

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Held on Wednesday, 5 January 2011 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr T.J. Lamb
Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr S. J. F. Rogers
Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr M. Fanthorpe	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)
Mr J.P. Labouchere	

**Also Present**

Mr A.C. Stasiak	- Ward Representative
Mr P J Hewett	- Ward Representative

**In Attendance**

John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Keith Eccles	- Building Control Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Mike Brennan	- Principal Planning Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Jane Osborne	- Committee Officer

**01/11 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**02/11 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr P S Francis.

**03/11 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

Councillor M Fanthorpe declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 13 (Dereham) by virtue of being a member of Dereham Town Council.

**04/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made her usual announcements regarding the fire exits and mobile phones etc.

There would be English Heritage Training for Members and Officers all day on 8 February 2011 and the second part of the CABA Training (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) would take place all day on 18 February. Members had previously been advised that it would be beneficial for them to attend, even if they had not attended the first part.

**Action By**

**Action By**

**05/11 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA**

There were none.

**06/11 URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

**07/11 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)**

There was nothing new to report.

**08/11 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS**

Noted.

**09/11 ATTLEBOROUGH : LAND OFF HONEYSUCKLE WAY : PROPOSED  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT : APPLICANT : NORFOLK HOMES  
LTD : REFERENCE 3PL/2010/1041/F**

The application was for residential development on land to the north of Honeysuckle Way, Attleborough, and would comprise of 66 dwellings, a new access road and provision of two areas of public open space. A range of house types were proposed and would be either 1½ or 2 storeys, with 26 provided as affordable.

In the late 1990s, the site had been proposed for allocation but was deleted due to general housing over supply.

Anglian Water had stipulated that no dwelling be occupied prior to March 2012, and the Applicant had stated that that would fit in with their timeframe.

The two areas of public open space amounted to 81% of the total open space provision required by Core Strategy Policy DC11. In order to compensate for the shortfall and in lieu of the provision of children's play equipment, a financial contribution of £28,880 was proposed. The Applicant had indicated that they would be happy for the terms of the legal agreement to be broadened to include general green infrastructure provision.

Breckland's view was that the development had been designed to minimise the affect on local properties, although some local residents had raised concern. Traffic would be spread equally between two arms of access roads and a 20 mph zone would be extended. The proposed development met PPS3 despite being outside the settlement boundary.

Mr Harper, for the Applicant said Norfolk Homes wanted to create family homes and that the site was part of the surrounding estate and was deliverable. The 40% affordable housing would meet Code Level 3 with the rest of the housing being 15% above building regulations, they would be air tight and as well insulated as possible. Many changes had been made in response to concerns raised and they wanted to maintain and enhance biodiversity. 10% renewal energy would be met.

Mr Stasiask, Ward Representative stated that the 66 dwellings outside the settlement boundary conflicted with the Core Strategy and that there was a

**Action By**

huge shortfall not just in Attleborough but every town in Breckland, and whilst the Town Council would be grateful for the money, they were opposed to the application. He believed the application came through 'on the back of' not having a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land in Breckland.

He advised that the Attleborough Task Force was in the middle of a consultation period seeking views of NR17 and NR16 and they wanted residents to decide where growth would be. He stated there were horrendous traffic problems in Attleborough and that the application did nothing to help those. £¼ million funding had been secured and it was necessary to make sure all residents were consulted. Whilst he acknowledged there was a shortage of open space in Breckland, he felt to try and get away with a 1/5<sup>th</sup> less than was required was unsatisfactory, and he believed that whilst in the fullness of time it might be acceptable, it was not at the moment and hoped that Members would refuse the application. It was confirmed that there would be pedestrian access out of the development onto Carvers Lane. Those who occupied the flats above the open garaging would have access to at least one parking space.

A Councillor asked that a condition be made that the open garages were left as 'open cart designs' and not to have doors on them, and the Development Services Manager confirmed that this could be imposed. The Applicant stated car ports were favoured, and would be leased with strict covenants, and that the vast majority of dwellings would have garages which had electric garage doors and sound insulation. It was asked if the open garaging would be walled per garage unit or a total open space. The Applicant agreed to look at the plans with regard to the open cart design and walls.

Concern was raised that trees would be taken out. The Applicant explained that the hedge that abutted Carvers Lane would be retained, and the one on the other side of Carvers Lane was not theirs. He stated they would improve the hedging by removing dead wood and supplementary planting with new. If the Council adopted the open space they would see it maintained in perpetuity. However, a Councillor believed that to strip out brambles and ivy could be considered contradictory to wildlife and birdlife, and did not want them to suffer. The Committee were made aware that a detailed habitat survey would be done and a report submitted to the Council.

In response to a Councillor who believed it would be an over development of the site, the Applicant believed 33 dwellings per hectare was a reasonably low rate. He said local people had been consulted and he believed the infrastructure query had been addressed, but he was not aware that the Town Council had objected.

It was stated by a Councillor that Breckland had been over willing in the past to grant planning permission for housing. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Breckland was not unique in not having a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land and that it was common across the country and not due to Breckland being reckless. Due to delays in the local planning system and bringing forward LDFs, the allocation had been used up and as a result, Breckland and many other Councils had a shortfall in housing which was a regular issue that occurred within the country. Currently there was a 1.7 year supply in Breckland.

**Action By**

The Developer had introduced a number of measures consisting of electric barriers and gates at the parking courts, windows in gables, and no alleyway 'cut throughs' which directly addressed the concerns raised by the Police with regard to the proposed layout relating to parking courts, private space and pedestrian access routes. No further comments had been received from the Police.

The flats would not have windows that looked out to existing properties, but would have roof lights. There would be a substantial double boundary at Hazel Road. Responsibility for hedging around the site would depend on who owned it. There would be owner occupied and social rented affordable housing.

The nearest house would be 70–75m away from the closest part of the A11. It was asked whether anything would be done to mitigate noise from the A11. It was stated that whilst the noise was clearly audible, it was not especially intrusive, but a condition could be added that a scheme for noise mitigation measures be required.

Whilst one Councillor described the development as being 'one field too far' due to the edge of the field getting close to the bypass, another one felt it was a good site for housing and was an extension of the current build but did cause worry due to the Attleborough point of view despite in principle having been very well thought out. It was not known how many houses had been granted in the last four years.

Whilst Norfolk County Council had been consulted it was not known where the children would go to school, or what Doctors or Churches the residents would attend.

A letter of objection was read out by the Principal Planning Officer from the Town Council.

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred, and the Officers be authorised to approve it on completion of the Section 106 Agreement and subject to conditions as set out in the report as well as the following additional conditions :

- (1) Ecological
- (2) Open structure car ports
- (3) Retention of hedgerows
- (4) Noise condition with regard to A11

A Councillor asked for direction with regard to what the default was with regard to code levels achieved by houses. The Principal Planning Officer explained that the core strategy included policy on renewable energy, it did not relate to code levels, and there was no policy basis for certain code levels. The aim was to gradually increase requirements through building regulations and over the next few years they would come together, but the code for sustainable homes was an advisory one and developers sought to achieve them for marketing reasons and it made buyers aware of how efficient a house was.

The Chairman said it was not possible for the Committee to decide on a default decision, and that the matter would have to be put to Council if a higher code was to be required. She added that the Committee had discussed the subject in the past and agreed that they would strive to

**Action By**

impose higher standards, but until the Council put through a policy, it could not be enforced.

**010/11 HARLING : CLOVERFIELDS, LOPHAM ROAD : PROPOSED  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 17 NO. HOUSES INCLUDING A MIX  
OF 2, 3 AND 4 BEDROOM HOUSES : APPLICANT MR BURTON :  
REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1079/F**

The application was for a residential development on the edge of Harling and would comprise of 17 dwellings. The site was already partly developed. Affordable housing fell slightly short of 40%. The Applicant was not a developer but there were no obstacles to development known.

The proposal would significantly exceed the planned level of growth for Harling and would conflict with the spatial vision for the area with regard to existing housing commitments in the village. The development would compound over supply and take units over 50. It was important to recognise that the 50 unit allocation was not a ceiling but did give a clear view of the overall spatial vision and concern was that this application tipped the balance.

Density was relatively low, with the tree belt being retained. The proposal did have a number of merits as outlined in the report and it would make a contribution towards housing land supply (land with planning permission was included in the 5 year land supply).

Mr Belton, Agent said that for clarity, the 50 dwellings were not a constraining number with regard to spatial vision. He stated a Planning Inspector had stated that this allocation would not conflict with Breckland's core strategy and that paragraphs 69 and 71 of PPS3 were a general guidance and not an absolute requirement. He added that 11 of the 17 dwellings were outside of the Settlement Boundary, and the proposal would help the Authority meet its housing contribution. It had considerable merit and would meet the core strategies and he felt it would be unreasonable to refuse.

Concern was raised by a Councillor that the Committee had reluctantly agreed in the past to go up to 65 which was above the 50 house guideline for Harling, and with the current application the Committee had been asked for a 60% increase on the 50 houses. The residents did not want an excess of houses built in their parish and he believed the increase to 82 houses would not be sustainable for the parish.

Councillors were concerned that Highways had not raised an objection despite there being one access road shared with an industrial estate. The Principal Planning Officer clarified the history of the previous development and that Highways' concern was about restricted visibility but since that time, they had raised no objections. A Councillor stated the whole estate had been engineered around retaining access and he felt aggrieved for the previous developer of the original 25 dwellings.

East Harling was a service centre and only a very short distance from a train station and fire station, it was very well serviced.

Having been through site specific panel meetings Members had been mindful to listen to Parish Councils and once again, Harling Parish Council had made it quite plain that they did not wish any more development. The

**Action By**

road was very difficult to negotiate, the nursery school was full to capacity and if the objections of Harling Parish Council were overridden, it would be contrary to what had been discussed at the site specific meeting.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission was refused on the grounds that

- (1) the development would conflict with policies designed to limit new housing development outside defined settlement boundaries
- (2) the proposals failed to satisfy the requirements of PPS3, notably paragraphs 69 and 71

**011/11 SHIPDHAM : LAND TO THE EAST OF POUND GREEN LANE :**  
**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT : APPLICANT : MR I LEONARD :**  
**REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1095/0**

The application was for outline planning permission for 35 dwellings on the edge of Shipdham. The site was situated to the south of Market Street rear gardens. The dwellings consisted of 1-4 bedrooms.

Existing access would be upgraded and the Applicant had indicated that screen planting would be added, the majority of trees on site and on boundaries would be retained with some enhancement, the pond would be enclosed by concrete posts and wire fencing.

The Parish Council had objected and 16 letters of objection had been received along with some letters of support. No objections had been received from any of the external consultees. Norfolk Landscape Archaeology required a condition to be attached requiring further investigative work to be carried out, as the initial investigation had uncovered evidence of Medieval metal workings and artefacts. There would be a requirement for a contribution to open space and it was for Members to determine if they required a full requirement of open space provision or take a contribution in lieu.

The development would be outside of the defined Settlement Boundary, it represented encroachment into the countryside and was of concern as to how it related to the surrounding development in terms of density.

Mr Irvine, Agent advised that the site had been part of a submission that formed part of a much larger site, but it had been reduced down to 35 with the aim to deal through Planning and not the LDF process. If approved it would come forward 12 months in advance of an LDF site. It had the advantage of helping the Council's 5 year supply and with regard to the Government's New Home Bonus, the Council would receive extra money.

He referred to the 'over cooking of the site' and stated that whilst it was thought to be a very well located and screened site, it had been a difficult balancing act, so the density had been looked at and it had been realised that they had 'got it wrong'. However he felt it would be helpful for Members to make comments with regard to the changes at the eastern end of the site and whether or not bigger plots would be favoured with less housing, as opposed to withdrawing the application.

Mr Hewett, Ward Representative said it was not a development that had

**Action By**

strategy in mind, it encroached into the countryside and was a 'back fill', it was outside the settlement boundary, contravened policies, and most of all the access was simply inadequate, and he could not believe that Highways had not objected. With regard to the Housing Enabling and Projects Officer's comment within the report, he said Shipdham had more than 70 properties with planning permission.

Councillors had concern over access, it being back land, crowded and of bad design.

**RESOLVED** to refuse the application on the grounds of it being detrimental to the character and appearance of that part of Shipdham and outside the village Settlement Boundary.

**012/11 SHIPDHAM : LAND OFF PARKLANDS AVENUE : RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT : APPLICANT : MR I LEONARD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1096/0**

The application sought outline planning permission for residential development consisting of 15 dwellings. However, the Applicant had agreed to withdraw the layout, so the Committee were required to consider access and scale only at the meeting. The site was outside the settlement boundary but was one of the preferred sites. It provided 40% affordable housing, but no designs were shown at the meeting and layout was not looked at in depth.

Existing trees would be retained and enhanced. A £5000 payment towards a pedestrian crossing would be required.

17 letters of support and 2 letters of objection had been received along with a petition containing 33 signatures of objection. A good level of consultation had been undertaken consisting of site notices, press advert and all neighbours notified.

Mrs Jordan, Objector said the development would be at the bottom of gardens, and most of the affected residents were elderly and unable to attend the meeting or send emails. She advised that most of the objections were with regard to sewerage, access (huge volume of traffic already), village infrastructure, increased noise and disturbance. She queried whether the consultation had been made available to all residents, and asked whether a heritage statement would now be required. She had attended all previous Parish Council meetings and was aware that the development had been formally known as SH3 which had been rejected by Shipdham Parish Council.

Mr Irvine, Agent stated that the proposal had been changed from 20 dwellings to 15.

Mr Hewett, Ward Representative asked that the Committee should consider and listen to the voices and messages of those affected. Parklands was a quiet area and full of elderly residents. Should the application be approved he requested that it be subject to the very clear concerns of residents and would want the significant conditions covered of timing, access, noise and open space.

A Councillor had concern with car parking and that it was an outline planning application. From the layout shown he felt that the end properties

**Action By**

had been pushed there because of garages. He felt that the end of the site should be looked at carefully to pull away from properties at the end of Watton Road, and wished that a soft boundary be retained.

Other concerns were that the development should be of low height housing or bungalows, about drainage (due to the problems reported at the south edge of Shipdham), and access to the main road. Also, the proposal to move a bridleway would involve making a TRO, which would require Norfolk County Council's approval which might not be received. The Solicitor and Standards Consultant confirmed it would have to be formally diverted, but that a process had to be followed.

Breckland had a 1.7 year supply of land available and a Councillor did not understand the emphasis on continuously having a 5 year supply. The Development Services Manager explained the process, and that LDFs had to be reviewed on a regular basis and the PPS expected the Council to find 5 years supply.

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it on completion of the Section 106 Agreement subject to the conditions set out in the report as well as the following additional conditions :

- (1) A time limit condition of one year
- (2) 10% energy on site
- (3) Single storey properties to be defined
- (4) Relating to archaeology

**013/11 DEREHAM : LAND OFF NORWICH ROAD : PROPOSED  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPEN SPACE & CEMETERY :  
APPLICANT : TAYLOR WIMPEY : REFERENCE : 3PL/2010/1142/F**

Councillor M Fanthorpe declared a personal interest by virtue of being a Member of Dereham Town Council.

The application was for full planning permission for residential development and green infrastructure on land at Norwich Road, Dereham which fell outside the settlement boundary. With the exception of drainage, the proposal fitted physically well and would make quite an important contribution to green infrastructure not only for the development but for Dereham too. It had been brought forward in line with local policy and the applicant had confirmed that they would commence development in a reasonably short term if the application was agreed. In terms of landscaping, the proposals had been well conceived. Changes to proposals had been addressed following criticisms received with regard to parapet gables, more traditional patterned windows and flint work incorporated in more prominent locations. Bungalows were proposed around all sensitive boundaries.

There were some outstanding drainage issues with regard to foul drainage and water quality and it was recommended that the application be deferred until the issues had been concluded. The Dereham WwTW had limited capacity and concern had been raised by Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England with regard to foul water treatment and the ecologically sensitive areas. It was believed sensible therefore to allow further time for foul surveys to be undertaken. The site had good access to public transport and financial contribution negotiations were ongoing with



**Action By**

Norfolk County Council

Feedback from Committee Members was sought to go through the application to get agreement with regard to the way forward.

Mr Hyde, Agent was happy for the application to be deferred.

A Councillor was concerned about day to day drainage as the Norwich Road sewer was working above capacity. The Agent said the applicant had commissioned a report to look into the issue with the outcome that foul drainage would be controlled on site, no discharge would occur, and flooding on Norwich Road would not be made any worse.

Mr Calvert, Agent said the sewer from the development would be routed to a pumping station in the corner of the development. He was asked why a pre-treatment plant could not be used instead of a holding tank. He explained that Anglian Water had indicated that a 50 cubic metre tank on site would be suitable and was required to meet building regulations, and that nothing else needed to be provided. The Agent advised that if on-site treatment was provided, it would take up much more land and therefore reduce the number of houses on site.

Mr Hyde, Agent, said the primary objective should be to connect to the public sewerage system, and if that were not possible then they may well have to fall back and deliver alternative solutions.

Four wheelchair adapted bungalows would be incorporated within the development.

The Development Services Manager advised that the application would not be brought back to Committee until the drainage issues were clear. Further detailed conversations with the applicants would take place, and he asked if broadly speaking Members were comfortable with the principle of the proposal.

**RESOLVED** to defer the application and advise the applicant that Members generally approved the principle of the proposal subject to further resolution of the drainage issues.

**014/11 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

- (a) Item 1 : Weeting : David Watson Transport Ltd., Mundford Road : Vary S106 agreement to allow vehicles owned/operated by Applicant to use A1065 through Brandon on PP 3PL/2005/0326/F. Reference : 30B/2010/0001/OB

Members were made aware of the history of the site and the existing Section 106 Agreement.

Mr Watson, Applicant, felt that the restriction was overly restrictive and hampered his business, stating that the cost to his business was £60,000 prior to the recent fuel increase. His business generated 12-15 movements a day through Brandon, and the vehicles would usually be empty through the High Street.

**Action By**

Strong objections had been received in respect of any additional movement through Brandon. The Ward Representative had sent an email supporting the recommendation of refusal on the grounds of the impact on local congestion and that the applicant had been well aware of the situation when he took on the tenancy of the building.

The Applicant advised that the direct route to Barton Mills was 10 miles, and the route to avoid Brandon was 22 miles, more than double, which added 37,000 litres of diesel, £40,000 costs and additional driver time, totalling £63,000. One quarter to one third of the trucks were away from site all day, 4-6 rigid vehicles left before the rush hour and returned after it. The extra 37,000 litres of diesel was a waste and the £63,000 costs was crippling to his business. There was one year left on the current lease and he would consider the viability of the depot if the variation was refused.

Whilst the Chairman understood why the restriction had been included in the legal agreement, she believed it unreasonable when the costs of £63,000 were considered against those to the environment.

It was felt by one Councillor that although he was aware of the traffic situation in Brandon, 10-12 movements was marginal, and should not handicap a particular business.

There was a need for a by-pass.

**Approved contrary to recommendation on the grounds :-**

- (1) of an acknowledged need to support a local business and local economy and that,
- (2) the additional movement through Brandon would be only a marginal increase.

- (b) Item 2 : Attleborough : Land to North of Honeysuckle Way : Residential development (66 dwellings & amend 2 no. prev approved dwellings, assoc garages, roads footways etc for Norfolk Homes Ltd  
Reference : 3PL/2010/1041/F

**Approved, as recommended, see Minute No. 09/11**

- (c) Item 3 : Harling : Cloverfield, Lopham Road : Proposed residential development of 17 no. houses including a mix of 2, 3 & 4 bedroom houses for Mr P Burton : Reference : 3PL/2010/1079/F

**Refused , as recommended, see Minute No. 010/11**

- (d) Item 4 : Shipdham : Land to east of Pound Green Lane : Erection of 35 dwellings with associated open space, access and infrastructure for Mr I Leonard : Reference : 3PL/2010/1095/0

**Refused, as recommended, see Minute No. 011/11**

**Action By**

- (e) Item 5 : Shipdham : Land off Parklands Avenue : Erection of 15 dwellings with associated open space, access and infrastructure for Mr I Leonard : Reference : 3PL/2010/1096/0

**Approved, as recommended, see Minute No. 012/11**

- (f) Item 6 : Dereham : Land North of Norwich Road : Erection of 200 dwellings with assoc. parking, garages, open space & landscaping & change of use of land to cemetery for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd Reference : 3PL/2010/1142/F

**Deferred, see Minute No. 013/11**

- (g) Item 7 : Attleborough : Wood Farm, Deopham Road : Erection of a single detached dwelling for Mr & Mrs D Alston : Reference : 3PL/2010/1181/0

The application sought outline planning permission for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling. The applicant ran the business from a building nearby and part of the purpose of the proposed dwelling was to provide a demonstration house showing some of the products the business supplied. In addition to that role, it would provide a house close to the business and to the applicant's parents. It would be built to Code Level 5 and would be a 100% improvement on building regulations.

Mr Took, Agent advised that the application was a re-submission of a proposal from the previous year with the dwelling now relocated to a far better location. It was of innovative and imaginative design and would possibly be the first designed to Code Level 5 in the district; it would be available as a show house of sustainable construction. The Applicant would be happy to link it to the business and confirm it would be a family home. There would be some 'tweaking' with regard to windows for example as the design was indicative.

Whereas it was felt not to be of ground breaking design by one Councillor another believed that Planning Policy was to support modern ecological low energy buildings.

The Agent said it would be linked to the house from the office, and would allow better access to visitors and customers.

**Deferred, and the Officers be authorised to approve, contrary to recommendation on the grounds that it was an innovative design linked to the business, on completion of a :-**

- (1) Section 106 Agreement that the dwelling be linked to the business, and subject to conditions including that the design would be similar to the indicative design and be built to Code Level 5.

It was felt that if Councillors tour the area in the future, that the property be included in the tour.

**Action By**

(h) Item 8 : Gressenhall : High House Farm : Extension to existing workshop unit for Mr N McLeod : Reference : 3PL/2010/1258/F

The reason for the application was to create an extension as additional floor space to better manage the existing workshop operation. Conditions of no power tools to be used outside and the roller shutter doors to be closed when machines were used, had not been imposed following planning permission granted previously.

The Committee were made aware of concerns raised with regard to radio noise, some of which had been heard at 6 a.m in the morning. It had also been heard during the middle of the day on a footpath close by and could also be heard with the doors shut.

Mr Bambridge, Agent, referred to the original planning application made in 2009 to change the use from farm building to a workshop. The applicant said that it was not possible to close off the doors to the east and had therefore not implemented that permission but had resubmitted an application. Three people were employed at the premises. The only other activities on site were farming.

The applicant said that suggestions had been made to keep the main doors shut but radio noise had not been discussed. However, the applicant would talk to the tenant about the radio.

The Environmental Health Officer had asked for conditions to be imposed in relation to hours of operation and the use of power tools, and a recommendation with regard to hours had been received of 7.30 a.m – 6 p.m.

An additional condition to deal with the radio was recommended in respect of agreeing any amplification either in or outside the building.

**Approved, as recommended subject to conditions including :-**

- (1) An additional condition in respect of agreeing any amplification relating to the radio either in or outside the building.

**Notes to the Schedule**

Item No	Speaker
1	Mr Watson – Applicant
2	Mr Stasiask – Ward Rep Mr Harper – For Applicant
3	Mr Belton - Agent
4	Mr Hewett – Ward Rep Mr Irvine - Agent
5	Mr Hewett – Ward Rep Mrs Jordon – Objector Mr Irvine - Agent
6	Mr Hyde – Agent Mr Calvert - Agent
7	Mr Took - Agent
8	Mr Watson – Applicant

**Action By**

**Written Representations Taken Into Account**

<b>Reference No.</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>
3PL/2010/1041/F	10
3PL/2010/1079/F	1
3PL/2010/1095/0	37
3PL/2010/1096/0	22
3PL/2010/1142/F	12
3OB/2010/0001/OB	3

**015/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
(FOR INFORMATION)**

This item was noted.

**016/11 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS (FOR INFORMATION)**

In response to questions submitted by a Member, the Development Services Manager said with regard to :-

Billingsford : the Enforcement Officer at been out to Billingsford and the site enforcement was not affected. Discussions were ongoing with the Solicitor with regards to additional work.

Colkirk : the applicants had until 22 March 2011 to comply.

**017/11 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)**

Noted.

With regard to The Bull, Litcham, Planning Permission had been granted but Listed Building Conditions had not been approved.

**018/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL  
(FOR INFORMATION)**

This item was noted.

**019/11 SPORLE : VARIATION OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENT : PROPOSED  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT HILL FARM : APPLICANT MRS E  
GENT REFERENCE : 3PL/2007/1303/0 & 3PL/2007/1305/0**

The application was to request a variation of the terms of the Section 106 agreement with regard to 3 plots in the southern part of the site.

**RESOLVED**, approved as recommended

The meeting closed at 2.30 pm

CHAIRMAN