

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 18 July 2018 at 10.00 am.

Committee Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, B Duffin (for items

Members Present: 1, 4, 5 and 6), F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp

and L Neal

Apologies: Councillor: G Minshull

Substitute Councillor: T Palmer for G Minshull

Members:

Officers in The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development

Attendance: Management Team Leader (R Collins), the Senior Planning Officer

(C Curtis), the Senior Conservation and Design Officer (C Bennett)

and the Landscape Architect (R Taylor)

10 members of the public were also in attendance

397. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

Application	Parish	Councillor	Declaration
2018/0888/F (Item 3)	LITTLE MELTON	D Bills and C Kemp	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by the Parish Council and members of the Little Melton Amphibian Group
2018/1325/RN (Item 6)	SOUTH NORFOLK	C Kemp	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied Cllr at North Norfolk District Council

398. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 20 June 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

399. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Business Development, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

APPLICATION	PARISH	SPEAKER
2018/0888/F (Item 3)	LITTLE MELTON	J Heaser – Parish Council S Jones – Agent for Applicant Cllr G Wheatley – Local Member
2018/1033/F (Item 4)	SEETHING	K Shepherdson - Objector J Long – on behalf of Agent for Applicant
2018/1042/O (Item 5)	HETHERSETT	M Thomson – on behalf of Agent for Applicant
2018/1325/RN (Item 6)	SOUTH NORFOLK	Cllr N Legg – Local Member for Mulbarton

The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Business Development.

400. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the report and	were pleased to	see a reduction i	n the number of
appeals			

(The meeting closed at 12.20pm)		

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 18 July 2018

Item 1 2017/1197 Item 2 2018/0465 Item 3 An updates 2018/0888 An updated ecology report has been received from the applicants. NCC Ecology Have confirmed that the revised report is fit for purpose and raise no objections. Oral update given at meeting Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newls; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of important hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be important on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Title and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest t	Item	Updates	Page No
No updates No updates An updated ecology report has been received from the applicants.			
2018/0485 Item 3	2017/1197	·	
Item 3 2018/0888 An updated ecology report has been received from the applicants. NCC Ecology Have confirmed that the revised report is fit for purpose and raise no objections. Oral update given at meeting Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tighness of the plot, impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be "important" on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full		No updates	43
applicants. NCC Ecology Have confirmed that the revised report is fit for purpose and raise no objections. Oral update given at meeting Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation progr		An undated ecology report has been received from the	49
Have confirmed that the revised report is fit for purpose and raise no objections. Oral update given at meeting Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mittigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-te			43
Oral update given at meeting Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response		Have confirmed that the revised report is fit for purpose and	
Members received an oral update that one additional neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capab		raise no objections.	
neighbour letter of representation had been received outlining matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. Ite			
matters covered in the officer's report including busy, narrow road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DMA.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DMA.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. Item 5 No updates			
tread on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-crested newts; overbearing; and setting a precedent. SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates			
Item 4 2018/1033 SNC Landscape Officer comments The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates No updates		road on bend; the tightness of the plot; impact on great-	
The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows Regulations; under DM4.8 the Council presumes in favour of retention of 'important' hedgerows (criteria set out in the Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates No updates	Itaas A		F-7
Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of the hedges against the criteria, but a quick search of the maps published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates 72		The existing hedgerows to the frontage (east boundary) and rear (west) are currently subject to the Hedgerows	57
published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries feature on both the Tithe and Enclosure maps). The scheme necessitates the removal of part of the frontage hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates 72		Regulations). There does not appear to be an assessment of	
hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider picture, I do not consider this is a major issue. Approval of the application will change the land use, therefore the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. No updates 72 No updates No updates		published by NCC online shows that both hedgerows are likely to be 'important' on historical grounds at least (the boundaries	
the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will comprise and how it will be managed in the long term. Therefore, if the application is approved, I suggest that conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. Tem 5 2018/1042 No updates 72		hedge to achieve an entrance and highway visibility, so arguably this is contrary to DM4.8. The replanting behind the visibility line will mitigate for the removal in terms of reinstating the species and providing a similar habitat, but a section of the historic line will be changed forever. In the wider	
conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both new and retained. Officer response Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. Item 5 No updates 72 Item 6 No updates 79		the hedgerows would no longer be subject to the Hedgerows Regulations. We will therefore need to make it clear via conditions that they are to be retained, maintained and ideally enhanced. The application seeks to add additional hedgerow to create the boundary between the plots, and this will create additional habitat, but we need to be certain what it will	
Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with this matter. Item 5 No updates 72 Item 6 No updates 79		conditions are attached to require full details of the new hedgerow planting (including implementation programme) and also a long-term management plan for all the hedgerows, both	
2018/1042 Tem 6 No updates 79		Suggested condition 11 is capable of satisfactorily dealing with	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		No updates	
		No updates	79

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

NOTE:

Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Growth and Business Development's final determination.

Major Applications referred back to Committee

1 Appl. No : 2017/1197/D Parish : COLNEY

Applicants Name : Bullen Developments Ltd

Site Address : Land Adj Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital Colney Lane

Colney Norfolk NR4 7UY

Proposal : Reserved Matters for multi-storey car park, internal access roads,

landscaping and associated infrastructure on Hethersett Lane for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, together with the discharge of conditions 4, 5, 19 and 21 relating to outline

consent from 2012/1880

Decision : Members voted unanimously to set a deadline to reconsider the

application at the August Development Management Committee to make a final decision based on the information available in the public domain at

that time.

Other Applications

2 Appl. No : 2018/0465/F Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Trevor Gurney

Site Address : Kings Head Meadow Back Lane Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QB Proposal : Erection of 2.5m close boarded fence with concrete posts in play

area

Decision : Members voted 8-0 for **Approval**

Approved with Conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit 2 In accord with submitted drawings

3 Appl. No : 2018/0888/F Parish : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Mr T Large

Site Address : 93 School Lane Little Melton NR9 3LA

Proposal : Subdivision of land and erection of 1No dwelling

Decision : Members voted 6-2 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit2 In accord with submitted drawings

3 Surface Water

4 External materials to be agreed5 Provision of parking, service

6 Ecology mitigation

4 Appl. No : 2018/1033/F Parish : SEETHING

Applicants Name : Mr Robin Key

Site Address : Land To The South Of Holmlea Seething Street Seething Norfolk

Proposal : 2 new detached dwellings with single garages

Decision : Members voted 8-1 for **Approval**

: Approved with conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit

2 in accordance with submitted drawings

3 Existing Access, Widen or Improve

4 Access Gates - Configuration5 Visibility splay, approved plan

6 Provision of parking, service

7 Surface water

8 Details of foul water disposal9 External materials to be agreed

10 Boundary treatments as submitted

11 Replacement Hedge along frontage

5 Appl. No : 2018/1042/O Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mr Jamie Gray

Site Address : Land West of Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk

Proposal : Proposal for 1 dwelling

Decision : Members voted 5-4 for **Approval** (contrary to officer recommendation,

which was lost 4-5)

Reason for overturning officer recommendation

Members considered that the development was sustainable and that there was sufficient connectivity in close proximity to a bus stop and use

of existing access was adequate in highway terms.

6 Appl. No : 2018/1325/RN Parish : SOUTH NORFOLK

Applicants Name : Orstead

Site Address : Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm

Proposal : National Infrastructure Application for an Order Granting

Development Consent for the Hornsea Project Three Offshore

Wind Farm

Decision : Members voted unanimously to **Approve** the Council's Relevant

Representation response to the National Infrastructure Application for Development Order consent- Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind

Farm, as detailed in the report.