

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE (FORMERLY KNOWN AS DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE)

**Held on Monday, 11 July 2011 at 9.30 am in
The Anglia Room, Conference Suite, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Dereham
NR19 1EE**

PRESENT

Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr W R J Richmond
Mr T R Carter	Mr M S Robinson
Mr C S Clark	Mr S. J. F. Rogers
Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr T.J. Lamb	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mrs J A North	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)

Also Present

Mrs E M Jolly (Ward Representative)

In Attendance

Paul Jackson	- Planning Manager
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Mike Brennan	- Principal Planning Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Jane Osborne	- Committee Officer

110/11 MINUTES

With regard to Agenda Item 10/11 Schedule of Planning Applications (c) Item 3 : 3PL/2010/1366/LB paragraph 4 on page 5, the words 'including on affordable housing' should be inserted to read, "Deferred, on the grounds that further information including on affordable housing was required, and to allow independent advice be sought on the viability case".

Subject to the above, the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

111/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

It was expected that an Atlas training session for Members and all other Council Members would take place on the evening of 26 July 2011; when the date was confirmed all Councillors would be informed.

A half hour training session would take place after the end of the meeting for the benefit of new Members.

112/11 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)

The Public Examination concluded last week, and the Inspector's report was due to be received in October. The Council had introduced a new policy which would be on the website later in the week, which identified villages with settlement boundaries, which would be the subject to a further six week consultation.

Action By

Action By

113/11 SHIPDHAM : PROPOSED ERECTION OF SINGLE DWELLING WITH INTEGRATED CART LODGE AT LAND ADJACENT 58 PARKLANDS AVENUE FOR A C WILLIAMSON & SON : REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1358/F

The report concerned an application for full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey detached dwelling with a cart lodge. The proposal also included a new access off Parkland Avenue. The application was considered by the Development Control Committee on 18 April 2011, when it was resolved to defer the application to consider the footprint of the dwelling marked out within the site boundaries, to confirm the roadway treatment and to enable further consideration of issues raised by a resident in respect of reported problems with foul water drainage in the local area. A site visit was undertaken on 8 July 2011.

Following the site visit the Principal Planning Officer stated that the positioning of the building was still felt to be acceptable. The drive surface treatment would be constructed in a porous bitumen finish. However some Councillors were not happy with the siting of the development and that it would not sit comfortably on the corner plot.

Anglian Water had admitted that there had been pump failures over the last decade but one of the pumps had now been fitted with non return valves and currently they were looking at costs to replace a second pump. They had stated there was not a capacity issue at the main sewer.

Mr Pick, Objector, who lives at 49 Parklands Avenue advised that everyone who lives in the cul-de-sac had complained and their gardens have been covered in sewerage, the last time being January 2011, and residents were concerned that another property would compound the problem that already existed. He advised that in May 2010 a monitor had been placed in the drain for several months and he had been told that the bore of the pipe was not big enough to take the volume of sewerage through it. The footpath constructed by Norfolk County Council had been moved nearer to the wall of his property recently, but he did not object to that.

The Planning Manager clarified with Members the need to establish if the site was capable of siting a dwelling of this type.

Members voted against the recommendation to approve the application. It was then :

RESOLVED, contrary to officer recommendation, to refuse the application, on the grounds that the proposal was unacceptable as proposed as too little amenity space was provided and the design was inappropriate for this site and too cramped.

114/11 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows :-

- (a) **Item 1 : Griston : Land off Church Road : Proposed 10 Unit Housing Estate for Miss L Bunn : Reference 3PL/2010/1277/F**

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of 10 dwellings consisting of 4 semi-detached bungalows, 2 detached chalet bungalows and 4 semi-detached houses with associated

Action By

garaging and parking spaces. The site is accessed via Church Road. The scheme proposes to provide the 4 semi-detached bungalows as affordable units.

No pre-application consultation or discussions had taken place. The Parish Council had objected. The Highways Authority required amendments to the layout and access. Environmental Health had concern over the septic tank. The Tree & Countryside Officer felt the sacrifice of a small-leafed lime was not acceptable, and that due to the juxtaposition between Plot 9 and the trees, there would be additional pressure to fell others. It was felt the layout was poor and cramped. With regard to foul drainage, there was a presumption to discharge into a public sewer, unless there were compelling reasons to use an alternative system e.g treatment plant. It was evident that the main foul sewer is within the Church Road carriageway. No justification had been put forward as to why this had been discounted as a viable option for dealing with foul water from the site.

A Member of the Committee questioned whether a development plan for the whole site should be provided so that future intentions could be made known.

Refused, as recommended.

- (b) Item 2 : Hockham : Poplars Farm : Re-building of 6 No Chicken Sheds, Tractor Shed & Associated Works (Retrospective) for Mr P Davidson : Reference 3PL/2011/0320/F

The proposal sought retrospective planning permission for the rebuilding of 6 chicken sheds, a tractor shed and associated works. The proposed buildings have the same footprint as the original buildings. No objections had been received, there would be no increase in the number of birds, and the buildings were a significant improvement.

Approved, as recommended.

- (c) Item 3 : Great Ellingham : Stallard Farm, Stalland Common : 3 No Duck Buildings Including Demolition Of Existing for Gressingham Foods : Reference 3PL/2011/0365/F

The proposal sought the demolition of 7 existing duck buildings and the erection of 3 duck buildings. The Parish Council, Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council had no objections. Three letters of concern from local residents with regard to noise, flies and additional screening required on the western boundary had been received. The site operated with an environmental permit of 65,000 ducks and the number would not be exceeded by the proposal. The Environmental Health Officer had recommended conditions for a boundary noise limit and a management plan for the control of pests.

Mr Urwin, Applicant advised that pest control was covered by regional contractors, fans used are those utilised across most poultry sites. The landscaping/screening would be implemented during the next Autumn-Winter.

Action By

In answer to a question raised by a Councillor as to how the existing asbestos roofing would be removed from the site, Mr Urwin confirmed that it would be taken away from the site.

Approved, as recommended.

- (d) Item 4 : Cranworth : 1 Rectory Villas : Single Storey Extension To Front for Mr P Carter and Ms S Wright : Reference 3PL/2011/0424/F

The application sought consent for the erection of a single storey extension with forward projecting gable to the side of a two storey semi-detached Victorian cottage and forward of an existing single storey extension. The Parish Council and local residents had raised no objection.

Mr Burton, Agent, stated that the extension was simplistic in terms of what his client wanted to achieve, which was additional living space. The pitched roof gable matched the existing gable and properties either side would not be affected by the proposal. The dwelling was set back from the main road and there was hedging.

Whilst the design was good, it was felt by the Committee that design adjustments would need to be made to the look of the proposed extension as it did not currently fit the attractive traditional pair of cottages.

Refused, as recommended.

- (e) Item 5 : Harling : The Old Stables, 51a White Hart Street : 12 No Solar Panels To Front Roof Slop (Retrospective) for Mr S Langridge : Reference 3PL/2011/0519/F

The application sought retrospective consent for the installation of 12 photo voltaic panels, 8 positioned vertically following the roof plane with 4 positioned horizontally below, to the roof slope of the front elevation of a two storey dwelling. The area of the roof covered by the panels is approximately 19m sq, equating to approximately 75% of the total area of that roof slope. The dwelling lies within the designated Conservation Area.

The Parish Council supported the application and one letter of support had been received from a local resident. The issues were finely balanced.

PPS5 makes specific reference to energy efficiency and the Applicant had demonstrated that he had looked at length at different alternatives. The Principal Planning Officer said that the Listed Building and Conservation Act duty in respect of Conservation Areas be borne in mind and it was considered that the addition of panels and their disposition within the roof slope would not either preserve or enhance the area therefore the recommendation was for refusal and enforcement action.

Mr Langridge, Applicant, stated that they had not been aware the

Action By

property was in a Conservation Area. The new build part of the property was ten years old, the panels do not overlap and they are not a permanent feature. The cost effective installation was carried out for the good of the environment. White Hart Street was not a uniform street and consisted of a multitude of different styles. The solar panels were dark grey and did not clash with the pantiles. The roof was shielded and the building was set back 13m from the narrow street; there were no pavements outside the property. Favourable response had been received from the resident immediately opposite, whilst no negative comments had been received. The installation was relatively unobtrusive there was no impact on the street scene, it was energy efficient and would be a temporary structure. Life of the panels would be for 25 years with the inverter lasting for 10 years.

Mrs Jolly, Ward Representative, advised that Policy SO12 was to promote renewable energy. There were 50 Conservation Areas in Breckland. Solar panels are non permanent. The Parish Council had considered the retrospective application and had registered no objection. Not all White Hart Street was in the Conservation Area. The solar panels had been placed on the modern extension. The roof was only visible from the road when opposite the building. She suggested that the item could be deferred to allow Members to view the dwelling themselves.

One Councillor felt that in the current financial climate there would be more applications for renewable energy systems, with another Councillor feeling that if the house had been built in a new style, the panels would be far more acceptable.

The Planning Manager explained to the Committee that the issue was not whether or not the panels were temporary but the need to balance the panels and their impact to their context, and this was finely balanced due to the particular part of the Conservation Area where the building was sited.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported. It was then **resolved** :-

To approve the application, contrary to recommendation on the grounds that the development was acceptable as the solar panels on the building were set well back from the road and would have very limited impact on street scene or Conservation Area.

Notes to Schedule

Item No	Speaker
1	N/A
2	N/A
3	Mr Urwin - Applicant
4	Mr Burton - Agent
5	Mrs Jolly – Ward Representative Mr Langridge - Applicant

Action By

Written Representations Taken Into Account

Reference No.	No. of Representations
3PL/2011/0519/F	1
3PL/2011/0365/F	2

115/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING

Noted.

116/11 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

117/11 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS

Noted.

118/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

The meeting closed at 11.00 am

CHAIRMAN