DM DPD stated that new tourist accommodation would be permitted outside settlement limits where it had been adequately demonstrated that a site-specific demand for the accommodation existed, for example where accommodation was associated with an established enterprise and that the enterprise would be financially viable.

It was noted that the applicant had submitted a written justification for the proposed tourist accommodation in this particular location which concluded that the development had the potential to be commercially viable if well marketed and developed to a high standard. The analysis also concluded that there was an identified local shortage of tourist accommodation within the district and this proposal would supply the local area with the additional bed spaces required to meet an identified need. Therefore, the application was considered to comply with the aims of Policies 5 and 17 of the JCS and paragraph 83 of the NPPF. However, Members acknowledged that the accommodation was not for a site-specific purpose and no financial evidence had been submitted and, therefore, did not comply with Policy E3 of the DM DPD.

In terms of the visual impact of the proposals, it was considered there would be no significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of the landscape and therefore, the proposal would comply with the aims of Policy 2 of the JCS and Policy EN3 of the DM DPD. Furthermore, it would be difficult to justify that there would be any significant adverse impacts from the proposal for the amenity of neighbours, which were some distance from the site, due to its small scale. Accordingly, it was considered to comply with the aims of Policy GC4 of the DM DPD.

As the site was in a very rural location, it was not close to any forms of public transport and therefore, the majority of visitors would arrive by private car. The nearest villages would be approximately 1.1 – 1.2 miles distant with the closest service centre at Reepham approximately 4.5 miles from the site. It was noted that the road leading to the proposed campsite was a narrow and winding single track road. Members acknowledged the concerns of the Highway Authority which had objected to the proposals, noting that Blackwater Lane was typically only 3m in width with a number of bends which restricted forward visibility. Whilst the applicant had proposed the provision of passing places to mitigate the increased traffic use, Blackwater Lane measured 1.6km in length from the Wood Dalling Road to the Heydon Road meaning the number of passing places required would be significant in order to be effective (each costing approximately £5,000). Furthermore, there were also a number of constraints such as conservation, verge alignment and land ownership issues.

Members were supportive of proposals for farm diversification but concluded that the applicant needed to provide evidence to demonstrate the financial viability of the proposals. Furthermore, there were issues concerning highway safety, in particular the provision of passing bays and how these could be achieved and also the impact of loss of hedgerows which would be required to provide appropriate visibility splays at the proposed site access.

Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to defer consideration of application number 20190005 to enable the applicant to demonstrate:

- the financial viability of the proposal and
- how the proposed passing bays and revised access could be achieved and to appraise the visual impact of these works.

91 APPLICATION NUMBER 20181487 – THE LODGE, 39 CHURCH ROAD, UPTON

The Committee considered an application for the sub-division of the curtilage and the erection of a detached dwelling on land to the south-west of The Lodge, 39 Church Road in Upton. Access would be onto Church Road. The proposed dwelling had a two-storey monopitch “barn” element with an exposed steel frame and an extended open bay and straw clad wall. At the front there would be a “silo” staircase leading to the first floor. The building would comprise a steel frame construction, zinc roof with a natural finish, sawn timber boarding, grey aluminium windows, straw cladding panels and a concrete finish to the silo stair tower. The application had been submitted for consideration under paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

The application was reported to committee at the request of Mr O’Neill, one of the Ward Members, for the reasons given in paragraph 5.2 of the report.

The Committee noted the receipt of an additional plan showing the root protection areas of the adjacent trees, together with the officer response, as reported in the Supplementary Schedule. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of Nigel Brennan, representing Upton Parish Council, objecting to the application and Mr Marris, the agent, at the meeting.

As the site was outside of the settlement limit, the application had been submitted as an example of a dwelling which met the guidance set out in paragraph 79(e) of the NPPF, a material consideration which could be given some weight contrary to the Development Plan, where the design was of exceptional quality. Members noted that to meet the test set by this paragraph, all four aspects needed to be met and this had been reinforced by Planning Inspector’s decisions when considering appeals against the previous Paragraph 55 requirements in the now superseded NPPF.

In terms of tests (3) and (4) – significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the characteristics of the area – Members concurred with the officers’ concern that the site was not suitable for a Paragraph 79 dwelling; given the semi-domesticated nature of the site and the paucity of features

within it, it was considered difficult to justify that the proposal would enhance the immediate setting. Furthermore, the building proposed and the use of “agricultural” materials in its construction were not considered to be in keeping with the immediate setting of that part of Church Road. The proposal would not only adversely change the existing settlement pattern by resulting in infill development and a loss of an open green space but would also result in an incongruous building which would be harmful to the existing rural setting of the locality. Members took into account the fact that the predominant character of the area was red brick, traditional style dwellings of quite a uniform design. Between the clusters of dwellings, the landscape gaps and views to open countryside remained an important characteristic of that part of Upton. It was noted that in order to preserve this more rural character, infill and ribbon development should be avoided. Members acknowledged that the site was an existing open gap and, although it was not considered to contribute significantly to expansive views across open countryside, it did remain of importance in preserving the existing settlement pattern of the locality. Furthermore, the addition of planting to the front of the site, to partly screen the building from the streetscene, suggested that the design of the building was not sensitive to the character of the area and the planting of trees behind the existing post and rail fencing hedge would change the “hedge and open field” character of the site. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policy 2 of the JCS, Policies GC2 and GC4 of the DM DPD and the requirements of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

As the dwelling had been submitted as a self-build proposal, the Committee had regard to the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. The applicant was not listed on the Register but, in any event, the Council was able to demonstrate an excess of the required provision in planning permissions.

In terms of the other matters raised, the Committee considered that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the new access onto Church Road was acceptable to the Highways Authority.

In conclusion, it was considered that the benefits of the proposal were outweighed by the harm and, in the absence of any special need identified, the proposal conflicted with the JCS and DM DPD and furthermore, did not satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to refuse application number 20181487 for the following reasons:

The proposed development is outside of a Settlement Limit as defined by the Broadland District Council Site Allocations DPD Development Management DPD 2016. In the absence of any special need identified, the proposal

conflicts with the Joint Core Strategy and the Development Management DPD Policy GC2.

The proposal fails to meet the four requirements of Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to significantly enhancing its immediate setting and being sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. The site is open and laid to grass, which contributes to the characteristics of the area. The proposed design, by virtue of its scale, size and contemporary form together with its siting and the proposed additional landscaping, would be harmful to the defining characteristics of this part of Church Road, Upton. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy GC4 of the DM DPD and Paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

As the proposal development conflicts with the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations that override it, including the criteria set out in Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the proposal is refused in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF.

92 APPLICATION NUMBER 20182088 – LEIGHTON HOUSE, BROAD LANE, LITTLE PLUMSTEAD

The Committee considered an outline application for the sub-division of the plot and erection of two dwellings at Leighton House, Broad Lane, Little Plumstead. All matters were reserved for later approval but an illustrative layout provided for two detached dwellings each served by their own vehicular access onto Broad Lane.

The application was reported to committee as the site was outside of the settlement limit and the recommendation was to approve.

It was noted that planning permission had been granted for a single property in 2017 and a subsequent application for three properties had been refused and dismissed on appeal.

Members noted the current situation with the housing land supply and how this should be calculated and, in advance of the publication of a comprehensive update of the land supply position, applications should continue to be determined in accordance with Appendix A of the Joint Core Strategy Annual Monitoring Report. As at 1 April 2017, there was a supply of 4.61 years in the combined Norwich Policy Area, a shortfall of 1,187 dwellings. Consequently, the policies related to housing land supply could not be considered up to date and applications for housing should continue to be determined within the context of the tilted balance referred to in Paragraph 11 of the NPPF which meant that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and

demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The Committee assessed the application against the relevant Development Plan policies and the NPPF, with reference to the three dimensions of sustainable development, as follows:

Economic Role

The development would result in some short-term economic benefits as part of any construction work and, in the longer term, spending from the future occupants of the dwellings. Therefore, it was considered that the scheme would bring forward a small level of economic benefit.

Social Role

Although the site was located outside of the settlement limit, it was less than half a kilometre from the settlement of Rackheath and on a bus route into the city of Norwich, as well as being close to the new Broadland Northway. It was noted that the new properties would be sited amongst other residential dwellings in accordance with Paragraph 79 of the NPPF (ie would not result in isolated homes in the countryside) and therefore, the site was considered to be a sustainable development.

It was noted that, given the site area, no affordable housing in accordance of Policy 4 of the JCS would be delivered. Furthermore, the site was below the threshold for both recreational open space and green infrastructure.

It was concluded that the provision of two additional dwellings in that location would make a small contribution to the maintenance of services in the settlement and also bring forward a modest social benefit on the basis of its contribution to the supply of homes.

Environmental Role

As the proposal involved the erection of two dwellings on an area of land between residential properties and did not extend further into the countryside, it was considered that it would not have an adverse visual impact on the locality.

In terms of the other matters raised, including the appeal decision, Members noted that the proposal would create two road frontages of approximately 18m and 20m respectively and these were considered to be in keeping with the existing character of Broad Lane. It was further considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on existing neighbouring residential properties and would be sympathetic to the existing character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy G4 of the DM DPD.

It was noted that adequate parking provision could be made with ample room for off-street parking and the Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal. Accordingly, the proposal was considered not to have an adverse impact on highway safety and therefore, was in accordance with Policies TS3 and TS4 of the DM DPD.

In conclusion it was considered that the application represented an acceptable form of development which would not undermine the aims and objectives of the Development Plan. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20182088 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Application for approval of ALL “reserved matters” must be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of TWO years beginning with the date of this decision.

The development hereby permitted must be begun in accordance with the “reserved matters” as approved not later than the expiration of TWO years from either, the final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such reserved matter to be approved. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than THREE years beginning with the date on which this permission was granted.

- (2) Application for the approval of the "reserved matters" shall include plans and descriptions of the:

- i) details of the layout;
- ii) scale of the building proposed
- iii) the appearance of the building including the precise details of the type and colour of the materials to be used in its construction;
- iv) the means of access to the site and
- v) the landscaping of the site.

- (3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and documents listed below:

20182088 Dwg No 12_12_2018 Location Plan.pdf

20182088 Dwg No MJSM12122018 Site Layout Plan.pdf

- (4) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved the vehicular access / crossing over the verge shall be constructed in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the highways specification (TRAD 5) and thereafter maintained at the position shown on the approved plan. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway.
- (5) Vehicular access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the accesses shown on the approved plan only. Any other access or egress shall be permanently closed, and the highway verge shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority concurrently with the bringing into use of the new approved access.
- (6) Prior to the first occupation of any of the development hereby approved a 2 metre wide parallel visibility splay (as measured back from the near edge of the adjacent highway carriageway) shall be provided across the whole of the site's roadside frontage and adjacent land under the control of the applicant (Leighton House). The splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.
- (7) Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (2015), (or any Order revoking, amending or re-enacting that Order) no gates / bollard / chain / other means of obstruction / enclosure shall be erected across the approved access unless details have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (8) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following:
 - Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard.

Reasons:

- (1) The time limit is imposed in compliance with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- (2) For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the satisfactory development of the site in accordance with the specified approved plans and documents.
- (3) To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.
- (4) To ensure construction of satisfactory accesses into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway.
- (5-8) In the interests of highway safety.

Informatives:

- (1) The Local Planning Authority has taken a proactive and positive approach to decision taking in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (2) If this development involves any works of a building or engineering nature, please note that before any such works are commenced it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consent under the Building Regulations is also obtained. Advice in respect of Buildings Regulations can be obtained from CNC Building Control Consultancy who provide the Building Control service to Broadland District Council. Their contact details are: telephone 0808 168 5041 or enquiries@cncbuildingcontrol.gov.uk and the website www.cncbuildingcontrol.gov.uk
- (3) This development involves works within the public highway that can only be carried out by Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing. It is an offence to carry out any works within the Public Highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's Highway Development Control Group. Please contact Stephen Coleman on 01603 430596. If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the applicants own expense. Public utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

- (4) The applicant needs to be aware that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied to development on this site. The amount of levy due will be calculated at the time the reserved matters application is submitted. Further information about CIL can be found at www.broadland.gov.uk/housing_and_planning/4734.asp

The meeting closed at 1:10pm