

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 2 October 2019** at **9.30am** when there were present:

Mr J M Ward – Chairman

Mr A D Adams
Mr S C Beadle
Mr N J Brennan

Mr R R Foulger
Ms R M Grattan
Mrs C Karimi-Ghovanlou

Mr G K Nurden
Mrs S M Prutton
Miss J L Thomas

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

Mr Kelly Minute no: 37 (Hill House, Hall Lane, Drayton)

Also in attendance were the Assistant Director of Planning; Area Planning Manager (West) (for Minute nos: 37 & 42-44); Area Planning Manager (East) (for Minute no: 39); Senior Planning Officer (CJ) (for Minute no: 38); Senior Planning Officer (CR) (for Minute nos: 40-41) and the Senior Committee Officer. Mr Bizley, the Council's viability consultant, attended for Minute no 38.

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member / Officer	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Senior Committee Officer on behalf of Members and officers	Minute no: 39 (Northgate House, 2 Links Avenue, Hellesdon)	Acquainted with one of the objectors as he was a former District Councillor (until May 2019)

35 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Clancy, Mr Fisher, Miss Lawn and Mr Moncur.

36 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

In respect of the decisions indicated in the following Minutes (nos: 37 to 44), 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.

37 APPLICATION NUMBER 20181623 – HILL HOUSE, HALL LANE, DRAYTON

Further to Minute no: 96 of the meeting held on 10 April 2019, the Committee reconsidered the application for the demolition of the dwelling and erection of a 56 bed nursing care home, new vehicular access, associated landscaping and erection of a new off-site public footpath at Hill House on Hall Lane in Drayton. The application had been deferred to enable officers to discuss with the applicant options for the provision of a footpath along Hall Lane to connect to Drayton village centre.

It was noted that since the deferral, the applicant had been in discussions with the Highway Authority and the latest set of plans now proposed a 1.5m wide footpath which ran from the application site and linked with the existing footpath near to the Hall Lane / Drayton Lane mini-roundabout. Users would need to make a total of three crossings along its full length.

In presenting the application, the Area Planning Manager (West) referred to a drawing which had been submitted two days previously indicating a proposed ramped area to allow wheelchairs etc to achieve access from the lower part of the care home into the rear garden due to the change in levels and also reported the comments of Mr Gray of Brickyard Farm in this respect. In response to a comment made by Mr Gray, he advised the Committee that the plan did not require formal consultation as the proposals were not visible outside of the site but officers would assess if there would be any impact on nearby trees.

The Committee noted further comments received from the occupiers of Brickyard Farm, Hall Lane together with the officer's comment in response; a proposed amendment to condition 13, correction to paragraph 4.10 of the report and an amended location plan (to reflect the proposed footpath provision), all as reported in the Supplementary Schedule. In addition, the Committee received the verbal views of Samantha Maxey of 36 The Street, Poringland, Yvonne Diver of 6B Highlow Road, Costessey and Mr Gray of Brickyard Farm (on behalf of himself, Drayton Hall Park Residents' Association and Mr Hall of Tall Trees, Hall Lane) all objecting to the application; Alison Lovelock (independent care consultant), Lisa (Director of Ethos Nursing) and Debi Sherman of One Planning (the agent) all in support of the application at the meeting. Mr Kelly, the Ward Member for Taverham South (adjoining Ward) expressed his objections to the proposal and requested that the application be refused.

The Committee was mindful of the need, as evidenced at the April committee meeting, and concurred with the conclusion reached by those Members at

that time. However, notwithstanding the fact that the Highway Authority had now removed all of its objections to the application, subject to the imposition of a number of conditions, Members came to the view that the proposal was remote from local service facilities which conflicted with the aims of sustainable development and the need to minimise travel as visitors, residents and staff would have to rely on use of a private car as it would be very difficult to access public transport, if any was available. This was exacerbated by the 24 hour/day operation of the proposal. The inclusion of the footpath was welcomed but it was considered this did not overcome Members' concerns regarding the remoteness of the site and the distances involved to the local centre (1.3km).

It was noted that the design of the building had been amended to overcome consultees' main concerns and despite this, officers had accepted that the proposed building, being four storeys in height, would be large in terms of its size and scale, resulting in a large building in the countryside. Members were of the opinion that, despite the existing mature trees which were to be retained and the proposed additional screening, together with the fact that the building proposed to be partly sunken into the ground, the care home building would clearly be visible from outside the site and would have a detrimental impact on the general character and appearance of the area.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposal represented an unacceptable form of development, contrary to Policies 1, 2 & 6 of the JCS; Policies GC1, GC2, GC4, EN2 & H5 of the DM DPD and Policy 1A of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the proposals were contrary to the advice contained in paragraphs 102(c), 103, 108 (a&b), 110 (a-c) and 127 (b&c) of the NPPF. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to refuse application number 20181623 for the following reasons:

This application has been considered against the Development Plan for the area, this being the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011) as amended (2014), the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) (2015) and the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) (2016). Other material considerations are The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 and the Planning Practice Guidance.

The policies particularly relevant to the determination of this application are Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 12 of the JCS, Policies GC1, GC2, GC4, EN1, EN2, EN4, H5, TS3, TS4 & CSU5 of the DM DPD and Policies 1A, 1C, 2A, 3, 5 & 7 of the DNP. In addition, regard has been given to the advice contained in the NPPF.

Policy H5 of the DM DPD is concerned specifically with residential institutions and requires that the site is accessible by public transport and is within reasonable proximity of community facilities. In addition, for those sites outside the settlement limit, it is necessary to demonstrate that the facility is required to meet an identified need in the locality.

Policy 6 of the JCS is concerned with enhancing Access and Transportation across the policy area and amongst the factors to achieve this, development should be concentrated close to essential services and facilities to encourage walking and cycling as the primary means of travel, with public transport for wider access. Policy GC4 of the DM DPD states that proposals should pay adequate regard to being accessible to all via sustainable means, including public transport.

Paragraphs 102(c), 103, 108 (a & b) & 110 (a–c) of the NPPF are also considered to be relevant. These require developments to provide a range of sustainable modes of transport and genuine alternatives to the use of the private car.

The site is located outside of any of the defined settlement limits and therefore is considered to be in open countryside. It is considered that the location of the site some 1.3km from the centre of Drayton is not within reasonable proximity of community facilities.

The proposed footpath is approximately 430m long and unlit with no controlled crossing points and the lack of safe cycling routes serving the site mean that there are very limited available sustainable modes of transport to provide a genuine alternative to the use of the private car for staff and visitors to the care home. The application is therefore considered to conflict with Policies H5 and GC4 of the DM DPD, Policy 6 of the JCS and Paragraphs 102(c), 103, 108 (a & b) & 110 (a–c) of the NPPF.

Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS require that the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained and enhanced and that all development will be designed to the highest possible standards. Policy GC4 of the DM DPD sets out the design standards for new development. It states that, amongst other factors, proposals should pay adequate regard to the environment, character and appearance of an area and to reinforcing local distinctiveness through careful consideration of the treatment of space throughout the development, the appearance of new development, the scale of new development and landscaping.

Policy EN2 of the DM DPD seeks to enhance the visual qualities of the area having regard to the Landscape Character Assessment SPD and protect its distinctive character. Policy 1A of the DNP requires that development proposals achieve a high standard of design, sustainability and innovation and Paragraph 127(b & c) seeks to ensure that developments are visually

attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to the local character.

The proposed care home is designed with 4 storey high gables to each elevation with accommodation in its roof space, it is 45.5m wide facing the Hall Lane site frontage and is up to 22.8m in depth. It is considered that the height, scale, form and design of the proposed building is not sympathetic to the visual qualities of the character of the local area which forms part of the rural landscape and it fails to protect or enhance its distinctive character. The overall form of the building within the plot is not considered to be visually attractive and does not pay adequate regard to the environment, character and appearance of the area. In addition, it fails to reinforce local distinctiveness by virtue of its scale, appearance and treatment of space throughout the development. The application is therefore considered to fail to comply with Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS, Policies GC4 and EN2 of the DM DPD, Policy 1A of the DNP and Paragraph 127(b & c) of the NPPF.

Overall the proposals are considered to be contrary to Policies 1, 2 and 6 of the JCS, Policies GC1, GC2, GC4, EN2 and H5 of the DM DPD and Policy 1A of the DNP. In addition, the proposals are contrary to the advice contained in paragraphs 102(c), 103, 108 (a & b), 110 (a–c) and 127(b & c) of the NPPF.

The Committee adjourned at 11:48am and reconvened at 11:55am when all of the Members listed above were present.

38 APPLICATION NUMBER 20182043 – LAND OFF MANOR ROAD AND MANOR ROAD, NEWTON ST FAITHS

Further to Minute no: 22 of the meeting held on 7 August 2019, the Committee reconsidered the application for the demolition of an existing dwelling (no: 156) and the erection of 69 dwellings and associated infrastructure and landscaping on land off Manor Road and Manor Road itself in Newton St Faiths. The development would be served by a single point of access onto Manor Road onto a 4.8m wide estate road with 1.5m wide footpaths to either side. The proposal provided for 10% affordable housing provision (equating to seven dwellings) and a viability appraisal had been submitted to justify this level of provision. The application had been deferred to enable further analysis of the figures provided in the applicant's viability report.

In presenting the application, the Senior Planning Officer advised the Committee of three emails which had been received, two from the owner of the adjacent site (subject of application 20181525) and one from the occupier of 150 Manor Road, both objecting to the proposals. In addition, he reported an amendment to the officer recommendation which related to the removal of

permitted development rights for plots 68 and 69 to secure the protection of the root protection area of an off-site tree.

The Committee received the verbal views of Dennis Jeans of Bright Future Developments (applicant for the adjacent site – 20181525) and Jon Jennings of Cheffins (his agent) objecting to the application and Darren Cogman of Bidwells (planning consultant) and Simon Medler of Lovells (the applicant) in support of the application at the meeting.

Following the deferral in August, the applicants had re-assessed the development and submitted additional information concluding that the development was marginally unviable at 10% affordable housing provision, having identified additional costs not previously known to them. Subsequently, the Council's independent viability consultant had met with the applicant, reviewed the additional information and provided the Council with an updated report on the viability (attached as appendix 4 to the committee report). It was noted that the additional costs related to the need for an archaeological survey to be carried out prior to development commencing and the need for a road capping layer. This resulted in the Residual Land Value being pushed below the Benchmark Land Value (BLV) rendering the development marginally unviable at 10% affordable housing but the applicant had confirmed they were still willing to proceed at that level. Furthermore, in response to queries raised by Members at the previous meeting, the Council's independent consultant had provided a detailed assessment of the individual inputs which made up the applicant's viability (including the BLV) and this concluded that the appraisal submitted by the applicant was reasonable. In addition, the applicant's viability appraisal had not taken into account increased construction costs and professional fees since the appraisal was originally run which would, in the independent consultant's view more than offset the reduction in the assumed BLV.

The Committee was reminded that the site had been allocated under Policy HNF1 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2016 and, therefore, the principle of development was considered to be acceptable. However, the site boundaries were not wholly contiguous with the allocation as the site included the curtilage of no: 156 Manor Road instead of no: 154 and therefore the "wrong" dwelling would need to be demolished to provide access to the site. The majority of no: 156 was within the settlement limit but part of the rear garden was outside the settlement limit and also the boundaries of the site allocation. It was this element which led the application to be contrary to Policy GC2 of the Development Management DPD. Members noted that the applicant was a house builder and was in advance discussions with the owners of no: 156 to purchase the property. Due to complexities with multi parties involved in the land deal for the whole site, to renegotiate the deal to reflect the boundaries of the allocation would significantly delay of housing on this mostly allocated site. It was considered that a refusal on the grounds that a small part of the site was outside of the allocation could not be justified.

The Committee acknowledged that the proposed provision of affordable housing was below that which would be expected by Policy 4 of the JCS but the applicant had adequately justified this through the submission of a suitable viability appraisal which had been independently assessed. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to comply with the policy requirement.

In terms of layout, design and landscape, it was noted that the density of the development would be higher than the existing development fronting Manor Road and therefore, the character of the area would be changed. Furthermore, there would also be an impact on the street scene, notwithstanding the fact that single storey dwellings were proposed to the front of the site, as these would not screen the development to the rear. It was noted that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment had been submitted with the application which identified that the site currently made a positive contribution to the landscape character. Members agreed that the development would change the rural settlement edge and result in a moderate adverse effect, noting that this would decrease to a negligible effect once landscaping had been established (approximately 15 years). However, the scale of the buildings was similar to existing buildings in the settlement and the form was broadly traditional and this was considered to help mitigate the increase in density and visual impact. Accordingly, whilst the density of development was at the upper limit of what would be acceptable and would result in some harm to the character and appearance of the area, the Committee considered that the harm would not be significant, particularly in the context of the application site being an allocation for approximately 60 homes where some impact would be inevitable to deliver housing on an allocated site.

It was noted the scheme would result in some tree loss but the most important trees within the site, together with the trees and hedges to the site boundaries would be retained and successfully integrated into the layout to the satisfaction of the Conservation Officer (Arboriculture & Landscape).

It was considered the proposed dwellings were sufficiently far from existing dwellings to not be overbearing or unneighbourly and would not result in unacceptable overlooking of dwellings. Furthermore, future residents would be afforded an acceptable level of residential amenity with a layout which provided for privacy and a suitable amount of external amenity space.

As there were two Grade II Listed Buildings approximately 330 metres to the east of the site, consideration was given to Section 16(2) and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Members noted that these were farm buildings (a farmhouse and granary) and concluded that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to their significance. Furthermore, this harm was outweighed by the benefits of allowing development on an allocated site.

The Committee noted that the Highway Authority had raised no objection to the scale of development, subject to the delivery of off-site footway improvements to provide enhanced pedestrian connectivity to the nearby primary school. However, there were minor issues which remained outstanding regarding the size of a turning head to serve plots 31-32. Therefore, the recommendation was for delegated authority.

In terms of open space, it was noted that the policy requirements would be met by way of off-site contributions in accordance with the Recreational Provision in Residential Development SPD 2016, secured through a Section 106 Agreement. Members accepted that whilst the allocation HNF1 suggested that children's play space could be provided on site, this would not be feasible with the layout and a higher quality provision could be provided on another site approximately 300m to the north.

In terms of all other matters raised through the consultation, Members noted that these had either been resolved or would be dealt with by the imposition of appropriate conditions.

In conclusion it was considered that, having regard to all issues raised, the proposal represented an acceptable form of development and accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to delegate authority to the Director of Place to approve application number 20182043, subject to no objections from the Highway Authority and subject to the following conditions and subject to a Section 106 Agreement with the following Heads of Terms:

Conditions:

- (1) Time limit
- (2) In accordance with plans and documents
- (3) Details of materials
- (4) Hard and soft landscaping
- (5) Trees to be protected in accordance with approved plans
- (6) Highways conditions TBC
- (7) Drainage condition
- (8) Contamination
- (9) Ecology mitigation
- (10) 10% renewable energy
- (11) Fire hydrants
- (12) External lighting
- (13) Scheme of archaeological investigation
- (14) Removal of PD for means of enclosure along external site boundaries
- (15) Removal of PD for roof alterations to plots 1-3

- (16) Removal of PDR for plots 68 and 69

Heads of Terms:

- (1) Affordable housing @10% with clawback provisions
- (2) Contributions for open space to meet Policy EN1, EN3 and RL1 of DM DPD requirements

The Committee adjourned at 1pm and reconvened at 1.35pm when all of the Members listed above were present for the remainder of the meeting with the exception of Ms Grattan who left during Minute no: 39.

39 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191142 – NORTHGATE HOUSE, 2 LINKS AVENUE, HELLESDON

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of an existing care home to three self-contained flats at Northgate House, 2 Links Avenue, Hellesdon. Parking would be available for six cars and a new communal amenity space would be located to the rear of no: 4 Links Avenue, in addition to the existing amenity space to the front and side of the building. The exterior of the building would remain unchanged except for the removal of the porch from the courtyard elevation, a lean-to structure and boiler room from the side of the property and the addition of a new door to provide access to the new amenity space from the single storey unit.

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 Richard Grady of 83 Links Avenue, Karen Warren of 6 Links Avenue and Stephen Warnes of 5 Links Avenue, all objecting to the application and Colin Smith (the agent) in support of the application, at the meeting.

The site was located within an existing urban area of Hellesdon with good access to a range of services and facilities and therefore, the principle of the proposal was considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy GC2.

In terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the area, it was noted that no significant alterations were required to the external appearance of the property and the changes to the rear elevation would only be visible from the enclosed garden / amenity area to the rear of no: 4 Links Avenue. Accordingly, there would be no impacts of the character and appearance of the area. The existing property was located in an area comprising a mix of

residential and commercial uses and therefore, whilst the conversion of the property to flats would result in a slightly higher density than existing residential development to the north and west, this would not significantly alter the character of the area and the proposal would be in accordance with Policy GC4 of the DM DPD.

It was noted that the Highways Authority had not raised an objection to the proposal but requested the permission be restricted to three dwellings.

The concerns of local residents were noted and in this case, it was considered reasonable to impose a condition to ensure that the proposed internal layout of the flats be retained as approved in perpetuity. This would prevent over-intensive use of the building which would be detrimental to the living conditions of future occupants and result in development that would be detrimental to highway safety.

In terms of all other matters raised through the consultation, Members noted that these had either been resolved or would be dealt with by the imposition of appropriate conditions.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development and accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191142, subject to the following conditions

- (1) Time limit (A1)
- (2) Plans and documents (E3)
- (3) Internal layout to be retained as approved (NS)
- (4) No use of amenity space for parking (NS)
- (5) Pedestrian only access to rear amenity space (NS)

40 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191211 – CARROWBRECK HOUSE, DRAYTON HIGH ROAD, HELLESDON

The Committee considered an application for the removal of condition 2 of planning permission 20100607, which had granted permission for the change of use of a residential institution (Use Class C2) to a training centre with overnight accommodation (Use Class D1) and retrospective permission for the rebuilding and use of an outbuilding to be used as an office and the retention of an outbuilding / workshop which had previously been granted temporary planning permission at Carrowbreck House, Drayton High Road in Helleston. Condition 2 stated:

The office and workshop outbuilding hereby approved shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the main building on the site known as Carrowbreck House and shall not be used as a separate and unassociated unit of accommodation.

Removal of this condition would allow the office and workshop buildings to be rented out separate to the training facility on the site, as a business use (Class B1) as they had been vacant for some time.

The application was reported to committee as the Council was the applicant and site owner.

The Committee noted a proposed amendment to the wording of condition 3, dependent upon the outcome of plan no: 20191212 (Minute no: 42 below referred) as reported in the Supplementary Schedule.

It was noted that the site was located outside of the settlement limit where new development would not normally be permitted unless it accorded with another specific allocation and / or policy of the development plan. Policy GC3 permitted the conversion of buildings for employment and tourist accommodation where the building was capable of conversion without substantial alteration. Both buildings were in good condition and no alterations were proposed as part of this application and therefore, it was considered the proposal complied with Policy GC3. Furthermore, the application would allow the two outbuildings to be brought back into use, thereby allowing additional jobs to be created. Accordingly, the proposal was also considered to comply with Policy 5 of the JCS which sought to support jobs and economic growth in both rural and urban locations.

The Committee acknowledged that the proposal might result in a slight increase in vehicular movements but the outbuildings were of a modest size and any business which occupied the buildings would likely be of a relatively small scale. Therefore, it was considered the application should not result in any significant intensification of the use of the site. Furthermore, there was a good degree of separation between the buildings and the nearest neighbouring residential properties and therefore, there would not be any significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers. In terms of parking, it was considered that there would be ample room on site, even allowing for the slight addition in vehicular movements which might arise from the proposals.

Finally, it was noted that the conditions imposed on pp 20100607 would be added to this latest permission (nos: 2,3, 4 & 5 below referred).

In conclusion it was considered that the proposals would not result in any detrimental impact on residential amenity, the character and appearance of the area or highway safety and, accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191211, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Limit use to B1 only
- (2) Overnight accommodation (in main building) limited to persons attending a training course
- (3) Main building to be used as training centre only and no other purpose
- (4) Visibility splays to be maintained
- (5) On-site parking to be retained

41 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191212 – CARROWBRECK HOUSE, DRAYTON HIGH ROAD, HELLESDON

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of a training centre (Class D1) to a flexible training centre and business (Class B1) mixed use at Carrowbreck House, Drayton High Road, Hellesdon. Planning permission 20100607 had primarily granted permission for a change of use of a residential institution (Use Class C2) to a training centre with overnight accommodation (Use Class D1). This new application related to seven training rooms within the building, on the first and second floors with the ground floor remaining unchanged to be used solely in connection with the training centre function. The existing internal layout was proposed to remain unchanged and there would be no physical alterations to the exterior of the building.

The application was reported to committee as the Council was the applicant and site owner.

It was noted that there were often times when the building was not fully occupied and consequently not being used to its full potential. This new application would allow the Council to make a more beneficial use of one of its assets and allow small, local businesses the opportunity to utilise flexible spaces within the building and provide local employment opportunities. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to comply with the aims of Policy 5 of the JCS which sought to support jobs and economic growth in both urban and rural locations.

The Committee acknowledged that the proposals might result in a slight increase in vehicular movements on site but given the size of the rooms in question, new businesses working in the building were likely to be relatively small in scale. Accordingly, it was considered that the application would not result in any significant intensification of the use of this site. Furthermore, there was a good degree of separation between the buildings and the nearest neighbouring residential properties and therefore, there would not be any significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers. In terms of

parking, it was considered that there would be ample room on site, even allowing for the slight addition in vehicular movements which might arise from the proposals.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposals would not result in any detrimental impact on residential amenity, the character and appearance of the area or highway safety and, accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191212 subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

- (1) Time limit
- (2) Accordance with plans
- (3) No more than 4 of the 7 'flexible rooms' shown highlighted in blue on the first and second floor plans can be used as a B1 use at any one time.

42 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191213 – STILLWATER FARM, RABBIT LANE, GT WITCHINGHAM

The Committee considered an application for the temporary standing of a static caravan for a period of 12 months to allow the landowners to live on the site to undertake necessary landscaping and environmental works to the site as well as establish a smallholding (eg for the grazing of sheep) at Stillwater Farm, Rabbit Lane, Gt Witchingham.

The application was reported to committee as it was contrary to policy.

The Committee received the verbal views of Tim Unsworth (the agent) at the meeting.

The site was located outside of the settlement limit where the principle of new development would not normally be considered acceptable unless the proposal complied with a specific allocation and / or policy of the development plan. In terms of the application site, permission had been granted in June 2016 for a residential conversion but a substantial amount of the barn had collapsed in 2018 during bad weather and consequently required rebuilding. Due to the amount of rebuild required, this would mean the conversion would not be lawful as the extensive works would be classed as a re-build as opposed to a conversion. Additionally, the consent expired on 15 June 2019 and therefore, could not be implemented. Members noted that permission had been granted in 2016 for the conversion of an existing agricultural barn into an agricultural worker's dwelling immediately adjacent to the north of the

site at Highfield Farm. Given that the neighbouring land had planning permission for an agricultural worker's dwelling, the Committee considered that it would be hard to justify that the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be harmed in any way given the siting of the proposed caravan in a position away from the main road and behind natural screening. Granting permission for one year was not considered to be unduly excessive or represent a significant incursion into the countryside to a degree which would cause harm to the general character and appearance of the surrounding area. The extensive works to enhance the environmental and landscape aspects of the wider site were material considerations. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to comply with Policies GC4 and EN2 of the DM DPD and Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS.

Given the degree of separation from the nearest residential property, together with the scale of development proposed, it was considered that the siting of the temporary residential caravan would not result in any significant adverse impact to the amenity of any nearby neighbours.

The Committee noted that the applicants had to travel 40 minutes from their current rented residence to the site and living on site would allow them to carry out further works to the site as well as potentially tending to livestock in the future. It was considered this was in compliance with Policy 1 of the JCS which sought to minimise the need to travel. Furthermore, it was the applicants' intention to create a dwelling on the site in due course, converting and enhancing the historic barn which was currently in a poor state of repair and the Committee acknowledged that pre-application discussions were currently ongoing in respect of this under paragraph 79 of the NPPF.

In conclusion it was considered that there were material considerations which justified approving the application and accordingly it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191213, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Development to proceed in accordance with the relevant submitted drawings (E3)
- (2) Caravan to be removed from the site within one year of the date of the planning permission and land returned to its previous condition (NS)
- (3) Occupation of caravan shall be limited to specifically to applicant (NS)

43 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191235 – VALLEY FARM, HOLT ROAD, FELTHORPE

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of land to residential curtilage for two properties which were granted planning permission from the conversion of agricultural barns to residential dwellings (pp 20141319) at Valley Farm, Holt Road in Felthorpe.

The application was reported to committee as it was contrary to policy.

The site was located outside of the settlement limit where the principle of new development would not normally be considered acceptable unless the proposal complied with a specific allocation and / or policy of the development plan. As the proposed extension of residential curtilage into the countryside was not considered to comply with a specific policy, the development was therefore considered to conflict with Policy GC2 of the DM DPD. However, since the earlier application had been approved, a full planning application had been approved (pp 20190455) for barn no: 4 within the wider barn complex and this had a larger amenity area than the footprint of the barn area. Accordingly, this application for the extension to residential curtilage would not be dissimilar to that approved under application 20190445. Furthermore, the curtilage at the main property, Valley Farm House, was also considerably larger than that of the resulting curtilage currently for each barn.

In terms of the impact, it was considered that the extension of curtilage was not unduly excessive and would 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. The roadside hedge screened views from outside of the site. It was noted that no structures were being proposed on the site but a condition was being proposed to restrict this for the future. The Committee acknowledged that the material change of use would not result in any significant adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent residents, given the degree of separation from the nearest residential properties and the scale of the development proposed.

In conclusion it was considered that, whilst there was a degree of conflict with the development plan, the lack of harm was considered to be a material consideration which justified approval of the application. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191235 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (A1)
- (2) Plans and Documents (E3)
- (3) Restrictions on permitted development for outbuildings (D5)

44 APPLICATION NUMBER 20191193 – 1F SAPPHIRE BUSINESS PARK, SAPPHIRE HOUSE, ROUNDTREE WAY, SPROWSTON

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of part of a two storey office building (Use Class B1) to educational purposes (Use Class D1) for Norwich School of Beauty at 1F Sapphire Business Park, Sapphire House, Roundtree Way in Sprowston. No physical alterations or extensions were proposed to the exterior of the building and no internal alterations were proposed. The proposed hours of opening were 0900-2130 Monday to Friday; 0900-1730 on Saturdays and 0900-1730 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The application was reported to committee at it was contrary to policy.

The site was located within the settlement limit and had been identified as a strategic employment site under Policy E1 of the DM DPD. The Committee noted that, since the start of the year, there had been three previous applications for separate units / suites relating to the premises for a change of use, including a gym, a registered nursery and a state funded school (either full planning or prior notification) and it was therefore considered that the current proposal was not too dissimilar from what had previously been approved.

It was acknowledged that the change of use to Class D1 would conflict with the objective of Policy E1 but Policy E2 of the DM DPD allowed for such sites to be used for other purposes than employment, subject to certain criteria. The Committee noted that this part of Sapphire House had been vacant since June 2018 and had been marketed with Sapphire Property Services who formed part of Sapphire House. The proposal would employ 1.5 full time equivalent members of staff which would see the site continue being used for some employment purposes, albeit at a reduced level than the former use as a call-centre. However, the overall scale of the business park would still be within its original use and a significant majority of the units continue to be used for employment purposes. Accordingly, the loss of this unit to a non-employment use would have a very limited impact on the business park as a whole and would not be significantly harmful to the function of the park as a strategic employment site.

In terms of the highway impacts, it was noted that the Highways Authority had not raised any issues.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact. However, the Committee considered that the hours of operation should be amended to commence from 0800 each day which would not be at odds within other business premises in the vicinity (eg the Sorting

Office operated 24 hours/day) and would enable staff to arrive before the hours of opening. Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to approve application number 20191193 subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Time limit (A1)
- (2) Plans and Documents (E3)
- (3) Restrictions on use for D1 Education purposes. Upon the use ceasing operation, site to revert back to its previous B1 business use (NS)
- (4) Hours of operation

45 PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted details of the planning appeals decisions which had been received and details of the appeals lodged for the period 24 August to 20 September 2019.

The meeting closed at 2:47pm