

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 1 October 2012 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mrs S Armes  
Mr S.G. Bambridge  
Councillor C Bowes  
Mr T R Carter  
Mr P.D. Claussen  
Mr T.J. Lamb

Mrs J A North (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr W. R. J. Richmond  
Mr F.J. Sharpe  
Mrs P.A. Spencer  
Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)  
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen (Substitute  
Member)

**Also Present**

Mr M. A. Wassell (Ward  
Representative)

Mr R. R. Richmond (Ward Representative)

**In Attendance**

Paul Jackson  
Heather Burlingham  
John Chinnery  
David Spencer  
Jane Osborne  
Nick Moys  
Ruth Ellerby  
Mike Brennan  
Michael Horn  
Candy Sheridan

Planning Manager  
Assistant Development Control Officer\*  
Solicitor & Standards Consultant  
Joint Deputy Planning Manager  
Committee Officer  
Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)\*  
Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Principal Planning Officer\*  
Solicitor to the Council

\* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

**94/12 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**95/12 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr M Robinson, Cllr M Chapman-Allen was in attendance as his substitute.

**96/12 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS  
RECEIVED**

Cllr C Bowes declared that she knew the applicants with regard to Item Nos. 3 and 4 of Agenda Item 9 Schedule of Planning Applications.

Cllr Bambridge declared that he used to have a connection with the Anchor Hotel with regard to Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning

**Action By**

**Action By**

Applications Items 9 and 10.

Cllr M Chapman-Allen declared that she was pre-determined as she had spoken on a related matter at a Norfolk County Council Planning meeting and mentioned the regeneration of the Anchor site with regard to Agenda Item 9, Schedule of Planning Applications Items 9 and 10. She would speak on these items but not vote.

**97/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman hoped that all Committee Members would stay for the briefing being held in the afternoon on Gypsies and Travellers.

**98/12 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA**

There were no requests to defer items, but Members were asked to note that Scheduled Items 1 and 2 (both for Kenninghall) and Agenda Item 11, Enforcement Report re Crown Milling, Kenninghall had been withdrawn from the agenda pending a Screening Direction to be requested from the Secretary of State.

**99/12 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)**

The Planning Manager advised that the challenge on the Thetford Area Action Plan was ongoing and would be heard by the High Court before Christmas 2012. On 20 November 2012 a report would go to Cabinet. Good progress on transport had been made with regard to the Attleborough and Thetford Market Plan.

**100/12 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS**

**101/12 THOMPSON: CONSTRUCTION OF TWO BEDROOM BUNGALOW INCLUDING LANDSCAPING AND PARKING : APPLICANT : BRECKLAND COUNCIL : REFERENCE : 3PL/2012/0547/F**

The proposal which sought full planning permission for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow was deferred at the Planning Committee held on 6 August 2012 to allow the applicant to improve the design due to concerns raised about the appearance of the proposed dwelling.

Comments made were that both sides of the window panes did not match as one side had a top opening and the other side did not, and the front door still opened straight into the lounge.

**Subject to the application being amended to include the porch being either closed in or made bigger and that there being a top opening light in each side of the window panes or a bar across the other side so both sides of the windows matched, the application be approved as recommended.**

Action By

**102/12 WATTON: ERECTION OF 31 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (18 FLATS & 13 HOUSES, ESTATE ROAD, PARKING AREAS & OPEN SPACE) AT PLASWOOD, GRISTON ROAD : APPLICANT: SERRUYS PROPERTY COMPANY LTD : REFERENCE: 3PL/2012/0503/O - DEFERRED ITEM**

The application had been deferred from the Planning Committee held on 3 September in order to conduct a site inspection which took place on 28 September 2012 to assess the proposal in further detail. The Principal Planning Officer gave a brief overview of the outline application.

Mr McCarthy, Objector, stated that as the meeting of Watton Town Council had not been quorate they had not approved the application. He did not believe that the site visit revealed a true reflection of noise, given that the factory had closed at 12 noon on that day.

Mr Watling, Supporter, was a resident of Field Maple Road and walked passed the proposed development six times a day. In six years he had never seen 24 hour working and had no recollection of work being undertaken on an evening or on a Sunday, although occasional work did take place on Saturday mornings. Friends who resided in Cherry Tree Close and Whitebeam Close had heard nothing from the factory. He believed the nearest plant/machinery would be 85' from the boundary of the proposed development. Children played on the derelict site which was an area residents understood would be developed. They were sick of the derelict site and the terrible view they had to look out on, and felt that the whole area would be enhanced if it was developed.

Mrs Surrige, Objector, was disappointed that they had not been made aware of the date of the site visit although there had been someone present from the developer. The site visit should have been undertaken when the factory was fully operational and not when it was closed. The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the site which had the ability to work 24 hours a day.

Mr McCarthy stated that it was incorrect to state that plant/machinery was 85' from the proposed development, as it was more appropriate to say it was 30' to the nearest machine which was not outside. Complaints had been received from residents in Field Maple Road.

Mrs Shelley, Agent, stated that they had received responses that Watton Town Council had not objected. Continuous noise assessments had been carried out which were consistent representations of the noise levels Members heard whilst on their site visit, and were similar to those emitted from the premises at other times. The scheme had been designed so the flats were positioned away from WECO. They had worked closely with Officers to tidy up the derelict site, provide open space and not create a noisy environment for residents and noise bunding would be provided to

**Action By**

protect all residents of the area. If the site was not approved, it could go back to B2 engineering.

Mr Wassell, Ward Representative, stated the some residents of Wild Cherry Close had contacted him as they were concerned with the derelict nature and size of the structures, also vandalism had reduced the enjoyment of their homes. The proposal would be a welcome addition and provide much needed homes for people of Watton and provide relief for residents of the area from the current blot on the landscape.

In answer to concerns raised by a Member with regard to mitigation measures and how much of a guarantee would there be that the bund would work, Ruth Ellerby, Senior Environmental Health Officer explained that they had looked at the report of the Noise Consultant and used the worst case scenario from the continuous monitoring. She added that the orientation of most of the properties' habitable rooms faced away from the WECO site. The bund was positioned in the best place.

A Committee Member was concerned at the loss of B2 development land but had been assured that there was other B2 development land available in Watton. 24 hour operation was a serious consideration given that WECO had permission to work 24/7. He too had concerns with regard to the bund and felt that firm assurances had not been provided with regard to it.

At the site visit, Members did hear an element of noise even when WECO were closing down. On entering the derelict buildings the noise level was appreciably lower than outside and a Member felt that noise levels in the proposed development would be more than acceptable.

**RESOLVED**, that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it as recommended on completion of the legal agreement.

**103/12 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**RESOLVED** that the applications be determined as follows :

- (a) Kenninghall : Extension to hatchery : Applicant : Crown Chicken Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/1100/F

The item had been withdrawn prior to the meeting pending a Screening Direction to be requested from the Secretary of State.

- (b) Kenninghall : Construct 4 x 48T bulk bins with automatic door : Applicant : C C L Holdings Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0156/F

The item had been withdrawn prior to the meeting pending a

Action By

Screening Direction to be requested from the Secretary of State.

- (c) Swaffham : Erection of 250 dwellings at the Swans Nest site access from Brandon Road : Applicant : Abel Homes Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0576/O

Cllr C Bowes declared that the applicant was a friend.

Outline planning permission was sought which included access for 250 dwellings. The proposal had been amended to incorporate the requests of NCC Highways and had resulted in the footpath/cycleway to the west of the site being located directly adjacent to Brandon Road rather than to the east of the hedgerow.

Since the report was published objections and a petition which contained 60 signatures had been received which related to increased traffic, character of the area, local facilities and local employment.

Mrs Miles, Objector, believed the medical cover in Swaffham and Norfolk was not sufficient to accommodate extra people. It could take up to 15-25 minutes to get out of Cygnet Walk and lots of traffic travelled along Brandon Road. The Swaffham Flyer did not go round all areas of the town and it would be necessary to walk over a mile to get to the town if transport was not provided.

Mr Hanlon, Agent, explained the application was in outline and the 250 dwellings were a mix of affordable and market led. Important hedges on the edge of the site would be retained. There was safe access along Brandon Road. The proposal would deliver very valuable residential contributions subject to the legal agreement.

A sustainable urban drainage scheme was proposed and a Member requested details be provided if a detailed application came forward and, for the safety of cyclists and pedestrians, the reason why Highways would want a path near the road and not behind the hedgerow. Travel Plan Bonds were explained to the Committee.

**RESOLVED, that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it as recommended, on completion of the legal agreement.**

- (d) Croxton : New purpose built refrigerated onion store : Applicant : Croxton Park Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0595/F

Cllr C Bowes declared that the applicant was a friend.

**Action By**

Permission was sought to erect a general purpose vegetable storage building designed for the long term storage of onions and potatoes. The building would be 42 metres by 25.7 metres with a 10m x 8m plant room. It would be a steel frame building clad with plastisol coated steel sheeting in olive green to match the adjacent existing buildings.

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (e) Mileham : Construction of 11 new dwellings : Applicant : Breckland District Council : Reference : 3PL/2012/0660/O

Planning permission with all matters reserved was sought to establish the principle of the construction of 11 dwellings, four of which would be affordable, on land at Burghwood Drive in the village of Mileham. Access was proposed from Burghwood Drive. Materials are to be agreed at the reserved matters stage.

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (f) Necton & Fransham : Construct new substation & section of onshore electrical cable route (Fransham Wood to Necton Substation) : Applicant : Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2012/0703/F

Michael Horn, Solicitor to the Council was present for this Agenda item.

The application presented by the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) sought full planning permission for the erection of a new substation and an associated section of on-shore cable route. Since the report publication, a petition of objection had been received which contained approximately 170 signatures and principally covered the impact on the landscape, traffic and local amenities.

Mr Watling, Parish Council, stated that whilst they were not averse to renewable energy installations, they did object to avoidable disturbance of rural communities. The proposal would be ugly and alien to the natural environment of a rural landscape with panoramic views. With more compassion and more investment a better site could be identified by the applicant. He asked Members to reflect on why the initial application was refused.

Mrs Willis, Objector, Necton Action Group stated that the majority of the village were against the proposal and reasons consisted of the proximity of the site to Necton village, its visual impact in a rural community, insufficient screening, road safety, access and visibility.

**Action By**

Mr Sheringham, Objector, emphasised the dangerous stretch of road which was an unrestricted single carriageway on a blind summit. Areas of his land would be affected. Pollutants could enter ponds and there were Great Crested newts in his own ponds.

Mr Petterson, Agent and Project Director for Dudgeon Wind Farm disagreed with comments made. There was no brownfield alternatives to the site, it would be increasingly screened over time, biodiversity targets would be met and the main concerns from the previous application had been addressed. No construction traffic would go through Necton village. It was an important project not just for the area, but for the UK and would bring clean energy, investment and jobs.

Comments from a Member were that road signage would need to be substantial to ensure road safety and he was not happy with the decision of Highways and felt that temporary extra lanes should be considered. He asked for assurances that adequate care would be taken to protect water voles and white-clawed crayfish if they were in the River Wissey and surrounding areas.

To ensure the depth of cables were not detrimental to the farming community, Mr Petterson confirmed that, they would be agreed with each individual farm owner. Planting would be of local varieties to look like surrounding woodland. The sub station would be unmanned.

**RESOLVED, that the application be approved, subject to conditions or subject to a legal agreement as appropriate.**

Michael Horn left the meeting.

- (g) Swanton Morely : Building plot for single detached dwelling :  
Applicant : Friends of All Saints Church : Reference :  
3PL/2012/0776/O

Members had received correspondence about the proposal which sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved to establish the principle of constructing a two storey detached dwelling on land to the north-east of a two storey detached dwelling known as Crispins in order to facilitate improvement works to All Saints Church comprising replacement of the current electrical system, the installation of a new heating and lighting system and the provision of toilets and kitchen facilities.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the Historic Buildings Consultant had stated that All Saints Church was not at risk. Four letters of objection had been received. Swanton Morley Parish Council had not commented on the application.

**Action By**

Mr Willis, Objector, stated that the site lay outside the Settlement Boundary, was not an exemption site, the fabric of the church was not at risk, it was opposite the listed building of Kesmark House, the setting of a heritage building should be respected and not just its fabric, and the application sought to put a sizeable modern house 20m from a listed building. Approval would set a precedent. The local community had made it clear they did not want the land developed.

Mr Took, Agent, explained that the application was to provide funds for essential works to the parish church which whilst structurally sound would be at risk if heating and electricity could not be provided. Basic facilities of a kitchen and toilet were required and without adequate funding simple functions could not be provided. The church had become a main church for the army and the Camp Padre was supportive of the application.

Mr Richmond, Ward Representative stated that the proposal was important as it affected the whole community. It was a constant battle to raise money although regular events were organised. The situation was embarrassing as Military personnel and families had to rely on the generosity of the Bowls Club for use of their toilet facilities. The street scene would not be affected by the proposal which the Highways Officer was supportive of. Swanton Morely was a growth village and the proposal would benefit the whole community.

As the church was regularly used by military personnel and families a Member was supportive as it was a focal point of the community and would be of everlasting public benefit for residents.

Members questioned the Agent on what external funding had been applied for, to which he advised support had been received from English Heritage to retile the chancel roof but there would be minimal chances of more support. Members were disappointed that alternative sources and further funding options had not been investigated for the interior works.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (h) Thetford : Demo. & redevelopment for mixed use of hotel, cinema & retail (A1), hot food (A5), restaurant (A3) & drinking (A4) : Applicant : Breckland District Council : Reference : 3PL/2012/0790/F

The item was discussed at the same time as Scheduled Item 10 below.

Cllr Bambridge declared that he used to have a connection

**Action By**

with the Anchor Hotel.

Cllr M Chapman-Allen declared that she was predetermined as she had spoken on a related matter at a Norfolk County Council Planning meeting and also mentioned the regeneration of the Anchor site. Therefore she would reserve her right to speak but would not vote.

Mr Wilson, Objector, represented the Thetford Society who believed the design was a cheap and desperate 4 storey ugly block which would do nothing to enhance the riverside area but would be a blot on the landscape in a conservation area.

Mr Cooper, Agent, advised that the scheme had eroded through an enormous amount of consultation. The site was purchased for regeneration and would be a catalyst for further regeneration in the town. It would create jobs during construction and thereafter. Social environmental elements would be provided and would result in a sustainable form of development. It included an enhanced riverside area for the whole of the town. It was rare to see a scheme with so many positives.

Members' comments were that whilst they agreed the need for redevelopment, it was the proposed monstrosity that they were against, one of the sides looked like a box, the overall design needed to be much more incorporated, the building was not contemporary but was an extension of a 1960s style building in the area, along with a reduction in car parking spaces.

A Member stated the people in Thetford would like the developers to incorporate the original façade of St Christophers which would not be beyond the ingenuity of the architects and developers.

Concern was raised that should the proposal be approved the area be landscaped in a sympathetic way so residents would not be subjected to a dreadful piece of land in the middle of the town in between the time the site was cleared and before the re-build took place.

It was felt by a Member that if the proposal went ahead it would promote footfall for the nightlife in the town and bring people in from outside so she was not worried about 21 car parking spaces being lost, as there were other car and lorry parks in the area.

The Planning Manager was also concerned about what would replace the Anchor Hotel and what would happen to the site in the interim, and he suggested that conditions be amended to stipulate that following demolition, the site should not be left

**Action By**

derelict but in the interim, should be landscaped.

Whilst Members accepted the need for redevelopment they were not supportive of the proposed design, therefore the recommendation for approval was not supported.

A new recommendation was made to defer the application which was seconded.

**RESOLVED, that contrary to the recommendation of Officers, the application be deferred to allow time for the applicant/agent to submit a better design.**

Cllr Bambridge abstained from voting.

- (i) Thetford : Demolition of existing buildings on site : Applicant : Breckland District Council : Reference : 3PL/2012/0791/CA

The item was discussed at the same time as Scheduled Item 9 above.

Cllr Bambridge declared that he used to have a connection with the Anchor Hotel.

Cllr M Chapman-Allen declared that she had spoke on a related matter at a Norfolk County Council Planning meeting and also mentioned the regeneration of the Anchor site. Therefore she would reserve her right to speak but would not vote.

**Approved, as recommended but with an amending condition which stipulated that, following demolition of The Anchor, the site should be developed in accordance with an approved scheme of redevelopment or, in the alternative or interim, landscaped in accordance with details which should first be agreed by the Council as LPA.**

Cllr Bambridge abstained from voting.

**Notes To Schedule**

Item No.	Speaker
1	
2	
3	Mrs Miles, Objector Mr Abel, Applicant Mr Hanlon, Agent
4	
5	
6	
7	Mr Watling, Parish Council

**Action By**

	Mrs Willis, Objector Mr J Sheringham, Objector Mr Petterson, Agent
8	Mr Richmond, Ward Representative Mr Willis, Objector Mr Took, Agent Mr Stone, Friends of Church Society
9	Mr Wilson, Objector Thetford Society Mr Cooper, Agent
10	Mr Wilson, Objector Thetford Society Mr Cooper, Agent

**Written Representations Taken Into Account**

<b>Reference No.</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>
3PL/2011/1100/F	8
3PL/2012/0156/F	10
3PL/2012/0503/O	15
3PL/2012/0547/F	1
3PL/2012/0576/O	10
3PL/2012/0660/O	3
3PL/2012/0703/F	21
3PL/2012/0776/O	9
3PL/2012/0790/F	6

**104/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING**

Noted.

**105/12 ENFORCEMENT REPORT : CROWN MILLING, GREEN FARM, EDGE GREEN, KENNINGHALL**

The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting pending a Screening Direction to be requested from the Secretary of State.

**106/12 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

**107/12 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

**108/12 APPEAL DECISION FOR LAND NORTH OF CROMWELL ROAD, WEETING (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

David Spencer, Deputy Planning Manager appraised Members on the outcome of the recent Appeal Decision for 35 houses, allotments

**Action By**

and public open space at Weeting and the implications for adopted Development Plan Policy relating to the protection of the environment.

**109/12 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

**110/12 GYPSY/TRAVELLER BRIEFING - CANDY SHERIDAN**

Candy Sheridan gave a talk on Gypsies and Travellers and imparted her knowledge for the benefit of the Committee.

The meeting closed at 3.00 pm

CHAIRMAN