

# AGENDA

**NOTE:** In the case of non-members, this agenda is for information only

- Committee** - **PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- Date & Time** - MONDAY 30 SEPTEMBER, 2013 AT 9.30 am
- Venue** - ANGLIA ROOM, THE CONFERENCE SUITE,  
 ELIZABETH HOUSE, DEREHAM

**Members of the Committee requiring further information, or with specific questions, are asked to raise these with the appropriate officer at least two working days before the meeting. If the information requested is available, this will be provided, and reported to Committee.**

**NOTE**

Ward Representatives wishing to speak on a particular application are asked to inform the Usher, Mrs H. Burlingham, well in advance and arrive at the meeting by **9.30am** as the items on which the public wish to speak will be taken first in order of the agenda.

<p><b>IN THE EVENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS APPEARING ON THE AGENDA, WARD REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE NOTIFIED ACCORDINGLY IN ADVANCE.</b></p>	<p><b>THE ORDER OF THE MEETING WILL VARY TO ALLOW FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING AND WILL NOT FOLLOW THAT OF THIS AGENDA</b></p>	<p><b>PERSONS ATTENDING THE MEETING ARE REQUESTED TO TURN OFF MOBILE PHONES</b></p>
---	---	---

**VOTING:**

**If the first vote is lost in considering an application, a new proposal will be requested (eg a vote for approval, if lost, does not automatically mean “refused”). On a tied vote, the Chairman has a casting vote, if he/she wishes to use it. It is necessary for summary reasons for approvals or refusals to be identified in each case.**

Member Services  
 Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke,  
 Dereham Norfolk, NR19 1EE  
 Date: Thursday, 19 September 2013

## THE STRENGTH OF PLANNING POLICY IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Planning process is set up, **IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST**, to protect the public from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies. Planning is primarily concerned to deal with issues of land use and the way they affect the environment.

The Council has a DUTY, through the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to prepare **Local Development Documents (DPDs)** to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The **Development Plan** for Breckland **currently** consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies document. This was adopted by Breckland Council on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2009 and is the local starting point in the determination of planning applications. Breckland Council has also adopted its Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The document allocates specific areas of land for development and revised settlement boundaries.

Breckland's Plan contains the Council's planning policies, which must be consistent with Government policy which is currently the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance.

The full public scrutiny of the Council's proposals will give the Plan an exceptional weight when dealing with planning applications.

This shift towards a "Plan-led" planning system is a major feature of planning legislation. The Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, states that ***planning applications should be determined in accordance with the policies of the Plan, unless material considerations which are relevant to planning indicate otherwise.***

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. The core planning principles contained within the NPPF are summarised as:

- To be genuinely plan led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets

Unless there are special reasons to do otherwise, planning permissions "run with the land", and are NOT personal licences.

The factors to be used in determining applications will relate to the effect on the "public at large" and will NOT be those that refer to private interests.

Personal circumstances of applicants "will rarely" be an influencing factor, **and then, only** when the planning issues are "finely balanced".

**THEREFORE we will:**

- **acknowledge the strength of our policies,**
- **be consistent in the application of our policy, and**
- **if we need to adapt our policy, we should do it through the LDF process.**

**Decisions which are finely balanced, and which contradict policy will be recorded in detail, to explain and justify the decision, and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.**

## LOCAL COUNCILS

**OCCASIONALLY, THERE ARE CONFLICTS WITH THE VIEWS OF THE PARISH OR TOWN COUNCIL. WHY IS THIS?**

We ask local parish and town councils to recognise that comments received are taken into account. Where we disagree with those comments it will be because:

- Districts look to "wider" policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.

**PART A**  
**ITEMS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>
1. <b><u>MINUTES</u></b> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2013.	1 - 9
2. <b><u>APOLOGIES &amp; SUBSTITUTES</u></b> To receive apologies for absence.	
3. <b><u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED</u></b>  Members are reminded that under the Code of Conduct they are not to participate and must leave the room, for the whole of an agenda item to which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.  In the interests of transparency, Members may also wish to declare any other interests they have in relation to an agenda item, that support the Nolan principles detailed within the Code of Conduct.	
4. <b><u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b>	
5. <b><u>REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA</u></b> To consider any requests from Ward Members, officers or applicants to defer an application included in this agenda, so as to save any unnecessary waiting by members of the public attending for such applications.	
6. <b><u>URGENT BUSINESS</u></b> To note whether the Chairman proposes to accept any item as urgent business, pursuant to Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
7. <b><u>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)</u></b> To receive an update.	
8. <b><u>DEFERRED APPLICATIONS</u></b> To consider applications deferred at previous meetings including some, but not all, of those shown on the attached Schedule of Deferred Applications.	10

**9. SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

11 - 87

To consider the Schedule of Planning Applications:

<u>Item No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Parish</u>	<u>Page No</u>
1	Crown Chicken Ltd	Kenninghall	12-18
2	Mr Bob Gooderham	Kenninghall	19-23
3	NR16 Limited	Kenninghall	24-29
4	Mr Bob Waterson	Attleborough	30-39
5	Rethink Energy Limited	Bridgham	40-50
6	Lincoln House Care Home	Swanton Morley	51-60
7	Lincoln House Care Home	Swanton Morley	61-70
8	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Ltd	Fransham	71-76
9	Mr David Taylor	Harling	77-78
10	Hursit SPV1 Limited	Narford	79-82
11	Claramond Solar SPV 1 Ltd	Litcham	83-87

**10. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING**

88 - 107

Report of the Director of Commissioning

*Members are requested to raise any questions at least two working days before the meeting to allow information to be provided to the Committee.*

**11. APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)**

**APP/F2605/H/13/2197265:** NECTON: Land North of the A47, West of Dunham Road: Appeal against the refusal to grant express consent for a freestanding advance directional sign by Hopkins Homes Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2013/0069/A

**Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Summary:** *The Inspector considered that the sign would add to the distraction of highway users and the potential for accidents, to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic on the A47 trunk road.*

***The following appeals relate to advertisements for a housing development at Swanton Morley***

**APP/F2605/H/13/2197885:** BAWDESWELL: Land South of Billingford Road, West of Fakenham Road: Appeal against the refusal to grant express consent for I No freestanding advance directional sign by Hopkins & Moore Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2013/0070/A

**Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Summary:** *The Inspector considered that, in a location remote from and not related to the development site it advertises, the sign would appear discordant and wholly at odds with its surroundings. The strongly coloured graphics and modern materials would appear alien.*

*It would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. In respect of public safety, the sign was considered likely to result in confusion and distraction to drivers and increase potential for accidents. It would be detrimental to the free and safe flow of traffic on the A1067.*

**APP/F2605/H/13/2197886:** NORTH TUDDENHAM: Land South of Hoe Road South: Appeal against the refusal to grant express consent for a freestanding advance directional sign by Hopkins & Moore Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2013/0068/A

**Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Summary:** *The Inspector considered that, in a location remote from and not related to the development site it advertises, the sign would appear discordant and wholly at odds with its surroundings. The strongly coloured graphics and modern materials would appear alien. It would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.*

**APP/F2605/H/13/2197888:** NORTH TUDDENHAM: Land South of A47: Appeal against a refusal to grant express consent for 2 No freestanding advance directional signs by Hopkins & Moore Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2013/0067/A

**Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Summary:** *The Inspector considered that the signs, remote from and unrelated to the site they advertise, are likely to be confused with official traffic signs and could distract highways users and add to the potential for accidents. This would be detrimental to the free and safe flow of traffic on the A47.*

**APP/F2605/H/13/2198090:** SWANTON MORLEY: Land North of Greengate: Appeal against a refusal to grant express consent for 2 No hoarding signs ('A' and 'B' on the submitted drawing No SWA-1-110); 1 No other sign ('C' on the submitted drawing) and 5 No flagpole signs ('D' on the submitted drawing) by Hopkins & Moore Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2013/0080/A

**Decision:** Appeal Dismissed

**Summary:** *The Inspector considered the main issue to be effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The display of five flagpole advertisements and two hoarding would introduce unnecessary clutter; the total number proposed would be excessive and harmful to the area's character and appearance.*