

## 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 10 October 2018 at 10.00 am.**

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

**Apologies:** **Councillor:** C Gould

**Substitute Members:** **Councillor:** G Wheatley for C Gould

**Officers in Attendance:** The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (T Lincoln), the Senior Planning Officers (G Beaumont and C Raine), the Landscape Architect (R Taylor) and the Planning Officer (T Barker)

27 members of the public were also in attendance

### 410. 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
<b>2018/8100 (Item 1)</b>	<b>WRENINGHAM</b>	G Minshull	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant
<b>2018/1492/F (Item 3)</b>	<b>CRINGLEFORD</b>	C Kemp	Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant  Other Interest Visited site and gave procedural advice <u>only</u>

### 411. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 12 September 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 412. 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
<b>2018/1516/F (Item 2)</b>	<b>DEOPHAM AND HACKFORD</b>	J Allen – Parish Council S Lee – Objector I Pick – Agent for the Applicant
<b>2018/1492/F (Item 3)</b>	<b>CRINGLEFORD</b>	H Hannah – Applicant
<b>2018/1758/RVC (Item 4)</b>	<b>COSTESSEY</b>	Cllr V Bell – Local Member
<b>2018/1884/F (Item 5)</b>	<b>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</b>	A Goodman – Parish Council J Parker – Agent for the Applicant

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.

#### **413. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

Members noted the quarterly enforcement report.

#### **414. PLANNING APPEALS**

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

(The meeting closed at 12.05pm)

---

Chairman

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 9<sup>th</sup> October 2018

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1	<p><u>Wreningham Parish Council</u> Wreningham Parish Council have written in, their comments have been summarised as follows:</p> <p>Planning officers have underplayed the violations associated with the conditions set in the decision for 2017/2831.</p> <p>Condition 5 - as a sewage treatment plant has been installed then it is not a long step to consider that the toilet is also in use. Hence a formal and significant violation is in place - not minor as suggested.</p> <p>Condition 6 – requires the stables to be used to accommodate the horses. The stables are occupied as a residential unit and no horses are present and therefore the unit has never acquired a lawful use.</p> <p>Condition 7 – requires no external lighting. There is significant lighting at the site.</p> <p><u>Officer comments</u> The Council are clear in the officer's report that the residential occupation of the unit is a breach of the earlier permission, which was never occupied as stables. The Council has a current planning application, which applies to occupy the site as a residential unit and this is currently under consideration. The appropriateness of residential as a use and lighting will be considered as part of this planning application.</p> <p>Please note at the time of writing the Committee report the toilet had not been installed and the Council has been in contact with the applicant advising them that any works they undertake on this site are at their own risk and planning permission may not subsequently be granted. As set out above the works on site to date can be adequately dealt with through the consideration of the current planning application. In the event planning permission is refused, appropriate enforcement action will be considered at that time.</p>	23
Item 2	<p>1 additional letter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee would get a better idea of the changes at the site if the plans showing the proposed development were shown beside the existing site as shown in appendix 1.</li> <li>• The transport details show movements of feed and manure removal, but there is reticence regarding the amount of litter to be delivered for use in the huts, and nothing about general to and fro associated with any enterprise.</li> </ul> <p>Officer comment: Existing and proposed plans will be shown in the presentation at the meeting. In regard to vehicle movements, these are less than the previous use of the site as noted in the report.</p>	28

	<p><u>Verbal update by Officer at meeting</u> Comments received from the Local Member, Cllr Y Bendle, summarised as follows:</p> <p>All routes to Victoria Lane are of considerable distance along narrow rural roads with no passing places. If permission is granted, all vehicles must be conditioned to enter the site from the B1108, both during construction and operation.</p> <p>The road from the B1108 is too narrow for two large vehicles to pass without destroying verges and vegetation. There are several blind bends and a narrow bridge on the route, with no footpath.</p> <p>Because the proposed activity is cyclical, there will be a concentration of movement at several times of the year. Note that the site has been out of use for a couple of years and it is my understanding it has been considerably longer since all three existing sheds were used.</p> <p>Points out that the increase of size in agricultural vehicles, together with extra traffic generated by local biodigesters is already having a detrimental effect on the local roads network.</p> <p>I ask the Development Management Committee to reject the Officer's recommendation on the basis of a contravention of Policy DM3.11.</p>	
Item 3	No update	37
Item 4	<p>On a point of clarification, in addition to those revisions listed in the committee report, it is also evident that the proposed scheme also proposes a smaller set of patio doors in the south east side and north west side elevations than those previously approved and a marginally smaller window in the south west front elevation. These present no concerns in either visual or neighbour amenity terms.</p>	48
Item 5	<p>Reason 4 in the recommendation should refer to not supporting sustainable transport objectives rather than flood risk</p> <p>SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer comments:</p> <p>The site has been subject to similar proposals for a paragraph 55 house (now paragraph 79.) The new proposals seek to overcome these issues.</p> <p>The principal reason for refusal was that the building did not significantly enhance its immediate setting, or was sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.</p> <p>With regard to the standard of design, it is acknowledged that the sustainability of the design has further improved with the green roof and retention pond. Boundary treatment would also be informal. The</p>	53

	<p>building is now views as being smaller with a more varied and broken massing and a mix of materials with a more naturalistic bent, which reduces the bulk and presence of the building within streetviews. Nevertheless, it is still clearly a new dwelling within a newly created domestic curtilage on a previously undeveloped site.</p> <p>With regard to the surrounding area, the east side of Norwich Road is mostly characterised by detached houses dispersed along the street with wide landscape gaps. Views of the flat landscape of Dickleburgh Moor to the east therefore dominate and provide the defining character of the east side of the road. Dickleburgh Moor is an important landscape recently purchased by the Otter Trust with a view of the Moor becoming a community nature reserve. The Moor is crisscrossed with footpaths and bodies of water and wildlife are clearly visible from Norwich Road.</p> <p>Even though quite a significant part of the views of the Moor from this site are currently obscured by landscaping, the undeveloped character of the site contributes to the prevailing landscape character of the east side. Although I appreciate that the new design is a more sensitive design than that previously submitted, it is nevertheless a new building on previously undeveloped land and has a significant impact through changing the character of the site from a natural area to a domestic curtilage (albeit with the present proposal designed in a more naturalistic manner.)</p> <p>As with the previous application, the loss of open countryside through development of the site would result in a significant degree of change which can't be considered to be in keeping with the defining characteristics of the area or to enhance the immediate setting.</p> <p>The case officer would also wish to make the following additional point:</p> <p>Mindful that the site can be considered to be a "small site" in the context of Paragraph 68 of the NPPF whereby they can make "an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area" it is evident that notwithstanding this as a material planning consideration, the site is not considered suitable for the reasons set out in the committee report.</p>	
Item 6	<p>The Highway Authority (NCC) have confirmed that they have no objection subject to conditions.</p> <p>The case officer has discussed with the SNC Water Management officer their comments and it has been confirmed that flood risk issues can be reasonably dealt with at reserved matters in considering the layout of the scheme, dwelling types and through the confirmation of how surface water run-off will be dealt with and there is no requirement to undertake a FRA at this stage.</p>	66

	<p>The case officer would also wish to make the following additional point:</p> <p>Mindful that the site can be considered to be a “small site” in the context of Paragraph 68 of the NPPF whereby they can make “an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area” given that the site is considered to present a scheme that complies with the relevant SNLP policies this scheme would also meet the requirements of paragraph 68.</p> <p>Two neighbour objections have been received which raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the site being outside of the development limit,</li> <li>- there is space elsewhere within the village,</li> <li>- people buy properties on the edge of a village for a reason,</li> <li>- dangerous access,</li> <li>- could set a precedent for further development in this part of the village,</li> <li>- loss of agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Officer comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The committee report acknowledges that the site is outside of the development limit,</li> <li>- the existence of other sites in the village does not represent a reason for refusing an application,</li> <li>- the Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objection to the scheme on safety grounds subject to conditions,</li> <li>- all applications must be assessed on their individual planning merits and the granting of any approval on this site would not prevent the Council from refusing an application on adjacent land in the future,</li> <li>- the loss of agricultural land would be modest.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

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.

**Enforcement**

1.     **Appl. No**                 :     **2018/8100**  
        **Parish**                 :     **WRENINGHAM**
- Site Address                 :     Land Adj To Wreningham Village Hall, Mill Lane, Wreningham  
 Development                 :     Built not in compliance with a pre-commencement condition  
 Developer                    :     Ms N Todd
- Decision                     :     Members voted unanimously that no further action is taken in respect of the non-compliance with condition five of application reference 2017/2831.

**Major Applications**

- 2       **Appl. No**                 :     **2018/1516/F**  
        **Parish**                 :     **DEOPHAM AND HACKFORD**
- Applicants Name             :     Mr Sam Drummond  
 Site Address                 :     Poultry Sheds East Of Ivy House Victoria Lane Deopham Norfolk  
 Proposal                     :     Demolition of existing poultry buildings and erection of replacement poultry buildings, hardstandings and drainage attenuation pond (revised)
- Decision                     :     Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1    Full Planning permission time limit
  - 2    In accord with submitted drawings
  - 3    Maximum 57,000 chickens
  - 4    Parking for construction workers
  - 5    Construction Traffic Management Plan
  - 6    Full details of external lighting
  - 7    Tree Protection
  - 8    Implement planting scheme
  - 9    Landscape management plan
  - 10   Ecology mitigation measures
  - 11   Drainage
  - 12   Reporting of unexpected contamination
  - 13   Renewable energy

**Other Applications**

- 3      Appl. No               :   2018/1492/F**  
**Parish               :   CRINGLEFORD**
- Applicants Name : Mr Howard Hannah  
Site Address : Land to the rear of 9 Harmer Crescent, Cringleford  
Proposal : Proposed new dwelling and associated external works
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**
- Refused
- 1 Adverse impact on character of area
  - 2 Flood Risk
  - 3 Adverse impact on veteran tree
- 4      Appl. No               :   2018/1758/RVC**  
**Parish               :   COSTESSEY**
- Applicants Name : Mrs Ines Romanelli  
Site Address : 19A Ruskin Road Costessey NR5 0LL  
Proposal : Variation of condition 2 of permission 2017/0240 (Erection of detached two storey dwelling) - fenestration changes
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**
- Approved with conditions
- 1.Accord with Submitted Plans
  - 2.Proposed Access
  - 3.Obstruction of highway
  - 4.Highway Encroachment
  - 5.New Water Efficiency
  - 6.No PD for Classes ABCDE&G
  - 7.Upper Floor Windows
  - 8.Upper Floor Window in NW Elevation
- 5      Appl. No               :   2018/1884/F**  
**Parish               :   DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL**
- Applicants Name : Mr Derek Lock  
Site Address : Land Adjacent To Moorlands Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed new Passivhaus / carbon negative dwelling
- Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Refusal**
- Refused
1. Outside development boundary with no justification under DM1.3
  2. Does not meet the requirements of paragraph 79 of the NPPF
  3. Adverse landscape impact
  4. Sustainable transport objectives
  5. Lack of ecology information
  6. Not sustainable development in the context of the NPPF



**6      Appl. No                :    2018/2019/F**  
**Parish                :    WORTWELL**

Applicants Name    :    Mrs Riches  
Site Address        :    Land West Of 2 High Road Wortwell Norfolk  
Proposal             :    Outline planning for 3 detached self-build dwellings with all matters reserved

Decision             :    Members voted 7-1 (with 1 abstention) to authorise the Director of Growth and Business Development to **Approve**

Approved with conditions

- 1 Time limit - outline - 5 Year Land Supply
- 2 In accord with submitted drawings
- 3 Visibility splay, approved plan
- 4 Provision of parking, service
- 5 Reporting of unexpected contamination
- 6 New Water Efficiency

subject to no other material planning conditions being raised during the consultation process as set out in paragraph 6.1 of the report.