

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 23 May 2018 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: **Councillors:** V Thomson (Chairman), D Bills, F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp and L Neal

Apologies: **Councillors:** B Duffin and G Minshull

Substitute Members: **Councillor:** C Foulger for B Duffin

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (R Collins), the Major Projects Team Leader (T Lincoln), the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and G Beaumont) and the Planning Officer (B Skipper)

The Press and 19 members of the public were also in attendance.

389. 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
2018/0554/F (Item 2)	GREAT MOULTON	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by MP
2017/2528/F (Item 3)	NEWTON FLOTMAN	V Thomson and L Neal	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector
		C Kemp	Local Planning Code of Practice Other interest
2017/2905/F (Item 4)	LODDON	C Gould	Member considered he was pre-determined and stepped down from the Committee for this item and reverted to his role as local member
2018/0340/F (Item 7)	BARNHAM BROOM	All	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Agent

390. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 25 April 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

391. 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
2018/0121/O (Item 1)	DITCHINGHAM	L Smith – Agent for Applicant Cllr B Bernard – Local Member
2018/0554/F (Item 2)	GREAT MOULTON	J Parker – Agent for Applicant Cllr M Wilby – Local Member
2017/2528/F (Item 3)	NEWTON FLOTMAN	C Broomfield and S Broomfield – Objectors M Haslam – Agent for Applicant
2017/2905/F (Item 4)	LODDON	Cllr C Gould – Local Member
2018/0340/F (Item 7)	BARNHAM BROOM	B Read – Parish Council H Booth – Applicant F Bootman – Agent Cllr M Edney – Local Member
2018/0564/O (Item 8)	ASLACTON	Cllr P Webb – Parish Council P Robinson – Objector M Philpot – Agent for Applicant
2018/0712/O (Item 9)	WICKLEWOOD	M Thompson – Agent for Applicant S Lamping – Applicant Cllr M Edney – Local Member

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.

392. PLANNING APPEALS

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

(The meeting closed at 3.55pm)

Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 23 May 2018

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	No update.	21
Item 2	<p><u>Correction to paragraph 5.1:</u> Delete reference to loss of hedgerow and poor connectivity, which are not harms related to this development.</p> <p>Further to the assessment of the principle of development, which sets out that the Council does not consider the Joint Core Strategy to be out of date and therefore it can be demonstrated that the Council has a five-year housing land supply in the rural policy area. Notwithstanding the above position, if the SHMA housing land supply figure was used and the tilted balance of paragraph 14 of the NPPF thereby triggered, this scheme would in any event result in significant and demonstrable harms as identified in the reason for refusal which outweigh the benefit of delivering one dwelling where a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.</p>	30
Item 3	<p>Two further objections received (from one address), summarised below:</p> <p>Lane already used by Mulbarton construction traffic, chicken and mushroom farms. 18 years ago, Highway Authority required upgrading of lane to allow business use. Applicant burning rubbish in yard.</p> <p><u>Officer comment</u> Lane included in construction management plan for Mulbarton for smaller vehicles only. Highway Authority raised no objection to use permitted in 1998 subject to limits on level of activity. NCC Highways have raised no objections to this current proposal.</p> <p>Commercial bonfires are investigated under environmental protection legislation.</p>	37
Item 4	As the boundary wall which is to be replaced is within the curtilage of the listed building and therefore Listed, an informative note will be attached to any planning permission confirming that a separate listed building consent for its demolition and the replacement wall is required, notwithstanding any planning permission granted.	43
Item 5	No update.	51
Item 6	No update.	63
Item 7	<p><u>Forestry Commission</u> The proposed development would cover an area of existing woodland planted under a Forestry Commission Woodland Grant Scheme. According to records the planting year was 2001. The landowner received 15 years of Farm Woodland Payments and although the scheme claim period is now closed the contract is under obligation i.e. to remain woodland, for a further 15 years. The land should remain as woodland therefore until 2031.</p>	68

	<p>If the planning application is approved the Forestry Commission would require there to be compensation for the loss of woodland by planting an equivalent area of woodland elsewhere on the same landholding. If the compensatory planting cannot be agreed then the Forestry Commission would make a reclaim of the grant paid on the area lost.</p> <p><u>NCC Ecology</u> If you are minded to approve this application, we recommend that you condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any vegetation clearance needs to be subject to a timing constraint. A model condition is included in these comments below. • No development shall take place until a method statement for bats, badgers, reptiles and hedgehogs has been submitted to the LPA. • Ecological enhancements need to be incorporated into the site's design as outlined in section 6.4 of the Phase 1 Ecological Survey report (Norfolk Wildlife Services; February 2018). <p>Further to the assessment of the principle of development, which sets out that the Council does not consider the Joint Core Strategy to be out of date and therefore it can be demonstrated that the Council has a five-year housing land supply in the rural policy area. Notwithstanding the above position, if the SHMA housing land supply figure was used and the tilted balance of paragraph 14 of the NPPF thereby triggered, this scheme would in any event result in significant and demonstrable harms as identified in the reasons for refusal which outweigh the benefit of delivering one dwelling where a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.</p>	
Item 8	No update.	77
Item 9	<p><u>Correction to the first sentence of paragraph 4.18, which should read as follows:</u> For the current self-build year running from 31 October 2017 to 30 October 2018, the Council's target s to make 97 plots available.</p> <p><u>Correction to paragraph 4.23, which should read as follows:</u> In having regard to the above, on balance it is considered that the location of the site will not minimise the need to travel nor give priority to low impact modes of travel as required by Policy 1 (bullet 7) of the JCS and Policy DM3.10 of the SNLP.</p> <p><u>Further objection received from occupant of Brambles Farm on Milestone Lane:</u> The site is outside of the development boundary, approving the application will set a precedent for future development and that there are sufficient sites for development within Wicklewood without having to build outside of the development boundary.</p>	84

	<p><u>Officer comments</u> These matters have already been addressed in the committee report.</p> <p>Further to the assessment of the principle of development, which sets out that the Council does not consider the Joint Core Strategy to be out of date and therefore it can be demonstrated that the Council has a five-year housing land supply in the rural policy area. Notwithstanding the above position, if the SHMA housing land supply figure was used and the tilted balance of paragraph 14 of the NPPF thereby triggered, this scheme would in any event result in significant and demonstrable harms as identified in the reasons for refusal which outweigh the benefit of delivering one dwelling where a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.</p>	
Item 10	<p><u>Further comments received from Parish Council:</u> Objects to the application as five houses is overdevelopment of the site. In addition, the road access at this location is hazardous.</p> <p><u>Highway Authority</u> Recommends refusal. This section of Crownthorpe Road (B1135) has a rather poor alignment and the location is not ideal for a residential development with the vehicle turning movements that will occur. There is a highway safety concern with regard to the proposal in that the development will result in the intensification in use of an access considered substandard by reasons of the inadequate visibility onto the B1135.</p> <p>The B1135 at this point is subject to a 60mph speed limit although it is accepted that the actual vehicle speeds will be constrained to below that level owing to the alignment of the road. However even based on a typical local speed of 40mph, this requires a visibility splay of 120m from a 2.4m setback in both directions. Whilst visibility to the north is potentially acceptable, that to the south is constrained by the frontage hedge to the adjacent property which is growing outwards towards the road edge. Visibility in that direction is limited to only 30 metres when measured from the centre of the site frontage to the nearside road edge. Owing to the limited visibility, turning right out of the site access particularly would present a degree of risk.</p> <p>The proposed development would generate additional traffic movements through a substandard access onto the B1135 at a location where visibility for vehicles exiting on to it is only 25% of the recommended sight distance. The proposal therefore gives rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety and the inconvenience of other highway users.</p> <p><u>Accessibility</u> The location of the site is rather poor in highway terms for access other than in a vehicle. Although the site is close to Wymondham, the alignment of Crownthorpe</p>	92

	<p>Road is such that walking to the site is not a particularly safe or attractive option.</p> <p>Development at this location does not offer the opportunity for people to travel more sustainably as the proposal does not provide high quality access to public transport / safe walking / cycling routes.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that this application be refused on the grounds of inadequate visibility splays being provided and the site being remote from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Officer comment</u> In light of the comments of the Highway Authority, the following additional reason for refusing the application is recommended:</p> <p><i>Inadequate visibility splays are provided at the junction of the access with the County highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway. The application is contrary to Policy DM 3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.</i></p> <p><u>Historic Environment Service:</u> The development site lies 400m southeast of a known temple site of Roman date and approximately 50m south of a Roman road which connect the temple to Caistor St. Edmund Roman Town. Cropmarks of boundaries and other features of probable Roman date have been mapped west and north of the site and artefacts of Roman date have been found in the immediate vicinity of the site. Further information is required about the date, function and state of preservation of any archaeological features that may be present on the site before an informed planning recommendation can be made.</p> <p>Consequently, we request that the results of an archaeological trial trenching evaluation are submitted prior to the determination of the planning application in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework para. 128.</p> <p><u>Officer comment:</u> Although it is recognised that the applicant may not have been aware of the potential for the site to hold features of archaeological interest until now, this issue is nevertheless a material consideration. Given the harm that officers have identified and the stance taken on the principle of development, it is considered unreasonable to expect the applicant to carry out the works requested by the Historic Environment Service. However, it remains an outstanding issue and officers are of the view that the absence of information relating to archaeological matters should be added to the reasons for refusal:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><i>Insufficient information has been provided to allow an informed assessment to be made of the prospective impact on the presence of underground heritage assets. The application is therefore contrary to Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy insofar as it relates to considering the impact on the historic environment, Policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and paragraph 128 of the NPPF.</i></p> <p>Further to the assessment of the principle of development, which sets out that the Council does not consider the Joint Core Strategy to be out of date and therefore it can be demonstrated that the Council has a five-year housing land supply in the rural policy area. Notwithstanding the above position, if the SHMA housing land supply figure was used and the tilted balance of paragraph 14 of the NPPF thereby triggered, this scheme would in any event result in significant and demonstrable harms as identified in the reasons for refusal which outweigh the benefit of delivering dwellings where a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated.</p>	
--	---	--

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

- 1 **Appl. No** : **2018/0121/O**
 Parish : **DITCHINGHAM**
- Applicants Name : Mr Andrew Shirley
Site Address : Land off Hamilton Way Ditchingham Norfolk
Proposal : Outline planning application for residential development of up to 24 dwellings and access
- Decision : Members voted 5-2 (with 1 abstention) for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Outline Permission Time Limit
- 2 Standard outline requiring RM
- 3 In accord with submitted drawings
- 4 Roads and footways
- 5 Highway Improvements – Offsite
- 6 Traffic Regulation Order
- 7 Construction Management Plan
- 8 Details of foul water disposal
- 9 Surface Water
- 10 New Water Efficiency
- 11 Renewable Energy - Decentralised source
- 12 Landscaping scheme to be submitted
- 13 Ecology Mitigation
- 14 Archaeological work to be agreed
- 15 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 16 Fire hydrants

Subject to the completion of a s106 agreement to cover provision of affordable housing, open space and play area.

Other Applications

- 2** **Appl. No** : **2018/0554/F**
 Parish : **GREAT MOULTON**
- Applicants Name : Christine Stannard And Andrea King
Site Address : Land To The Rear Of Greendale High Green Great Moulton Norfolk
Proposal : Construction of new dwelling house, driveway and garage
- Decision : Members voted 6-1 (with 1 abstention) for **Approval** (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 2-6)
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Full planning permission time limit
 - 2 In accord with submitted drawing
 - 3 New water efficiency
 - 4 External materials to be agreed
 - 5 Retention of trees and hedges
 - 6 Visibility splay dimension in condition
 - 7 Provision of parking, service
 - 8 Full drainage to be sealed system

Reasons for overturning officer recommendation

Members considered that the proposal would not erode the rural character of the area and, given its proximity to the development boundary for Great Moulton, would represent unsustainable development.

- 3** **Appl. No** : **2017/2528/F**
 Parish : **NEWTON FLOTMAN**
- Applicants Name : Mr Karl Lake
Site Address : Land at Brick Kiln Lane Newton Flotman Norfolk
Proposal : Retention of use of land for storage and crushing of materials and display of finished work in connection with a domestic brick weave and drive replacement business
- Decision : Members voted unanimously to amend the proposal to give temporary permission to allow 12 months operation and the submission of an Environmental Management Plan. Members then voted unanimously for **Approval of** these proposals
- Temporarily approved with conditions
- 1 Temporary time limit
 - 2 In accord with submitted drawings
 - 3 Environmental Management Plan
 - 4 Reporting of unexpected contamination
 - 5 Retention of parking and turning
 - 6 Boundary treatment to be agreed
 - 7 Restriction on sales

- 4 Appl. No : 2017/2905/F**
Parish : LODDON
- Applicants Name : Mr Justin Fenwick
Site Address : Land At Swan Court Loddon Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of building to provide three letting rooms, and associated landscaping.
- Decision : Members voted 7-0 for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
 - 2 In accordance with amendments
 - 3 External materials to be agreed including those for boundary wall and bonding to match
 - 4 Restriction on occupancy of rooms
 - 5 Parking as in approved plan
 - 6 Retaining wall maximum height 1 metre
- 5 Appl. No : 2018/0211/O**
Parish : COSTESSEY
- Applicants Name : Mr Martin Green
Site Address : Land South East Of Tandarra Townhouse Road Costessey Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for four dwellings
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**
- Refused
- 1 Landscape impact
 - 2 Trees/Landscape
 - 3 Not sustainable development
 - 4 Inadequate information access/visibility
- 6 Appl. No : 2018/0265/H**
Parish : COSTESSEY
- Applicants Name : Mr Justin Revell
Site Address : 44 Peter Pulling Drive Costessey NR8 5GP
Proposal : Proposed orangery, basement development and all associated works.
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1 Full Planning permission time limit
 - 2 In accord with submitted drawings
 - 3 Annexe use only

7 Appl. No : 2018/0340/F
Parish : BARNHAM BROOM

Applicants Name : Dr Hartley Booth
Site Address : The Old Hall Honingham Road Barnham Broom Norfolk NR9 4DB
Proposal : Creation of a new access to The Old Hall and erection of a new lodge (dwelling).

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

Refused

1. Out of character/design
2. Unacceptable amenity Impact due to trees – over shadowing windows and garden area.
3. Detrimental impact of character of area, removal of trees
4. Unsustainable development

8 Appl. No : 2018/0564/O
Parish : ASLACTON

Applicants Name : Mr Richard Harrison
Site Address : Land east of Pottergate Street, Aslacton
Proposal : Erection of two dwellings on land adjacent to Holly Tree House (outline)

Decision : Members voted 7-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Outline Permission Time Limit
- 2 Standard outline requiring RM
- 3 In accord with submitted drawings
- 4 Details of foul water disposal
- 5 Surface Water
- 6 Water efficiency
- 7 Contaminated land during construction
- 8 New Access Construction over verge
- 9 Access gates - configuration
- 10 Visibility splay, approved plan
- 11 Provision of parking, not on plan

9 Appl. No : 2018/0712/O
Parish : WICKLEWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr Steven Lamping
Site Address : Land South of Milestone Farm, Milestone Lane, Wicklewood
Proposal : Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for the
 development of one detached self-build dwelling with garage and
 gardens.

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

Refused

- 1 Impact on character and appearance of immediate vicinity
- 2 Accessibility of site to local services and facilities
- 3 Does not comply with either of the relevant criteria of Policy DM1.3
- 4 Unsustainable development

10 Appl. No : 2018/0744/O
Parish : WICKLEWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr J Cole
Site Address : Land adjacent to The Drift, Crownthorpe Road, Crownthorpe
Proposal : Outline application for five Passive Houses

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**

Refused

- 1 Proposal does not represent sustainable development, contrary to DM1.3 and NNPF
- 2 Impact on character and appearance of immediate vicinity
- 3 Accessibility of site to local services and facilities
- 4 No information provided on prospective contamination
- 5 Inadequate visibility splays provided at junction
- 6 Insufficient information relating to archaeological matters
- 7 Does not comply with either of the relevant criteria of Policy DM1.3