

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 31 October 2011 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

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

**Also Present**

Mrs L.S. Turner (Ward Representative)	Lady Fisher (Ward Representative)
Mr S.G. Bambridge (Ward Representative)	Mr J.W. Nunn (Ward Representative)
	Mr R. R. Richmond (Ward Representative)
	Lady Fisher (Ward Representative)

**In Attendance**

Paul Jackson	- Planning Manager
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Mike Brennan	- Principal Planning Officer*
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)*
Jane Osborne	- Committee Officer
Mike Wheatley	- Environmental Health Officer
Ruth Ellerby	- Senior Environmental Health Officer

\* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

**157/11 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**158/11 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr S Rogers, Cllr P Duigan was in attendance as his substitute.

**159/11 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

Cllr P Duigan declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9, Deferred Item (a) Dereham, by virtue of being a Member of Dereham Town Council.

Cllr Sharpe declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 10, Schedule of Planning Applications, Item 13 Swaffham, by virtue of being an Executive Support Member for Asset Management.

Cllr Wilkin declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 11 & 12, by virtue of having attended a function in the past with the applicant, but it was not relevant to the applications.

Cllr Nunn declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 11 & 12, by virtue of being a distant relative of the applicant.

**Action By**

**Action By**

**160/11 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA**

Prior to the meeting Item No. 4 of Agenda Item No. 10, Schedule of Planning Applications, had been withdrawn : Lynford : Lynford Hall Mobile Home Park, Lynford Hall for Lynford Hall Hotel : Reference : 3PL/2011/0808/F.

**161/11 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)**

The initial report into Site Specifics would be subject to a further 6 week consultation period which ends 5 December 2011. Final submission for TAAP was scheduled for mid November with provisional dates for examination in public February/March 2012.

**162/11 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Chairman suggested to Cllr Lamb that the EPR Thetford Liaison Group, which is a sub-group of the Planning Committee, should be disbanded as the Planning Committee have no involvement in it. She suggested that perhaps Thetford Town Council might like to take over administration of the Group to continue providing liaison between residents and the Power Station. The proposal would be put to the Planning Committee on 28 November 2011.

**163/11 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS**

163 .1 Dereham : Erection of Block of 14 Residential Apartments inc. Access and Parking Areas at Fleece Meadow, Norwich Street, Dereham for Pelorus : Reference : 3PL/2011/0565/D

Cllr P Duigan declared a prejudicial interest by virtue of being a Member of Dereham Town Council, and left the room.

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved as recommended.

163 .2 Hardingham : Conversion of Garage to Dwelling at Oak Lodge, Nordelph Corner for Alan Irvine : Reference : 3PL/2011/0618/F

Mr Townshend, Applicant, stated that to tie the garage conversion to the existing dwelling would not work due to mortgage issues, it would not create a secure home for his son and family, if he and his wife downsized in the future their son and his family would lose their home and the main house was 20m away. It was an existing building with only 2 small dormer windows and would make no difference to the countryside. There were transport links less than a mile away at Hingham.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused as recommended.

163 .3 MUNDFORD: 60-62 Malsters Close (Plots A and B), Mundford: Erection of two detached houses with integral garages and parking spaces off a private drive for Mr J Newbould/Mr Stephen Hart, The Whitworth Company Partnership: Reference: 3PL/2011/0192/F

For Members' benefit, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained the various flood zones 1-3. He read out an email from Cllr Ann

**Action By**

Steward in which she stated that the Parish Council and residents continued to raise concern over the application and that the area had been left clear due to flooding and to be used as open space.

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved as recommended.

**164/11 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

- (a) Item 1 : Kenninghall : Garboldisham Road : Renewable Energy Facility for Greenshoots Energy Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2010/1372/F

See minute numbers 166/11 and 167/11.

- (b) Item 2 : Kenninghall : Crown Mill Ltd : Heat & Power Generating Unit & underground gas pipeline for Greenshoots Energy Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/0445/F

See minute numbers 166/11 and 167/11.

- (c) Item 3 : Griston : Old Dairy, Caston Road : Create link between house and garage and convert garage into a day room (retrospective) for Mr G Lond Caulk : Reference : 3PL/2011/0613/F

**Refused, as recommended.**

The Planning Manager advised that enforcement of the non use of the garage would be considered, but enforcement would take place with regard to the demolition of the link between the two.

- (d) Item 4 : Lynford : Lynford Hall Mobile Home Park, Lynford Hall : Continued use of site for 46 park homes for Lynford Hall Hotel : Reference : 3PL/2011/0808/F

The application had been withdrawn on 26 October 2011.

**Withdrawn.**

- (e) Item 5 : Swanton Morley : Greengate : Erection of 20 residential dwellings with associated garaging, parking and access for Hopkins & Moore Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/0830/D

Committee Members had received communication from Mr Atterwill.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) brought to the Committee's attention the amendments made to the Reserved Matters application to try and ensure the layout and design materials picked up on distinctive features found in Swanton Morely. The Parish Council were concerned that too many materials were proposed, but he believed there was scope for simplification of the palette of materials. Local interest and opposition had been focused on flooding and surface water drainage.

Mr Atterwill, Parish Council, advised that there was no detail with regard to street lighting. The farm access gate was a safety issue. They objected to the rendered appearance of properties which were

**Action By**

not in keeping with the village and wanted the white horizontal cladding removed. Drainage was of concern as there was a history of flooding at Nos. 40 and 42 as shown in photographs to Members. There should have been a Flood Risk Assessment carried out. The swale was not thought to be sustainable. He asked for the item to be deferred or refused.

Mr Hyde, Objector, stated that the applicant proposed to discharge surface water onto his land, which did not belong to the developer. He asked that interested parties met for an informal meeting with the Council to enable clarity of the legal status.

Mrs Briggs, Objector, stated that questions remained unanswered. No Flood Risk Assessment had been published, there was no mention of the slope of the land.

Mr Eburne, Applicant, advised that the site was within the Settlement Boundary and was supported by statutory consultees. It delivered 7 affordable dwellings. Flood risk problems would be alleviated by the development, without it, flood issues would remain. There was no intention to drain water into the pond.

Mr Richmond, Ward Representative supported the Parish Council and the local community. The second entrance was dangerous for local children. Water ran off fields. The Parish Council could not say anything positive towards the development. No Flood Risk Assessment had been carried out. There was a dispute with regard to external boundaries. There were invertebrates within the area which had conservation features.

Concern was raised with regard to biodiversity. The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) read out the conditions originally put in place in 2009, no wildlife condition had been imposed. The Solicitor advised the Committee that a condition could be put in place to ensure the adjacent plot did not in any way affect the pond. Flood Risk Assessments were normally required at Outline Application stage. The surface water condition must be done before any work commenced on site.

Members did not feel they had sufficient information to make a decision.

**Deferred, to allow Officers obtain drainage details and look into points raised.**

- (f) Item 6 : Hockham : Scotgate Cottage, Watton Road : Change of use from agricultural to residential garden with planning & large pond for Mr David Garner : Reference : 3PL/2011/0837/F

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (g) Item 7 : Roudham/Larling and Bridgham : Camp Farm, Roudham Road: Change of use of buildings 1, 3 8 and 15 for commercial storage purposes for Paul Rackham Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/0851/CU

Members of the Committee had received correspondence from the

**Action By**

Agent and the Parish Council.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) outlined the history of the site and enforcement action. The Applicant had produced a good case to show that the buildings were no longer required for farming purposes and therefore the first reason for refusal, "failure to demonstrate use could not be on allocated site" was no longer a reason for refusal, particularly taking into account the findings of the Inspector on the previous appeals.

The issue of scale remained. He read out the Planning Inspector's observation as noted on page 46 of the Agenda. It was a significant development despite a reduction of use. Storage tended to be for long term use and the Applicant would be willing to have conditions personal to existing users.

Mr Larwood, Chairman of Roudham Parish Council, stated that Camp Farm had been the subject of sustained development for the last 15 years. A concern of the Independent Agricultural Review undertaken in 2011 was if the Applicant sold the estate. The Applicant had ceased his intensive beef enterprise. If the application was successful a further application could follow and the site could be sold leaving the main arable farm with no farm buildings. It attempted to negate the decision by the Inspector. The quality of the landscape and road congestion were of concern.

Mr Dickenson, Bridgham Parish Council, stressed that it was a massive site down a narrow lane currently used illegally with enforcement action in progress, and that now was not the time to consider uses.

Mr Webb, was the occupier of building 3, which, he said, had been on site since 1948. He had operated there since 1998 and had not been aware there was a restriction to agriculture, but at that time, he did purely deal with agriculture. The floor had been power screeded and he could not find an alternative building in the area. He needed an area outside to wash marquees and then take them inside to dry. If refusal was enforced occupiers would have to vacate the buildings and he would cease trading. Buildings were in lovely condition. The site was well screened with trees. Soil had blown onto the road and reduced the width of the road.

Mr Cunnane, Agent, for the Applicant, informed the Committee the Applicant had commissioned an Agricultural Appraisal and issues of scale had been addressed. The Applicant was happy to enter into a S106 Agreement to avoid traffic going through Harling and condition limiting hours to 7 a.m–7 p.m Monday–Friday, 12–1 on Saturday with no Sunday or Bank Holiday operation. No complaints had been received. If planning permission was refused, the buildings would sit empty and people made unemployed. No harm would arise from the scale of the development. Units 5, 6 and 9 continued to be used as agriculture. Beef finishing was now not viable and would never be re-introduced on the site.

Lady Fisher, Ward Representative, reiterated the local view that the site had been under enforcement and appeal. She was very dismayed at Norfolk County Council's comments and their apparent

**Action By**

relaxed attitude. It was a special landscape area and not an industrial zone. Buildings could easily return to agricultural purposes.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported.

**RESOLVED, that contrary to the recommendation of Officers, the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it, subject to conditions, on completion of a legal agreement in relation to routing of HGV movements. In relation to conditions, it was stressed that these should include hours of work limitation, personal conditions (as offered) and use for storage only, not distribution.**

The reasons for the decision were that :

- i) the proposed reduction in the scale of the uses of the buildings;
- ii) the economic arguments put forward;
- iii) the limited potential for re-use of the buildings for agricultural purposes;
- iv) the fact that the buildings were permanent and would remain on site in any case; and
- v) the restrictions now offered and included relating to HGV routing, personal use, hours of work and a limitation to storage use only differentiated the proposals from previous proposals promoted on the same site

- (h) Item 8 : Quidenham : Richard Johnston Ltd, Harling Road : Erection of two proposed warehouse buildings (Units 13 & 14) for Richard Johnston Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/0853/F

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (i) Item 9 : Dereham : Greenfields Road/Wheatcroft Way : Construction of 200 homes with associated landscaping and infrastructure for Mr Robin Green : Reference : 3PL/2011/0898/0

In answer to a comment from a Councillor about open space, play areas and an outside sports area, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) said there were sports facility opportunities not far from the site and that configuration of on site facilities could be covered at the detailed design stage. He explained the normal procedure with regard to maintaining the open spaces.

Mr Green, Applicant, hoped to achieve secured bio design award status.

**Deferred, and subject to satisfactory conclusion of discussion with NCC Highways, the Officers be authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the S106 Agreement in relation to affordable housing, open space, highways and other contributions.**

**Action By**

- (j) Item 10 : Narford & Narborough : Hall Farm, Narford Road : Proposed agricultural store for C R Melton & Sons : Reference : 3PL/2011/0907/F

**Approved, as recommended, with an additional condition relating to boundary planting.**

- (k) Item 11 : Shipdham : Dusty Meadow, Watton Road : Temporary standing of mobile home for agricultural worker for Mrs Kathryn McCarthy : Reference : 3PL/2011/0913/F

The Principal Planning Officer advised that Norfolk County Council would require visibility levels 2.4m back from the highway if Members were minded to approve the application, and they would object to the application if no visibility splay was provided. Highways recommended a condition be attached requiring a visibility splay. As the application failed to comply with functional and financial tests it was recommended for refusal.

Mr Took, Agent, advised that the application sought temporary permission for the siting of a mobile home for 3 years. The Applicant and her husband had already invested in the site and provided an independent business plan appraisal which took into account financial tests. A profit was projected after three years, the Applicant's enthusiasm was infectious and she was convinced she could succeed and was determined to be proven right, however without being on site the profit margin would be less. Security on site was a significant factor. It was not the Applicant's intention to rent or buy adjacent land.

Mrs Turner, Ward Representative, stated she was impressed with the Applicant's enthusiasm and realism. Shipdham was a designated service centre. A number of village residents had written in support of the application. The Applicant had accepted that the entrance needed to be made wider. Her family and business needs would run more efficiently if she lived on site.

A Councillor commented that there were agricultural enterprises that were successfully managed from a distance.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (l) Item 12 : Lyng : The Mallards, Farman Close : Change of use of land to stand touring caravans for Ms S J Jarvis : Reference : 3PL/2011/0953/CU

The Parish Council objected to the proposal. 7 letters of support and 4 letters of objection had been received. No noise complaints had been received by the Environmental Health Team.

Mr Bude, Objector, commented that the area shown to the Committee during the presentation had diminished in size. His 3 neighbours who lived next door to the site, supported him fully in his objections of overlooking and noise.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the application site had been reduced.

**Action By**

Mr Woods, Supporter, who lived in Lyng was present to speak on behalf of himself and Mr Butcher a proprietor in the town. Mr Woods declared a personal interest in that he stored his caravan on the site, and personally rated the caravan park as 5 star. There was ample room for manoeuvring. Mr Butcher had advised that the Applicant had an established business which was responsible for 20% of his own business' daily takings, and in his experience only a few pedestrians and caravans used The Drift. For the economic well being of the village he urged the Committee to approve the application.

Ms Jarvis, Applicant, explained that she had run the site for 26 years as a tranquil retreat which did not allow children, and where caravans had been positioned for at least 20 years. She wished to regularise the situation now that the issue had come to light with regard to not having planning permission. Being granted permission would ensure the site would be able to continue to be used as a retreat. Her guests made a positive contribution to the village. Making the site disabled friendly was of great importance. The extension would give more time to evacuate the area should an emergency occur. The Drift would not be used and noise would not increase. The gate at Quarry Lane would be used for emergency access.

Mr Bambridge, Ward Representative, advised the Committee that he and others had not been advised that the site area had changed. He had spoken to both sides. The Applicant had a compelling and legitimate case and the park was attractive to those who had health problems. The public house and shop could see a reduction in business. Objectors did have cause for complaint in that caravans parked close to their bungalows. The Parish Council had objected and were concerned with regard to the increase in complaints they had received about the site. As the Parish Council wanted to encourage businesses as well as protect residents they suggested if the Committee were minded to approve the application, to consider a time limit being imposed with a review in 12 months.

**The Committee agreed to defer the Item to allow Officers time to re-consult with the Parish Council and members of the public.**

- (m) Item 13 : Swaffham : Sandringham Way : Provision of pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings to area of vacant land between 44 and 46 Sandringham Way for Breckland Council : Reference : 3PL/2011/0958/0

Cllr Sharpe declared a prejudicial interest by virtue of being an Executive Support Member for Asset Management, he left the room.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Action By**

**Notes To Schedule**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
1	Mr Gordon, Parish Council Ms Burridge, Objector Mr Kay, Objector Mr Sibley, Youth Council Mr Gooderham, Applicant Mr Alston, Applicant Mr Riley, Agent Mr Heap, Technical Advisor Mr Nunn, Ward Rep Mr Wheatley, Env Health Ms Ellerby, Env Health
2	Ms Scott Barber, Parish Council Mr Waters, Objector Mr Sibley, Youth Council Mr Gooderham, Applicant Mr Alston, Applicant Mr Riley, Agent Mr Heap, Technical Advisor Mr Nunn, Ward Rep Mr Wheatley, Env Health Ms Ellerby, Env Health
3	
4	
5	Mr Atterwill, Parish Council Mr Hyde, Objector Mrs Briggs, Objector Mr Eburne, Applicant Mr Richmond, Ward Rep
6	
7	Mr Larwood, Parish Council Mr Dickenson, Parish Council Mr Cunnane, Agent Mr Webb, Occupier Lady Fisher, Ward Rep
8	Mr Johnson, Applicant
9	Mr Green, Applicant
10	
11	Mr Took, Agent Mrs McCarthy, Applicant Mrs Turner, Ward Rep
12	Mr Bude, Objector Mr Woods, Supporter Ms Jarvis, Applicant Mr Bambridge, Ward Rep
13	

**Written Representations Taken Into Account**

<b>Reference No.</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>
3PL/2010/1372/F	98
3PL/2011/0445/F	28
3PL/2011/0613/F	

**Action By**

3PL/2011/0808/F	
3PL/2011/0830/D	3
3PL/2011/0837/F	
3PL/2011/0851/CU	13
3PL/2011/0853/F	
3PL/2011/0898/O	6
3PL/2011/0907/F	
3PL/2011/0913/F	7
3PL/2011/0953/CU	11
3PL/2011/0958/O	

**165/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING**

Noted.

**166/11 KENNINGHALL : PROPOSED BIOGAS RENEWABLE ENERGY PLANT, LAND OFF GARDBOLDISHAM ROAD FOR GREENSHOOTS ENERGY LTD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1372/F**

The application was considered at the same time as the item below. Members had received correspondence about both applications.

Cllr Wilkin declared a personal interest by virtue of having attended a function in the past with the applicant, but it was not relevant to the application.

Cllr Nunn declared a personal interest by virtue of being a distant relative of the applicant.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented his reports. He pointed out the differences between the Taverham plant which the Members had visited and these proposals. Crown Chicken had confirmed that it intended to submit an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness. He explained the involvement of the Health & Safety Executive was a reactive one once the proposed development was in operation. Whilst the HSE was not prepared to comment further on the proposal, it was understood if they had had serious concerns they would have included them within their reply to the Council. Since the report the Fire Officer had stated that a condition be required that water and fire fighting facilities be made available on site.

Mr Gordon, Chairman, Kenninghall Parish Council, stated both applications were opposed and a 500 signature petition had been submitted to Breckland Council. The proposed Biogas Renewable Energy Plant was in a conspicuous location, it sat on the horizon and was now more visible from a wider circumference. Road safety as well as the safety and security of the site was deeply worrying. Sustainability and credentials of the project was questionable along with the impact on biodiversity.

Mr Kay, Objector, lived at Heath Farm and stated the proposal did not comply with Policy.

Ms Burrige, Objector, advised that Greenshoots was not like a farm in scale and would dominate a beautiful landscape. It would be hugely detrimental on high ground. Any increase in noise would be noticeable. Fuel security was of concern, and there would be smells from feed stock.

**Action By**

Further large vehicles on the roads were not wanted.

Mr Sibley, Youth Council, advised that the Youth Council were against any proposal. Traffic, noise and odours would increase. He questioned the location as the Applicant owned other land.

Mr Alston, Applicant, believed there was a lack of understanding between the town and village. Noise standards would be achieved. They were totally confident in the project for future generations and they would improve on standards and performance. Having seen the plant located at Taverham, they could provide a bund. The fresh water lagoon which collected water from the roof domes and silage clamps would be uncovered. At Crown Mill, the methane that goes to the plant should save in the region of £200,000 of fossil fuels. The hopper would have a lid on it and would be opened once a day hydraulically.

In respect of the CHP Plant, Ms Scott Barber, Kenninghall Parish Council, commented that there was no written evidence that the engine and enclosure would meet noise limits. Evidence was required of what would be built and how it would affect the environment. The Mill had never had any planning permission. The hours the Mill did not work varied each week. It had been the subject of noise complaints since 2002. The Parish Council strongly recommend that retrospective planning be submitted first. 60% of Kenninghall adults were against the application.

Mr Waters, Objector, questioned where the technical details were of the enclosure. He believed the noise report was inaccurate, and Crown Mill worked 24/7. The Applicant and Plandescil had been unable to answer questions at the Parish Council meeting. There was overwhelming opposition from the Kenninghall residents, and he urged the Committee to listen to the views of the local community and reject the application.

Mr Gooderham, Applicant, stated that comments from locals were that Crown Milling was not noisy at weekends and that is why the decision was made to measure noise at the gate, parameters would be set and they would not cause a nuisance to anybody. Noise attenuation could be achieved comfortably. They had considered the traffic past the school.

Mr Nunn, Ward Representative, thanked the Committee for attending site visits on 28 October, 2011. The community and surroundings were very important to Kenninghall residents now and in the future. The proposal was not using waste. He was pleased waste heat would be utilised at the Mill but the challenge was to ensure it did not cause a blight to the community 24/7 365 days a year. It would be difficult to know how bad the smell would be. The land was designated some years ago to protect it. The application had 4 tanks and not 2. Photographs were shown to the Committee which showed the trees with no leaves, the open landscape and skyline.

Mr Wheatley, Environmental Health, Breckland Council, clarified points raised about noise levels. The Mill was monitored at quiet times. Both conditions delivered the same LEQ rating of 30-31dB. A slide was shown and he gave an explanation to Members as to what LEQ was. He explained how the rated LEQ would be complied with and it was a stringent condition to be used at both sites.

At times when milling operations were being undertaken, noise from the CHP plant would be below levels generated by the operation of the Mill and

**Action By**

would not be audible.

In answer to a question asked by Members as to what would happen to the bio digester if the CHP plant stopped, the Committee were advised that there was a storage facility at the rear of the plant, so in the short term, gas storage would accommodate. Flaring would be needed if it was a longer term shut down, but if it was a planned shut down, the feed impact would be lowered to the plant and the gas reduced. It would be very expensive on the biomass business if the CHP closed; as there would be no financial income, feeding it would stop.

Industries also generated bi-products. It was not felt to be overly intrusive and a Councillor encouraged Members to support the applications with conditions for screening.

**RESOLVED that the proposed Biogas Renewable Energy Plant : Reference : 3PL/2010/1372/F be approved as recommended, subject to conditions relating to odour, noise and pest management plans, delivery hours, boundary noise limits, external lighting, feedstock, landscaping, wildlife surveys/mitigation, foul/surface water drainage, ground contamination, construction traffic management plan and access construction.**

**167/11 KENNINGHALL : PROPOSED CHP PLANT, CROWN MILLING, HEATH ROAD, EDGE GREEN FOR GREENSHOOTS ENERGY LTD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2011/0445/F**

The application was considered at the same time as the above item, therefore Minute number 166/11 referred to this item also.

Cllr Wilkin declared a personal interest by virtue of having attended a function in the past with the applicant, but it was not relevant to the application.

Cllr Nunn declared a personal interest by virtue of being a distant relative of the applicant.

**RESOLVED that the proposed CHP Plant : Reference : 3PL/2011/0445/F be approved as recommended, subject to conditions relating to noise mitigation, boundary noise limits, external lighting, tree protection, wildlife mitigation, groundwater protection and contamination.**

Mr Gordon, Kenninghall Parish Council stated that in light of the outcome, they would take both decisions to Judicial Review.

**168/11 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS**

Noted.

**169/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

**Action By**

**170/11 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**171/11 ENFORCEMENT ITEM : COLKIRK**

**RESOLVED** that direct action be taken by the Council to remedy the breach by entering the land and doing the work themselves (s.178) – the Council to recover its reasonable costs from the owner of the land, and/or place a charge on the land.

Housing Officers would make the appropriate assessment. The Planning Manager would keep the Planning Committee informed.

The meeting closed at 4.30 pm

CHAIRMAN