

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 2 July 2007 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr J.P. Labouchere
Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr T.J. Lamb
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr B. Rose
Mr P.S. Francis	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr M. Fanthorpe	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mrs S.R. Howard-Alpe	Mr M. Spencer
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)
Mr R. Kemp	

Also Present

Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mrs J. Ball
Mr P.J. Hewett	

In Attendance

Julie Britton	- Committee Services Officer
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Chris Raine	- Senior Development Control Officer
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Monitoring Officer
Lee Webster	- Housing Advisory Officer

101/07 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2007 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

102/07 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 3)

An apology for absence was received from Mrs M Chapman-Allen.

103/07 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 4)

Members and Officers were asked to declare any interests as appropriate at the time the applications were made.

Mr N Moys, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects), declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda item 10 (Bawdeswell) as he lived in the vicinity of the site. Mr Moys left the room whilst this item was being discussed.

Mr Sharpe declared a personal interest in items 7 and 15 of the Schedule of Applications (Swaffham). The nature of his interest related to him being a Member of Swaffham Town Council.

Action By

Action By

104/07 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) (AGENDA ITEM 5)

The Chairman introduced Mr Chris Raine, a Senior Development Control Officer, and welcomed him to his first meeting of the Development Control Committee.

105/07 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 6)

- a) Mileham: Coronation Grove, Litcham Road: Conversion and Re-use of Part of Barn for Class B8 with Ancillary Residential and Parking (Ref: 3PL/2007/0318/F)

Members were informed that at the Development Control Committee on 21 May 2007 the aforementioned application had been deferred and the Development Services Manager had been authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to tie the new accommodation to the commercial use and require that the commercial use commenced first.

The Development Services Manager explained that the Applicant's Agent had, at first, disputed the content of the Section 106; however, after further discussions and since the production of the Agenda, the Agent had now agreed to the terms of the S106 Agreement and would continue through this route.

- b) Thetford: 29 Norwich Road (corner of Vicarage Road and Norwich Road): Demolition of dwelling and erection of 4 town houses and 20 apartments: (Ref: 3PL/2007/0546/F)

Members were advised that the recommendation on this application had been changed to one of refusal.

- c) Shipdham: Land off Mill Road: Residential Development: (Ref: 3PL/2006/1234/F)

Members were advised that the recommendation to this application had changed from one of approval to one of deferment for the reason that the issues relating to the Highways provision had not been resolved. Objections to these issues were still continuing and therefore an Officer decision could not be made; however, as various and numerous discussions had already taken place, it was felt reasonable that Members be given the opportunity to put their views forward and the application be discussed (see Minute No.107/07 below)

106/07 SHIPDHAM: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, LAND OFF MILL ROAD (AGENDA ITEM 8)

The following public speakers were in attendance for this item:

- Mr Hewett, Ward Representative
- Mr Tindale, Objector
- Mr Edwards, Applicant's Agent
- Mr Tracey, Norfolk County Council Highways Representative

Action By

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report which concerned an application for full planning permission for residential development on land off Mill Road, Shipdham. The development proposed included the erection of 24 dwellings, a new access and estate road and associated landscaped open spaces. The development would include 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties, in a range of sizes, and seven units of affordable housing. The existing residential house on the site would be demolished. The site itself, in the past, had included uses such as gravel extraction, a timber yard and a tip for builders waste.

The policy issues and the planning history relating to the application, as set out in the report, were explained. Members noted that Shipdham had, during the course of the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), been identified as a potential local Service Centre and had therefore been considered suitable for further development.

The proposal had given rise to considerable concerns in relation to highway safety. Objections had been raised by the Parish Council, the Highway Authority and local residents. It had been considered that Mill Road, in its present condition, although close to public amenities, was not suitable to cater for any significant increase in traffic. Further to this, existing footways in the vicinity of the site were very narrow and the junction of Mill Road and the A1075 was also narrow and had limited visibility. In response to concerns raised, the developer had offered to install three mini roundabouts at different junctions to improve circulation of traffic. He had also offered to widen the existing footways, introduce traffic calming measures and improve local highway signage including further provisions to instate 'keep clear' road markings adjacent to the village school. However, the Highway Authority had objected to these proposals and as an alternative the developer had offered a financial contribution of up to £48k to be spent on local highway improvements. The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained that although this sum had been offered there was no guarantee that the monies would be spent on the scheme. If the aforementioned highway improvements were not implemented there was a real danger that the money would be paid back to the developer; that was the main reason that Officers were requesting a deferral of this application.

Video footage was shown of the site and the surrounding road network.

Mr Tindale spoke against the application. He felt that further expansion in the village was not needed; Shipdham was a rural community where the facilities were limited and the local bus service was insufficient. He had nothing against a smaller development, but felt that if the application was granted it could set a precedent for further larger developments in the village. Mr Tindale pointed out that the application made many references to Policy PPG3 which, in his opinion, referred to guidelines for towns and not villages.

Mr Edwards, the Applicant's Agent, put his views forward and stated that the brownfield site was well located within the

Action By

settlement boundary. The original application had been for the erection of 42 units; however, that application had been withdrawn and had been revised and reduced to 24 units. Mr Edwards explained that the proposal offered a range of highway improvements that would generate very few extra traffic movements. The applicant had tried to address local concerns and had offered a flexible approach to deliver these improvements.

Mr Hewett, the Ward Member, added that this had been a frustrating application and had divided the community of the village. He pointed out that Shipdham had been refused highway improvements in the past and therefore he applauded the developer's willingness to amend his proposal to accommodate local concerns. However, the issue of highway safety had not been resolved and he accordingly supported the Officers' view of deferral.

Mr Tracey, the Highway Authority Representative, was in attendance and he agreed that this application had been a difficult one. He explained that if the mini roundabouts were to be installed, all arms of the roundabout had to have similar flows of traffic. The junction off Mill Road onto the A1075 had poor visibility and inadequate footways. If the application was to be approved the traffic generated from one dwelling alone would create 8 to 10 movements a day, therefore the only solution to reduce the vehicular traffic would be to render Mill Road one way; however, for this to happen, the road would have to be narrowed to make allowance for the widening of the footpaths. This would offer a technical solution but the applicant had not put forward any vehicular proposals and for that reason the Highway Authority was not in a position to support the application.

A Member asked whether there was any possibility of closing Mill Road and making it a cul-de-sac and whether the Highway Authority would consider any traffic calming measures along the A1075 and by the church. In response, the Highways Authority Representative advised that residents would see it as a major inconvenience if Mill Road was turned into a cul-de-sac. As far as the calming measures were concerned, the Highway Authority had received a number of comments that the speed limit, currently in operation, was not being observed. Further to this, larger vehicles had always had difficulty navigating this stretch of narrow road, particularly alongside the church.

Another Member felt that the Highway Authority should consider improvements to the junction as it was an accident waiting to happen.

A Member asked whether an Environmental Assessment had been carried out as he had concerns about flooding. Further to this, other Members felt that to build 24 dwellings on this site, alongside an inadequate road, was inappropriate and it was proposed that the application be refused on highways grounds, overdevelopment and flood risk.

The Committee was informed that an Environmental Assessment had been submitted.

Action By

At the conclusion of the debate, it was

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused, contrary to the recommendation, on the grounds that the development would have a potential impact on highway safety.

107/07 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS (FOR INFORMATION)
(AGENDA ITEM 9)

This item was noted.

108/07 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

- a) Bawdeswell: Folland Court: Demolition of existing sheltered housing units and construction of 8 dwellings for rent and a post office: Reference 3PL/2007/0606/F

The following public speakers were in attendance for this item:

- Mr Bambridge, Ward Representative
- Mr Mallen, Parish Council
- Mr Snape, Objector
- Mrs Handford, for the Applicants
- Mr Nourse, Agent
- Mr Tracey, Norfolk County Council Highways Representative

The Senior Development Control Officer presented the details of the application which had been deferred from the meeting held on 11 June 2007 to enable an Officer from the Highway Authority to attend.

The Committee was informed that a subsequent meeting had been held between the applicant and the Parish Council where an agreement had been reached in support of the application.

Mr Mallen spoke in support of the application, adding that he had attended the Development Control Committee meeting in his capacity as a Bawdeswell Parish Councillor and not as a member of the Board of Peddars Way Housing Association. He outlined the results of the meeting between the applicant and the Parish Council which had concluded that the revision of the proposals, to provide the open space and the post office, had been agreed. Mr Mallen advised that he still had some reservations concerning the trees and parking issues but he did not want to delay the application any further now that an agreement had been reached. He confirmed that the Parish Council was now unanimous that the proposal be approved.

Mr Snape advised that there was nothing wrong with the existing buildings that had been built solely for sheltered accommodation. All the dwellings were in perfectly good condition except for the heating system being disconnected.

Action By

Mr Nourse confirmed that there was a housing need in Bawdeswell, and if approved, this development would be a positive contribution to the area. The impact on the trees had been minimised and the dwellings were of a traditional design that would have no adverse impact on the character of the area.

Mrs Handford explained that local demand for the current facilities offered at Folland Court had diminished over the years; this had recently been proven by two bungalows on the site having to be re-let to people outside of the Breckland area. Mrs Handford pointed out that three trees out of 14 would have to be removed but would be replaced elsewhere. She gave the reasons for not installing a new central heating boiler.

Mr Bambridge, the Ward Representative, spoke on behalf of the parishioners and advised that one of the main concerns was the inadequacy of the footpath leading from the site to the school. He felt that moves should be made to install a footpath around the corner of Paradise Road prior to the scheme going ahead. A further concern raised was with regard to the Sweet Chestnut tree on the site which he asked to be retained.

Mr Tracey, the Norfolk County Council's Highway Representative, advised that he was aware that Paradise Road was the primary link to the school; however, it was not possible to widen the footways as the road was inadequate. There were alternatives that the developer could consider which included re-surfacing of the road, formalised flash kerbs, and enhanced pedestrian safety measures; Mr Tracey felt that the developer should meet those obligations. He would also prefer to see more parking provision; however, the developer could choose his own parking requirements.

Following questions relating to the parking issues, highway issues and the post office building, the Development Services Manager advised that normally a scheme would be agreed in advance but in this instance it had not; therefore the matters should be discussed and not deferred again at this stage. A Member felt that the post office building should be discounted at this stage as there was no guarantee, in these uncertain times, that it would be allowed. In response, Members were informed that the post office building, if not required, could be converted into a small dwelling but would necessitate a further planning application. The Committee further noted that Peddars Way Housing Association had received confirmation from the Post Office saying that it would be willing to move the branch office once from the site if the current facility in Bawdeswell happened to close.

In conclusion, it was

RESOLVED that the application be approved as recommended in the report.

Action By

- b) Attleborough: Westholme, Station Road: Proposed residential development: Reference 3PL/2007/0246/F

The report concerned a planning application for the redevelopment of an existing residential property on Station Road, Attleborough. The application had been due to be heard by the Development Control Committee on 11 June 2007 but was deferred in order to allow discussions to continue in relation to noise and design.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that a Noise Assessment report had been submitted. The report acknowledged that current noise levels from traffic on Station Road and from the poultry processing plant opposite were relatively high and could be expected to raise a number of complaints. Various measures were proposed to reduce noise levels, including acoustic screening to the balconies of the flats and acoustically attenuated ventilation systems. The Committee noted that solar panels would be incorporated.

A model of the proposed flats was circulated.

In response to questions, Mr Cumming, the Applicant's Agent, advised that the distance between the two buildings would be nine metres, the grounds floor flats would have small gardens and the row of leylandii hedge behind the site would be removed and replaced with suitable screening.

RESOLVED that the application be approved as recommended subject to conditions relating to materials, access, parking, cycle storage and ground investigation.

- b) Mileham: Coronation Grove, Litcham Road: Reference 3PL/2007/0318/F

See Minute No. 105/07 above.

109/07 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS
(AGENDA ITEM 11)

RESOLVED that the applications be determined in accordance with the recommendations contained in the schedule, subject to the following conditions and amendments:

- (a) Item 2: 3PL/2006/1234/F: Shipdham: Land at Mill Road including Molecatchers Cottage: Demolition of existing building and construction of residential development for Buckfastleigh Ltd

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 8 (see Minute No. 106/07 above).

- (b) Item 4: 3PL/2007/0424/O: Thetford: Brandon Road/Maine Street: Residential development for The Crown Estate

Approved as recommended, subject to the inclusion of direct pedestrian access being provided on to the Brandon Road.

Action By

- (c) Item 5: 3PL/2007/0484/F: Thetford: Old Glass Warehouse, Old Market Street: Conversion into flats

Deferred, with authority for the Development Services Manager to approve as recommended on completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution.

- (d) Item 8: 3PL/2007/0503/F: Watton: Thetford Road and Gregor Shanks Way: 19 sheltered flats

Deferred, with authority for the Development Services Manager to approve as recommended on completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution.

- (e) Item 9: 3PL/2007/0546/F: Thetford: 29 Vicarage Road (corner of Vicarage Road and Norwich Road): Demolition of dwelling and erection of 4 town Houses and 20 apartments

The Committee was informed that the recommendation had been changed to one of refusal due to the Council's Tree and Countryside Officer still having concerns about the close proximity of the existing Lime trees to some of the proposed apartments. Members noted that the applicant had recently submitted revised plans to try to overcome these concerns.

Refused, as recommended on the grounds that:

- i) the proposal, together with the loss of the existing house, would fail to enhance the character of the area; and
- ii) the buildings would have an impact on two large existing Lime trees.

- (f) Item 10: 3PL/2007/686/F: Thetford: 3 Minstergate: Convert house to provide 2 no. one bed apartments, new build block to provide 11 no. one bed apartments for Henstead Hall Estates

Deferred, contrary to the recommendation. Members felt that the dimensions of the building should be verified to ensure that the proposed scheme was similar to the previously approved application.

- (g) Item 11: 3PL/2007/0687/F: Attleborough: Bunns Bank: 2 blocks of industrial units

Approved as recommended, with an additional condition restricting the use to Classes B1 and B8 only.

- (h) Item 12: 3PL/2007/0714/D: Dereham: Toftmead, South Green: Erection of 12 no. flats and 4 no. semi-detached houses for Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd

Refused, contrary to the recommendation. Members felt that the dwellings fronting the site should be of a superior design to compensate for the loss of the former Georgian building.

Action By

Notes to the Schedule

The following persons were in attendance to speak on the following items:

<u>Schedule Item No.</u>	<u>Speaker</u>
Agenda item 10 (Bawdeswell)	Mr Bambridge, Ward Member Mr Mallen, Parish Council Mr Snape, Objector Mrs Handford, for the Applicants Mr Nourse, Applicant's Agent Mr Tracey, NCC Highways Representative
Agenda item 8 (Shipdham)	Mr P Hewett, Ward Member Mr Edwards, Applicant's Agent Mr Tracey, NCC Highways Representative Mr Tindale, Objector
1	Mr Leighton, Parish Council Mr Abram, Objector Mrs Ball, Ward Member
14	Mr Quinton, Blakes Abbatoir (in support) Mrs Lawes, Parish Council Mr Cross, on behalf of the applicant
13	Mr Beaumont, Objector Mrs Bealey, Applicant
15	Mr Butters, Swaffham Town Council
3	Mr Thacker, Objector Mr Flett, Applicant's Agent
4	Mr Blackwell, Applicant's Agent
5 & 6	Lee Webster, Breckland Council
9	Mr Took, Applicant's Agent
8	Mr Nolan, Applicant's Agent

The Committee was made aware of the following amendments to the Agenda:

- a) Item 3: Thetford – the proposal had been changed to the erection of four townhouses and not five.

Action By

- b) item 15: Swaffham - the description of development should have stated: 2 one bed flats and 8 two bed flats and not 8 one bed flats.
- c) Item 16: Attleborough – the proposal should have read: “change of use to retail/office” and not “change of use from retail to office”.

Written Representations taken into account

<u>Reference No.</u>	<u>No. of Representations</u>
3PL/2006/0441/O	20
3PL/2006/1234/F	12
3PL/2007/0246/F	1
3PL/2007/0292/F	6
3PL/2007/0530/F	1
3PL/2007/0546/F	7
3PL/2007/0606/F	8
3PL/2007/0687/F	2
3PL/2007/0714/D	1
3PL/2007/0743/O	2
3PL/2007/0806/F	4

110/07 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 12)

This item was noted.

111/07 APPEALS DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 13)

APP/F2605/A/06/2033013: Toftwood: 20 School Lane: erection of new three bed dwelling for Mr and Mrs Sandford (Dismissed)

Members congratulated the Officers concerned on the outcome of the above Appeal.

This item was otherwise noted.

112/07 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 14)

This item was noted.

The meeting closed at 4.05 pm

CHAIRMAN