

AGENDA

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

- Committee** - **PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- Date & Time** - MONDAY, 9TH JUNE, 2014 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.

IN THE EVENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS APPEARING ON THE AGENDA, WARD REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE NOTIFIED ACCORDINGLY IN ADVANCE.

THE ORDER OF THE MEETING WILL VARY TO ALLOW FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING AND WILL NOT FOLLOW THAT OF THIS AGENDA

PERSONS ATTENDING THE MEETING ARE REQUESTED TO TURN OFF MOBILE PHONES

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, 29 May 2014

PLANNING POLICY NOTE

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 17th 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 19th 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. <u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2014.	1 - 12
2. <u>APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
3. <u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED</u> 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. <u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
5. <u>REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA</u> 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. <u>URGENT BUSINESS</u> 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. <u>LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (STANDING ITEM)</u> To receive an update.	
8. <u>DEFERRED APPLICATIONS</u> To consider applications deferred at previous meetings including some, but not all, of those shown on the attached Schedule of Deferred Applications.	13

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>																				
<p>9. <u>NORTH ELMHAM: STATION YARD: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 19 DWELLINGS: APPLICANT: MR H S THOMPSON: REFERENCE: 3PL/2013/1045/O</u></p> <p>Report of the Director of Commissioning.</p>	14 - 25																				
<p>10. <u>SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS</u></p> <p>To consider the Schedule of Planning Applications:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Item No</u></th> <th><u>Applicant</u></th> <th><u>Parish</u></th> <th><u>Page No</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Mr H S Thompson</td> <td>North Elmham</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>AVIC-PCI Ltd</td> <td>South Lopham</td> <td>28-39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Mr P Freeman</td> <td>Garvestone</td> <td>40-45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Mr S Knowles</td> <td>Mileham</td> <td>46-53</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Item No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Parish</u>	<u>Page No</u>	1	Mr H S Thompson	North Elmham	27	2	AVIC-PCI Ltd	South Lopham	28-39	3	Mr P Freeman	Garvestone	40-45	4	Mr S Knowles	Mileham	46-53	26 - 53
<u>Item No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Parish</u>	<u>Page No</u>																		
1	Mr H S Thompson	North Elmham	27																		
2	AVIC-PCI Ltd	South Lopham	28-39																		
3	Mr P Freeman	Garvestone	40-45																		
4	Mr S Knowles	Mileham	46-53																		
<p>11. <u>APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING</u></p> <p>Report of the Director of Commissioning</p> <p><i>Members are requested to raise any questions at least two working days before the meeting to allow information to be provided to the Committee.</i></p>	54 - 70																				
<p>12. <u>APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)</u></p>	71																				
<p>13. <u>APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)</u></p> <p>APP/F2605/A/13/2210283: ATTLEBOROUGH: Land between London Road and New Road: Appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for development of land for the Erection of 73 dwellings and associated access roads, public open space, play areas and landscaping by Stepford Construction Ltd.</p> <p>Decision: Allowed</p> <p>Summary: The Inspector concluded that there was little prospect of the land allocated for open space coming forward and therefore the development would not in practice result in its loss. It would therefore not unacceptably undermine the Council's open space objectives. The Inspector also concluded that the development would result in an acceptable balance between residential development and open space provision.</p> <p>Application for Costs</p> <p>Decision: Refused</p> <p>Summary: The Inspector concluded that the circumstances which would justify an award of costs as set out in the PPG had not been demonstrated.</p> <p>APP/F2605/A/1/2212627: ELSING: Garden Land adjacent to Woodforde Cottage. Appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the</p>																					

erection of a pair of semi-detached cottages and related parking by R S Baker and Sons.

Decision: Dismissed

Summary: The Inspector considered that the site was inaccessible to local shops and facilities other than by means of car and was not therefore sustainable. He concluded that the harm in terms of sustainability would be significant and demonstrable and would outweigh any benefit from the proposed dwellings.

APP/F2605/A/14/2213613:LYNG: The Clump Easthaugh Road Appeal against the refusal to grant planning permission for the retention of existing residential cabin and caravan for a temporary period by Mrs Heather Glanfield.

Decision: Dismissed

Summary: The Inspector considered that the site was poorly related to services and facilities and that the occupiers would have to rely on private vehicles to access them. He also concluded that the development would result in highway danger and that the personal circumstances of the applicant did not outweigh the harm from the development.