

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 12 May 2014 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mrs S Armes  
Councillor C Bowes  
Mr T R Carter  
Mr P.D. Claussen  
Mrs J A North  
Mr W. R. J. Richmond

Mr M. S. Robinson (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr F.J. Sharpe  
Mrs P.A. Spencer  
Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)  
Mr P.J. Duigan (Substitute Member)

**Also Present**

Mr W.P. Borrett (Ward Representative)      Mrs E. M. Jolly (Ward Representative)  
Mr A.P. Joel (Ward Representative)          Mrs A.L. Steward (Ward Representative)

**In Attendance**

Mike Brennan  
Heather Burlingham  
Jemima Dean  
Chris Gordon  
Andrew Grimley  
Paul Jackson  
Helen McAleer  
Jason Parker  
Martin Pendlebury

Head of Development Management\*  
Assistant Development Control Officer\*  
Senior Development Planner\*  
Locum Solicitor  
Team Leader (Environmental Protection)  
Planning Manager  
Senior Committee Officer  
Principal Development Management Planner\*  
Director of Planning & Business Manager \*  
\* Capita for Breckland Council

**46/14 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**47/14 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chapman-Allen and Lamb. Councillor Duigan was present as Substitute for Councillor Chapman-Allen.

**48/14 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED  
(AGENDA ITEM 3)**

All Members had received direct representation for Agenda Item 8a (Deferred Item) – Billingford and Schedule Item 6 – Ickburgh.

**49/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

The Chairman reminded Members that a bus tour had been organised to visit sites in the north of the District which had received planning permission from the Committee and were now developed. The tour would commence at 10.00am on Friday 23 May and was expected to finish by 3.00pm.

**Action By**

**50/14 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Director of Planning & Business Manager advised Members that the first consultation on the Local Plan would take place in the autumn. The team were currently undertaking new evidence base studies which would support the Local Plan including a new Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which would look at the potential of land across Breckland for housing development. A new open space assessment, which would consider the quality and quantity of open space within Breckland, was also being prepared. The previous open space assessment had helped to inform the standards for open space requirements on planning applications within the Core Strategy.

The site visits for the housing, employment, retail and tourism monitoring had just been completed and the team were currently collating the results. There had been 425 new dwellings completed in Breckland in the last year. That was the highest level of housing completions in a single year within Breckland since 2009/10. Whilst it was still significantly short on the District's yearly housing target; the former Regional Spatial Strategy target was 780 dwellings per annum, a number of the schemes which had been through the planning committee in the last couple of years were now being completed. The information would inform an updated five year land supply statement.

There had been no new requests from parishes to be designated for a neighbourhood plan. However, there was an ongoing consultation on the designation of a neighbourhood plan area for Croxton, Brettenham and Kilverstone. The plan area would include the majority of the Thetford SUE land. The consultation would close on 21 May and it would be considered by the Council's Cabinet on 1 July.

**51/14 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

51 .a BILLINGFORD: Site at Elmham Road: Recreation and agricultural facilities with visitor centre: Applicant: Mr B Todd: Reference: 3PL/2014/0056/F

All Members had received direct representation.

There had been a lengthy debate at the April Committee before Members had decided to defer the application for a site visit. The site visit had taken place on Friday 9 May.

The Officer gave a brief recap of the details of the proposal and showed maps, photographs, plans and elevations detailing the different parts of the application and showing views into the site from surrounding roads.

The history of the agricultural building which was proposed for conversion to the visitor centre was clarified. An Agricultural Notification application for the building had been received in 2011 and No Prior Approval had been agreed. However, the building had been extended during construction and therefore the entire building did not benefit from any permission. It was subject to Enforcement action and a Hearing was scheduled for 3 June 2014, seeking removal of the building.

The site visit had been arranged to allow Members to assess the impact of the proposals and to determine if they were acceptable or not and whether further mitigation was needed.

**Action By**

At the previous meeting there had been various references to the behaviour of the Applicant and Members were advised that the proposals should be determined on their own merits. The retrospective nature of certain aspects were not a material issue.

If Members were minded to approve the proposals it was suggested that a site survey should be provided by the applicant, including plans and photographs, to give an accurate record of the current status of the site and allow for future monitoring.

Mr Davies (Billingford Parish Council) summarised events on the site. In 2010 a new road had been built and a septic tank installed. The larger building had been erected in 2012. Open access to the site had been obstructed for many years and recreational use by the public had been prevented from 2010 despite the fact that a Right of Way across the site had been added to the County Council Register and confirmed by a Public Inspector.

Mr Wood (Hoe & Worthing Parish Council) asked that all their previous objections still be considered. He was concerned that a large recreation area had been created abutting the River Wensum and the land mechanically transformed to create an inland beach and barbeque area and advertised for use at £10 per car. Recreation needs were already met in the area and the proposals would not be viable or contribute to local viability. It would set a precedent for development in river valleys.

Mr Atterwill (Swanton Morley Parish Council) said the application stated that no motorised recreational vehicles would be used on site but that was already happening. He had video clips of 4x4 trucks using the site for off-road recreation and other such events were scheduled in June. He also had a flyer advertising hovercrafting. There had been vast earth works carried out and large areas were devoid of vegetation. Vehicle movements would increase and noise disturbance and pollution would affect the river's SSSI status.

Mr Howell (Norfolk Flyfishers Club) reiterated the points made at the previous meeting and was present to answer questions.

Mr Labouchere (Objector) said that over 80 local families objected to the proposals. If policies were ignored it would be to the detriment of wildlife and ecology and the River Wensum SSSI and the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) would be compromised. A well used track had been eliminated, views had been desecrated and local access denied. As elected Members the Committee were responsible for protecting the site for the wellbeing of constituents.

Mr Hewitt (Planning Lawyer for Applicant) said the use of the land as a recreational facility was supported by local and National policies. 70% of the building was approved and the use and the building were not an issue. The application was supported by policy, statutory consultees and officers. He urged Members to look at the application on its merits.

Mr Todd (Applicant) thanked Members for carrying out the site visit and said it was a shame he had not been allowed to be present. The site had been derelict when he had bought it, just 25 acres of meadow grazed by horses. Now there was cover for various birds and wildlife had improved by 100%. He wanted to put something back. He had enjoyed his time in the scouts and wanted to turn it into a site for scouts, guides and schoolchildren. It would not be used for hovercrafting and 4x4s in future. He wanted the site for children to learn about

**Action By**

wildlife.

Councillor Borrett (Ward Representative) again drew attention to the number of elected representatives from Parishes that were in attendance. Rarely was a site so contentious. He referred to the aerial photograph and pointed out that the wood in the top left corner had been completely removed and two of the lakes had been reconfigured. Enormous engineering works had been carried out by the applicant. The application for Prior Approval had been granted subject to criteria including the use of the land for agriculture and that had never happened. The building had also been built 2m higher than proposed. He asked Members to turn the application down on grounds of adverse landscape impact.

The Principal Planning Officer clarified that the building was not 2m higher than it should have been.

Councillor Claussen asked the Planning Manager to sum up what Members were being asked to consider as a lot of the matters seemed to be civil issues, not planning. He also asked for the extent of the SSSI to be clarified.

The Planning Manager advised that Members had heard a lot about past activities and future intentions. If the application was to be approved it had been suggested that a record be made of exactly what was on site for future monitoring purposes. Members needed to judge the application before them, not previous or future actions. The planning permission was with the land, not the applicant. The proposal was for the retention of the building and uses of the land, along with limiting of access and suggested conditions for screening. He asked Members to focus on those elements and to decide if they felt confident that the site could be secured and well managed for the future with conditions.

Councillor Carter was concerned that the building stood out from various view points. That had been apparent on the site visit. An environmental area should have an environmental building and he suggested that the roof could be sedum covered to break up its outline and make it more natural.

Councillor North understood the recreational proposals but asked what agricultural uses were proposed.

Mr Todd explained that he would like to have poultry, an orchard and fishery. He wanted children to learn about how fish hatched and carp were bred. They could catch and cook crayfish, learning to live off the land. Land had been planted with maize and small seed plants to attract birds such as goldfinches. There would be a couple of hundred free range chickens; a small area had already been prepared for them.

The Planning Manager was concerned that certain aspects of the application were unclear. A fish hatchery would require specific planning permission. Members needed to be very clear about what was on site already. Conditions would have to be precise and he felt that further discussions were needed with the applicant to provide more clarity. A legal agreement might also be required.

Councillor Sharpe asked what sort of building the chickens would be kept in and the Applicant advised that there would be moveable wooden buildings, not fixed. The chickens would not be for a commercial agricultural business. Children could collect the eggs.

Councillor Claussen agreed about the appearance of the visitor centre which looked too industrial for an ecological site. However, he felt that the disused

**Action By**

gravel pits could be the right site for the uses proposed as long as they did not impinge on the SSSI.

Councillor Robinson had attended the site visit and was concerned that camping area 6 was remote from the rest of the site and might not be accessible in inclement weather. On the site visit there were areas that they had been unable to see due to the driver being concerned about becoming stuck.

Mr Todd assured him that the track was useable all year round.

Councillor Duigan felt Members needed to see a list of proposed conditions before they could approve the application.

The Chairman asked about the public access issues raised by Billingford Parish Council; a quarter of the site was open access land under the 2000 Act but that access had been blocked. There was also a Right of Way path through the site.

Mr Todd said there had been no public access when he originally rented the site 40 years ago. In response to a question about the sanded area and barbecues he confirmed that the area would be for campers and other members of the public. He reiterated that there would be no further 4x4 or hovercraft activity apart from one more session on 17 May.

The Chairman thought there were still a lot of unanswered questions and he proposed that the application be deferred. Councillor Claussen seconded that proposal.

The Planning Manager asked for a number of matters to be clarified before the application came back to Committee, including:

- Definitive information about what was being included in the application (such as road surfacing, signage, poultry, fishing/hatchery, etc)
- Screening issues – would the Applicant be willing to provide additional screening and incorporate cladding and a sedum roof, etc?
- Whether there was open public access and a Right of Way across the site.

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred for further information.

**52/14 OLD BUCKENHAM: ROUGHLANDS, GROVE ROAD: ERECTION OF LIVESTOCK BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED FEED SILOS. ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS AND PROVISION OF PASSING BAY. REFERENCES: 3PL/2014/0150/F AND 3PL/2014/0151/F (AGENDA ITEM 9 - SCHEDULE ITEMS 4 & 5)**

This application proposed the removal of a group of buildings and the erection of two, large, identical buildings for 500 pigs each, in their place.

A Site Management Plan had been provided and it was considered that there would be no harm to local amenity subject to a list of conditions to address the issues raised.

Mr Ing (Old Buckenham Parish Council) had concerns about environmental impact. There had been a modest pig farm on the site 15 years ago and there had been pollution problems as the land sloped towards the stream. Rain could cause the muck heap and surface water to overflow. The river had taken 10

**Action By**

years to get back to health. He was also concerned about 40 tonne lorries accessing the site.

Mr Chryssaphes (Objector) said that of almost 40 objections none was against farming, but the proposed methods were not sympathetic to the quality of life of neighbours. The large scale development would cause impact through smell, flies and contamination. Such an enterprise should be far from domestic dwellings and away from ecological sites.

Mr Pick (Agent) noted that the site was an existing pig unit although there was no stock at present. It could however be brought back into production without planning permission. The proposal would produce high welfare British pork for Waitrose. Historically there had been problems with the pig industry but the design of buildings had been changed to overcome the problems with smell, flies etc. The straw base would be removed daily and taken off-site weekly. That broke the fly cycle and there was no odour problem. The Waitrose contract was highly regulated and meant they could not be bad neighbours or cause pollution. Tanks would be inspected six monthly. There would only be one or two vehicle movements a week and improvements had been agreed to provide safer access.

Councillor Joel (Ward Representative) opposed the application. The previous pig unit had only been an annex to the main farm and had not been used for 15 years. The site was not big enough for intensive farming. One third of the village was opposed to the application. He showed photographs of the narrow lanes in the vicinity, many single track with only limited passing places and not big enough for the vehicles using them. They were quiet lanes used by walkers and horse riders. Finally he referred to the smell from pigs and said the proposal was not right for the edge of the village.

The Chairman advised Members that the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) was in attendance to answer any questions.

Councillor Sharpe asked the distance from the site to the nearest dwellings and was advised that it was about 200/250metres.

Councillor Bowes asked the Agent how effluent would be prevented from entering the watercourse.

Mr Pick explained that it was an entirely sealed system with a ring main around the site.

Councillor Richmond asked how many pigs had been on the site previously and was advised that there had been 40-50 sows before. The footprint of the old site was about 800 square metres compared to 930 square metres for the new buildings.

Councillor Spencer noted that 'muck' was to be removed daily. She asked where it would be stored. She was advised that there would be doors on either side of the buildings and the 'muck' would be scraped out onto concrete pads. It would not be spread on the land.

It was clarified that the buildings would only be power hosed every 20 weeks when the pigs were removed, before the next batch arrived.

The EHO was asked what controls the Council could exercise to prevent contamination of the stream. He explained that the Environment Agency controlled effluent on the site. The Planning Manager noted that a system would

**Action By**

be installed and checks would be carried out, but failures could occur.

Councillor Claussen asked what research had been done to ensure that the new buildings would mitigate smells.

The EHO pointed out that there was an existing unit on site which could restart without planning permission with the potential for smell. The application would provide better quality buildings. They were ventilated and there was an odour management plan proposed. The muck would be removed weekly. Depending on the time of year there could be an issue with smell. If that happened they could request that the muck be removed more regularly during warm weather and the Council had powers to enforce such conditions under statutory nuisance regulations.

**RESOLVED** that, subject to conditions, both applications be approved.

**53/14 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

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

- (a) Item 1: QUIDENHAM: Land at Station Road, Eccles: Residential development: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Tye: Reference: 3PL/2013/1123/O

This outline application for 24 dwellings would provide 40% affordable housing on an infill site between two settlement areas. An indicative layout plan and street scenes had been provided. The proposal had received no statutory objections and was strongly supported by the Parish Council. Due to the lack of sustainable access to medical and retail facilities it was recommended for refusal.

Mr Lotarius (Quidenham Parish Council) backed the proposal wholeheartedly. It would provide a mix of housing types and would knit the two parts of the village together providing community cohesion whilst maintaining a rural feel. The train station was a major factor, providing access to medical facilities two miles away at Kenninghall. There was also a range of shops within three miles. A key issue was the strategic relationship with the Snetterton Heath employment area which was only 400 yards away by footway and fulfilled the economic sustainability criteria.

Mr Futter (Agent) thought that the recommendation flew in the face of the NPPF and Localism. The site was close to the A11 strategic corridor and other facilities. It was immediately adjacent the Settlement Boundary. The Council had a housing land shortfall and the application would provide 40% affordable housing. Guidance stated that thriving communities depended on retaining facilities and rural housing was essential for that. The benefits could not be overstated.

Councillor Claussen asked if 40% was viable and it was confirmed that it was.

Councillor Bowes asked that if the application was approved the Detailed stage should come to Committee.

Councillor Robinson noted that the reference to access to services was interesting. He lived in a town and had to travel two miles to access a post office and he used his car to do so. Villages supported each other.

**Action By**

He asked what other initiatives the proposal would support and how many dwellings were in the village.

Mr Lotarius advised that there were approximately 140 dwellings in the village. The additional development would provide support for the three churches, village hall and public house in the village and give confidence for the future.

The recommendation was not supported.

**Approved, contrary to the recommendation, as the development was immediately adjacent to the Settlement Boundary, related well to the existing settlement form and reflected the character of the settlement.**

- (c) Item 2: BRIDGHAM: Land adjacent to Hall Farm Barn, The Street: Erection of 2 cottages (revised design): Applicant: Mr J Wright: Reference: 3PL/2014/0103

This was a revised application which was virtually the same as the one refused by the Committee in 2013. The scale had been slightly reduced. No archaeological trial trenching had been carried out.

Mr Scarlett (Agent) noted that the Council's policies did not say that all housing outside Settlement Boundaries should be refused. The NPPF advised against isolated housing in the countryside, but the site was not isolated and had previously been the site of a Dutch barn. It met the NPPF requirements for sustainable development and would sustain the viability of local services. The development would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Councillor Jolly (Ward Representative) spoke on behalf of the Parish Council. They had no objection to the proposal which would improve a scruffy site. The barn style dwellings would be in keeping with the street scene. Two small bungalows would be a welcome addition to accommodation in the village.

Councillor North thought the design was in keeping with the surrounds and Councillor Claussen agreed and said the NPPF was unclear on what took precedence. Style and design was a matter of personal interpretation and policy needed to be more concrete.

In response to the Agent's comments, the Planning Manager noted that the Council's Policies were worded positively and they clearly aimed to focus development in sustainable locations. He advised Members that they needed to be consistent. He did not feel that the NPPF sustainability requirements were met.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (c) Item 3: SWAFFHAM: Stanfield House, Lynn Road: Proposed residential development: Applicant: Mr John Ball: Reference: 3PL/2014/0125/F

This application for nine dwellings included two, affordable, wheelchair accessible bungalows. The site had previous approval for 13 care homes as part of a retirement village. It was a low density, attractive design relating well to other properties on the site and was within 750 metres of



**Action By**

key services which were easily accessible on foot.

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (d) Item 4: OLD BUCKENHAM: Roughlands, Grove Road: Erection of livestock building and associated feed silo (Building 1). Alterations to access and provision of passing bay: Applicant: Mrs Barbara Murray: Reference: 3PL/2014/0150/F

**Approved, as recommended. See Minute No 52/14 above.**

- (e) Item 5: OLD BUCKENHAM: Roughlands, Grove Road: Erection of livestock building and associated feed silo (Building 2). Alterations to access and provision of passing bay: Applicant: Mrs Barbara Murray: Reference: 3PL/2014/0151/F

**Approved, as recommended. See Minute No 52/14 above.**

- (f) Item 6: ICKBURGH: The Old Rectory, Ashburton Road: Residential development of four detached dwellings and garages: Applicant: Mr Donal McGovern: Reference: 3PL/2014/0244/F

All Members had received direct representation concerning this item.

This application was almost identical to one refused by the Committee in November 2013, except for additional screening to the southern boundary. Although the design and appearance was acceptable there were no special circumstances to overcome policy objections.

Mr Gore (Ickburgh Parish Council) said there was overwhelming support for the development which would provide quality housing and remove old buildings, enhancing a rural area. There were existing problems with anti social behaviour on the site. The applicant had offered to pay for highway improvements to the narrow country lane. The entrance was wide enough for two large lorries to pass side by side.

Ms Whettingsteel (Agent) pointed out that as well as the additional screening the application was different from the previous one as the applicant had offered a legal covenant to overcome concerns raised about further development on the additional triangle of land at the back of the site. The site had been vacant for some years and had been marketed for commercial use without success. It had fallen into disrepair and was detrimental to the village. The applicant had also offered financial contributions to off site affordable housing and open space and the proposals had significant local support.

Councillor Steward (Ward Representative) supported everything that had been said. The Committee's concern about more than four houses had been addressed by the offer of the covenant. The site was outside the Settlement Boundary but it was not isolated and it was the right place for an attractive housing development which would enhance the area. She asked Members to look upon it as an exceptional windfall site.

Members discussed the distance of the site from the nearest services and the previous commercial use. It was noted that the pit at the rear of the site which had been created by mineral extraction could be filled in or turned into a pond for wildlife.

**Action By**

The recommendation for refusal was tied and the Chairman used his casting vote against the recommendation following advice from the Planning Manager that the offer to restrict further development was a material change which overcame previous concerns. However, it was considered that a legal agreement was needed in place of the covenant.

**Deferred, and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of a section 106 agreement.**

- (g) Item 7: COLKIRK: Azure (plot 2), Market Hill: Minor material amendment to p/p 3PL/2013/0434 in respect of planting: Applicant: Mr D & Mrs M A Cram: Reference: 3PL/2014/0252/F

The Applicant advised the Chairman that she had been unaware of the supplementary information sent to Members.

This matter had received significant debate at Committee in July 2013 as the dwelling had been constructed higher than approved, therefore having a greater visual impact on the adjacent dwelling. When Members had agreed to approve the additional height they had required a condition to mitigate the visual impact requiring the planting of pleached hornbeams. The current application proposed the removal of that condition.

Mrs Lawrence (Objector) said that the additional height meant that the dwelling was overbearing and had a negative effect on her house, garden and the locality. She had offered four solutions to mitigate the problem but they had been rejected by the applicant. However, the Committee had supported her request for a planting scheme and had conditioned the approval accordingly. Following discussions with the Director of Planning she would reluctantly accept black bamboo with a restricting membrane as an alternative along the whole boundary. It was a long running saga and she hoped there would be swift implementation.

Mrs Cram (Applicant) noted that they did not own all the land along the boundary. The condition was unnecessary, inappropriate and out of proportion. The Officers did not consider that there were significant adverse effects due to the additional height. The trees would be only 2.5feet from foundations and walls which would be foolhardy. It would also compromise the design and appearance of the architect designed house. The original mistake had not been deliberate. She asked for the removal of the condition and to allow bamboo in planters which would not affect the garden or foundations and would rise to a level above the wall providing a soft but solid effect.

Councillor Sharpe asked Mrs Lawrence if she would be happy with that. She said that she would not be 'happy' but if it would soften their outlook they would accept it, but she believed that pleached hornbeam would be better.

Councillor Sharpe was concerned about the proposal and asked if the Committee could dictate the amount of bamboo.

The Planning Manager advised that the crux of the problem was that the Committee had decided that the development was unacceptable without screening, but the specificity of the condition, requiring pleached hornbeam, was difficult to impose. He suggested that an alternative

**Action By**

should be allowed. The amount and height of the bamboo could not be specified, but it could be specified that it must provide screening.

Members debated the suggestion to widen the condition. Councillor Bowes did not think that bamboo was sympathetic to the local area and said that the planting should support local insects and wildlife.

Councillor Spencer was dismayed that the application was before the Committee again. The matter had been discussed at length and the conclusion had been that hornbeam was best and would enhance both sides. She suggested that the proposal be refused and enforcement authorised.

Councillor Armes agreed. She was totally against bamboo. The applicant had even offered to have the hornbeams planted on her side.

Following further discussion the Planning Manager clarified that the previous application to approve the additional height was completely separate to the matter currently under discussion. If the condition was removed it would infer that the house was acceptable as built. The reason for the condition had been to screen the additional height. The weakness was that because the condition had been so specific it would be difficult to defend if appealed. Members could either agree to remove the condition, or amend it to include wider alternatives.

Councillor North was dismayed at the intransigence of the applicants. She also did not like bamboo. All Members had agreed that hornbeam would be best and had asked for enforcement to ensure that planting took place at the correct time of year. If a different condition was applied more arguments could follow. It was not satisfactory.

The recommendation for approval was not supported. After some further discussion an amendment was proposed and seconded.

**Approved, subject to a condition requiring negotiated agreement on a screening scheme between the parties to be agreed within six weeks.**

Officers were authorised to take Enforcement action and prosecute for non-compliance if a planting scheme was not agreed within the required timescale.

**Notes to the Schedule**

| Item No                     | Speaker  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1                           | Mr Lotarius – Parish Council<br>Mr Futter - Agent  |
| 2                           | Cllr Jolly – Ward Representative<br>Mr Scarlett - Agent  |
| 4 & 5<br>(Agenda Item<br>9) | Cllr Joel – Ward Representative<br>Mr Ing – Parish Council<br>Mr Chryssaphes – Objector<br>Mr Pick - Agent |
| 6                           | Cllr Steward – Ward Representative<br>Mr Gore – Parish Council<br>Ms Whettingsteel - Agent                 |
| 7                           | Mrs Cram – Applicant   |

**Action By**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   | Mrs Lawrence - Objector  |
| Agenda Item<br>8a | Cllr Borrett – Ward Representative<br>Mr Davies – Billingford PC<br>Mr Wood – Hoe/Worthing PC<br>Mr Atterwill – Swanton Morley PC<br>Mr Howell – Norfolk Flyfishers Club<br>Mr Labouchere – Objector<br>Mr Moulton – Agent<br>Mr Hewitt – for Applicant<br>Mr Todd - Applicant |

**Written Representations Taken into Account**

| Reference No    | No of Representations |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 3PL/2014/0244/F | 9                     |
| 3PL/2013/1123/O | 4                     |
| 3PL/2014/0150/F | 31                    |
| 3PL/2014/0151/F | 23                    |
| 3PL/2014/0056/F | 61                    |
| 3PL/20140252/F  | 2                     |

**54/14 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING  
(AGENDA ITEM 11)**

Noted.

**55/14 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

Noted.

The meeting closed at 1.40 pm

CHAIRMAN