

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 26 November 2007 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr R. Kemp
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris
Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr J.P. Labouchere
Mr A.J. Byrne	Mr T.J. Lamb
Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mr B. Rose
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr P.S. Francis	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr M. Fanthorpe	Mr M. Spencer
Mrs S.R. Howard-Alpe	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	

Also Present

Mrs A.L. Steward	Mr. A Willeard, Norfolk County Council
------------------	--

In Attendance

Heather Burlingham	- Assistant Development Control Officer
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Chris Raine	- Senior Development Control Officer
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer
Julie Britton	- Committee Services Officer

185/07 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2007 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Members were informed that the absence of Councillor Bowes from this meeting was due to her attending other Council business.

186/07 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

There were no apologies for absence.

187/07 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

Members and Officers were asked to declare any interest as appropriate at the time the applications were made.

Mr Lamb declared a personal interest in Schedule item 11 (Thetford) because of his involvement with the Charles Burrell Museum.

188/07 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

The Chairman advised the meeting of the procedures for public

Action By

Action By

speaking.

Members were asked to make a provisional note in their diaries for a member training day, which would be a half day session, on Monday, 28 January 2008. A letter confirming the arrangements would be issued nearer the time.

The Committee was reminded about the Open Evening for Breckland Councillors and Town and Parish Councillors on Monday 3rd December 2007. All Members were encouraged to attend.

189/07 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

The Development Services Manager explained that it had been intended to include item 2 of the Schedule of Applications (Swaffham/Sporle), the wind turbine application, on the Agenda but it had been withdrawn due to the information from the MOD not being submitted.

In addition it was announced that the officers' recommendation in regard to Agenda item 10/ item 3 of the Schedule of Applications (Fransham) had been amended to one of approval in the light of the Section 106 Agreement being accepted and signed by the applicants. Therefore the application did not need to be discussed.

190/07 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDARD ITEM) (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Principal Environmental Planning Officer provided Members with an update on the Local Development Framework.

The Committee was informed that the Policy Development and Review Panel 1 had been considering issues concerning the Core Strategy documents and the Development Control Policies. A further meeting of the Panel had been arranged for Tuesday, 27 November 2007 to consider the remaining Preferred Policy Options which had been adjourned from the last meeting held on 8 November 2007. The meeting would commence at 5.30pm and Members of the Development Control Committee were invited to attend. Both reports would be presented to the Cabinet meeting on 3rd December 2007 together with the comments of the Panel for consideration.

191/07 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

- (a) Shipdham: Land off Church Close: Residential Development for Abel Homes Ltd (reference 3PL/2007/1234/F) (Agenda item 8a)

This report concerned a proposal for a residential development in the village of Shipdham. The application had been considered at the Development Control Committee meeting held on 5th November 2007 where it had been deferred to enable a site visit to be carried out on 23rd November 2007.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained the details of the relevant planning policies and the assessment of the

Action By

application, covering the issues of local character, recreation provision, trees/ecology, highway safety and flooding. The application had been supported by a number of technical reports, including a Design & Access Statement, a Flood Risk Assessment, a Tree Survey, an Archaeological Report and an Ecological Report. Detailed amendments had been made to the proposals in the light of responses from consultees. One of the changes included an amended design to one of the affordable housing units which had been dropped in height and set further back from the remaining affordable dwellings.

A number of concerns had been raised with regard to flooding on the site as the land was low lying and a ditch had been allowed to be filled in. The Principal Planning Officer admitted that the site was quite soggy underfoot; however, the Environment Agency was quite satisfied with the Flood Risk Assessment that had been submitted in support of the application.

As far as the traffic issues were concerned, the Highway Authority had concluded that it was satisfied with the application and had stated that no traffic calming measures in that area were required. The applicant; however, had offered to improve facilities if requested.

Mr Willeard, Norfolk County Council's Assistant Engineer for Estate Development was present to answer questions.

Mr Hill, for the Parish Council was concerned about the flooding issues and the proposed access from the A1075. He urged the Committee to support some form of pedestrian crossing in that area. He also had concerns with regard to the on-going and future development in the village which he felt could lead to Shipdham having to accommodate in the region of 100 homes over the next five years.

Mr Bird, the Applicant, was in attendance and put his views forward. He stated that the density proposed would, at around 20 dwellings per hectare, be lower than that generally sought by PPS3. Mr Bird advised that the drainage on the site had been neglected over the years and the new drainage system that would be installed would eliminate existing problems. The Flood Risk Assessment had been carried out by the applicant's own professional advisors. On the issue of highway safety, a 20 metre extension of footpath would be installed to allow buses to stop away from the access/entrance. Mr Bird felt that he had met and exceeded all requirements and urged Members to support the Officers' recommendation.

Mr Jordan, a neighbouring Ward Member, acting on behalf of the Ward Representative, had attended the site visit and was impressed with the proposed engineering solutions to the existing flooding problems. However, he felt that there was one matter that the applicant could not change and that was the land itself. The land was spring fed and would never dry out no matter what innovative solution was installed and therefore should not be built on. He also felt that the affect on the village if this development went ahead would be horrendous. Shipdham was a small village and did not

Action By

have the infrastructure to accommodate all these extra dwellings. Mr Jordan felt appalled that Norfolk County Council had not agreed to install any traffic calming measures. He felt that common sense should prevail and that there should be some form of traffic calming measures installed particularly for parents and children looking for a safe route to the local school. Although he was against the application in the village of Shipdham Mr Jordan felt that the developers should be congratulated on such a well thought out scheme.

Another Member advised that the main reasons for him not being able to support the application were the flooding issues and the increased traffic implications. Following the site visit that he had attended, he had been most distressed with the amount of traffic passing through the village on the A1075, particularly with the amount of HGVs. He felt that the access was not good and the visibility splay was limited by the number of trees being retained. The Member agreed with Mr Jordan's comments on the flooding issues. The land was classed as a fen and therefore was attenuation in its own right. If Members were mindful to approve the application, the developers would be covering more than half the site in concrete and, in his opinion, would not help to dispose of the spring water that already existed. The slab levels would have to be raised dramatically to avoid any future flooding problems. He could not support this application.

A Member felt that the Committee was being caught up with issues that would not be of concern to the people living there. Not to develop the site just because of the lack of any highway measures would be slightly tenuous; however, he did agree that some form of traffic calming measure should be installed.

A Member asked, if this development was approved, who would be responsible for the costs if flooding occurred onto other neighbouring properties. In response, the Solicitor advised that it was impossible to provide an answer; however, the costs would not fall to Breckland Council.

Another Member asked Mr Willeard how Norfolk County Council had come to the conclusion that traffic restraints were not required. In response, Mr Willeard explained that the access onto the A1075 had only been agreed because of the speed survey that had been undertaken by the applicant. As far as footpaths were concerned, he felt that the main demand would be to the north-west of the site. The existing residents to the south-west might have a desire to cross the estate but, in his opinion, there would not be a sufficient demand for a pedestrian crossing. The Member was astounded that Norfolk County Council could be content with 40 plus houses being built without installing any appropriate footpaths. In his defence, Mr Willeard reminded Members that the applicant was intending to extend the existing footpath and that Norfolk County Council would be installing dropped kerbs.

Referring to the flooding issues, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) understood the concerns and agreed that part of

Action By

the site was very wet. However, a detailed Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted and the Environment Agency had stated very clearly that the scheme was acceptable and would not increase the flooding elsewhere. He advised that it would be very difficult to provide technical evidence against the proposal.

With regard to traffic issues, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) pointed out that no-one could expect the developer to address any existing traffic problems; however, it might be possible to develop and improve pedestrian facilities by making representations to Norfolk County Council to install a safety scheme along this end of the village. Mr Jordan, who was also a County Member, agreed to take forward all the above concerns and suggestions to Norfolk County Council.

Other concerns related to the commuted sums, and who it was payable to, archaeology and site working times.

The Committee was informed that the law for commuted sums was that it had to be directly related to the proposed development, there was not any policy in the Council's Local Plan or in any national policy to pay a commuted sum direct to a community. However, the public open space contribution of £50,000 that had been offered by the applicant would most likely be paid to the Parish Council to improve existing recreational facilities in the village.

As far as archaeology was concerned, it was explained that some archaeological investigations had already been undertaken. A further condition would be required to record and monitor any finds during development and would be evaluated as development progressed.

General conditions would be attached to the permission on site working times. Members were informed that Abel Homes had its own Neighbour Charter and therefore was certainly conscious of its responsibilities. The conditions would include deliveries, parking and keeping the site clean and tidy.

The Development Services Manager advised that this application should be considered on its own merits. Members should not make a decision on what might or might not be built in the village in the future.

A vote to approve the application was lost. However, after seeking reasons for the new proposal, it was proposed and seconded that the application be approved subject to suitable highway improvements being agreed.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the application be deferred and the officers, in consultation with the Chairman, be asked to negotiate traffic/highway improvements with Norfolk County Council, and if these negotiations are successful, the Development Services Manager be authorised to grant permission subject to:

Action By

- (i) the detailed matters relating to materials, landscaping, tree protection, ecology, boundary treatments, slab levels, archaeology, access, parking and drainage being agreed in order to secure a satisfactory development;
 - (ii) completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the affordable housing provision and the contributions relating to recreation facilities, schools and library services;
- (2) if the negotiations with Norfolk County Council failed to provide suitable traffic/highway improvements, the application be referred back to Committee.

(b) Attleborough: Heisker, West Carr Road: Residential development of nine dwellings including demolition of existing dwelling for Bennett PLC (Agenda item 8a)

Members recalled that this application had been deferred at the Development Control Committee meeting on 5th November to enable further consideration to be given to the relationship between the proposed and existing terrace.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that amended plans had been received which had reduced the height of the end terrace closest to the existing terrace and thereby lessened the visual impact. A chimney had also been added. A further amendment that had been added was a proposed 2.4 metre fence to provide further screening to an adjacent existing property. Members were informed that a new section of footway would be linked to an existing footway to provide a pedestrian link. The Environment Agency had also confirmed that it had no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

The amended plans were considered acceptable and the proposal had been recommended for approval.

Mr Nuttall, an Objector to the application, was in attendance and was concerned with the lack of privacy, access, road safety and the demolition of an architectural property. He stated that the proposed two bed dwellings fronting the road would affect his and his neighbours' privacy. He suggested that the access to the development would be better situated from cottage no. 1. The Committee was made aware that the garden at Wisteria Cottage already had flooding problems and the cesspit had to be emptied much more regularly. If Members were mindful to approve the application, Mr Nuttall requested that double yellow lines be installed outside his and his neighbours' properties.

Mr Bell, on behalf of the applicants, was in attendance in support of the application. He did not feel that the bungalow that would be demolished would be a great loss. He also felt that Mr Nuttall would not be in any worse of a position than anyone else who resided

Action By

along the West Carr Road. He mentioned the Environment Agency approval and that the proposed development would be connected to the mains drainage system at the junction of Westfields and West Carr Road.

Following discussion, Members were still concerned with flooding issues, overcrowding, the increase of traffic off a private drive and that the development could set a precedent.

RESOLVED that the application be refused, contrary to the recommendation, on the grounds that the proposal represented overdevelopment and failed to enhance the form and character of the area.

192/07 LONGHAM: LAND AT BITTERING QUARRY: PROPOSED CONTINUED EXTRACTION OF MINERALS FROM LAND AT LONGHAM AND EXTENSION OF EXTRACTION AREA OF SPREADOAK: REFERENCE: 3CM/2007/0019/F (AGENDA ITEM 9)

The Senior Development Control Officer presented the report which related to a minerals application to be determined by Norfolk County Council. Breckland Council, as consultee, had been requested to provide its views on the proposal. Subject to appropriate conditions, it was recommended that no objection be raised to the application.

The proposal was for the continued extraction of sand and gravel from the existing site at Longham, for a further 2½ years and an extension of the extraction area into 26 ha of land at Speadoak, immediately to the south east. Additionally, the proposal included the retention of and improvement to the existing site plant.

The Chairman advised that Longham Parish Council had not raised any objections to the proposal subject to a 40mph speed limit being installed on the stretch of road leading to the quarry. Wending Parish Council; however, had objected to the proposal for the reasons that it wanted Norfolk County Council to provide a dedicated road for the HGV traffic.

A Member, whose part of his Ward fell within Bittering, stated that Bittering Parish Council had no objections to the proposal and, in fact, was quite pleased that this application had come forward for the reason that, if approved, the site would be further away from the Parish once the operator moved onto the Spreadoak site.

RESOLVED that

- (1) Norfolk County Council be informed that this Council does not raise any objection to the proposal subject to:
 - (i) the mineral extraction to which this permission relates shall cease and all mineral processing and ancillary plant including concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant shall be removed on or before 31 December 2019 with the approved restoration programme being completed before 30 June 2020;

Action By

- (ii) all activities proposed or existing should be able to comply with the noise levels set out in Planning Ref. No C/3/2002/3003 including when the processing plant and extraction from the existing site at Longham are in operation i.e.:

Monday – Friday 06.00 – 08.00 hours 42 dBLAeq (1 hour) free field
Monday – Friday 08.00 – 18.00 hours 45 dB LAeq (1 hour) free field
Saturday 06.00 – 08.00 42 dBLA eq (1 hour) free field
Saturday 08.00 – 13.00 45 dBLA eq (1 hour) free field
These levels as measured at the nearest residential properties to both the existing operations and the new Spreadoak operation.
 - (iii) all reversing beepers fitted to vehicles, under the control of the applicant, should be of the directional sound or broad band type.
 - (iv) hours of operation should be as in supporting statement.
 - (iv) measures shall be taken to minimise dust nuisance and sand blow caused by the operations, including spraying of road surfaces, plant area and stockpiles as necessary.
 - (v) no external lighting shall be installed on the site unless it is maintained such that it will not cause glare beyond the site boundaries.
 - (vi) notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that order), no further buildings, plant or machinery, nor structures of the nature of plant or machinery other than that permitted under this planning permission, shall be erected on the site, except with permission granted on an application under Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- (2) a request be made to Norfolk County Council to install a 40mph speed limit; and
 - (3) all drivers be asked to exercise extreme caution when approaching the site.

193/07 FRANSHAM: THE MANOR, MAIN ROAD: PROPOSED ERECTION OF DWELLING (OUTLINE): REFERENCE: 3PL/2007/1142/O (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The Development Services Manager announced that the officers'

Action By

recommendation in regard to this item had been amended to one of approval in the light of the Section 106 Agreement being accepted and signed by the applicants. Therefore the application did not need to be discussed.

194/07 SWAFFHAM: LAND TO THE EAST OF BRANDON ROAD: FULL APPLICATION FOR 135 DWELLINGS, ACCESS & ASSOCIATED WORKS AND OUTLINE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED WORKS: REFERENCE: 3PL/2007/1436/H (AGENDA ITEM 11)

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report which concerned proposals for a residential development of approximately 400 dwellings on 10.7 hectares of former commercial land at Brandon Road, Swaffham. It was recommended that permission be granted, subjects to conditions and a S106 Agreement.

The fact that the current proposal made no provision for any continuation of previous commercial uses was not considered to be objectionable given the current figures for housing and employment land supply across the District.

An application for outline planning permission to develop the site for part residential and part commercial (roughly 60:40 split) had been submitted in September 2000. Committee approval of the application had been given in October 2004, subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement. This application was currently being held in abeyance, pending the outcome of the latest proposals.

The application had been split into two parts. The hybrid application sought planning permission for 135 dwellings on 4.38 hectares, and an outline permission was sought for approximately 265 houses on the remaining 6.32 hectares of the site.

A new roundabout was proposed on Brandon Road (A1065) to provide access to the development, together with a new footway/cycleway. Affordable housing, public open space, sustainable construction standards, and contributions towards education, library, transport services and public art, were proposed as part of the development, and would be secured through a S106 Agreement.

The application was supported by a number of technical reports, including a Design & Access Statement, a Transport Assessment/Travel Plan, a Flood Risk Assessment, an Open Space & Recreation Strategy, an Arboricultural Implications Assessment, a Landscape Strategy Report, an Archaeological Evaluation Brief, a Wildlife Habitat Survey and an Acoustic Report. A draft S106 Agreement had also been submitted.

In order that the development had a sense of identity, a Design Code had been drawn up which divided the development into distinct character zones. Within these zones, the design, street spaces, building types and external materials would be varied to create visual interest and a sense of place. It was explained that the Home Zone Areas was a relatively new idea, the roads and the paths had been designed to limit vehicle traffic and encourage much more comfortable areas for children and pedestrians.

Action By

Densities would vary across the site with the site frontage being principally 25 to the hectare.

The S106 Agreement would require the dwellings to be built to Code Level 3. The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained that there were currently six codes; codes five and six contained zero environmental factors. Code Level 3; however, was considered to be of a good standard of environmental design and was 25% better than the current building regulations standards.

Swaffham Town Council were now happy with the elements of the detailed design but had still raised concerns about the traffic implications of the proposed development.

The Highway Authority had concluded that it was satisfied with the location of the proposed roundabout and had withdrawn its concerns. As far as accessibility issues were concerned, the application included a number of proposals to promote more sustainable modes of transport bearing in mind the rather peripheral location of the site. A financial contribution of £60,000 had been offered to fund a demand response bus service to the town centre, whilst a further £40,000 would be used to fund the extension of an existing footway/cycleway on Brandon Road up to the site. This footway/cycleway would be continued into the site. Links would also be created from the development to an existing public footpath which would run along the northern site boundary. The new roundabout would have the additional benefit of reducing traffic speeds and providing a turning facility for local traffic.

As far as the S106 Agreement was concerned, various discussions were still on-going with the applicants. The applicants were now offering a slightly different affordable housing package. The package would now include an element of private/shared equity ownership dwellings as well as dwellings being socially rented. The Principal Planning Officer felt that this would be a positive element and one that should be supported subject to further discussions.

Mrs McNab, the Applicant's Agent, advised that she had worked very closely with Swaffham Town Council and the public which had resulted in a number of changes to the scheme including amended designs to a number of the dwellings and an increase in parking spaces. The increased population in Swaffham would help support local shops and businesses. The contamination had been removed from the site and a number of packages and benefits would arrive from this proposal. Norfolk County Council had requested a contribution of £60,000 to provide an on demand bus service. Following this request, it had been decided that when the bus was not required it could be utilised for Swaffham Community Services. Mrs McNab felt that this sustainable development would be a positive benefit for Swaffham.

Mr Sharpe, the Ward Member for Swaffham, congratulated the architect and the developers on the scheme and for their co-operation with Swaffham Town Council. He felt that there was only one topic of contention and that was the increase of traffic on the A1065. The initial 135 dwellings would not have much of an impact but on completion Mr Sharpe felt that the development would have to house approximately 600 cars on the site and the impact during the rush hours and at weekends would cause bottlenecks at various junctions.

Action By

He urged Norfolk County Council to investigate these problems and resolve these issues before the site was completed. In support of Mr Sharpe's comments, the Development Services Manager said that the Officers would send a letter directly to Norfolk County Council on this matter.

Mr Wilkin, a neighbouring Ward Member, was surprised at Mr Sharpe's comments as he felt that he could be in danger of asking for a north/south bypass which would be like signing a death certificate for the town. Mr Wilkin reminded the Committee that if Members were mindful not to approve the application, the site could end up with a mixed industrial/housing development. He felt that a lot of care and thought had been put into this application and should be supported and, in his opinion, was a much better application than the previous one.

A Member asked whether the location of the roundabout had been amended and whether a zoned soft play area would be installed for the young children. In response, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that the roundabout location had been moved which had eliminated the Highway Authority's previous concerns. As far as the zoned play area was concerned, it was explained that the Home Zone would be extended to pick up the area of the play equipment area in the middle of the site. Breckland Council's Senior Leisure Manager had been very supportive of this approach. In response to a concern about the capacity of the schools in the area, the Committee was advised that Norfolk County Council had advised that there was sufficient capacity at the moment and the commuted sum towards local education would be retained for Swaffham's future needs.

Another Member had concerns about giving up industrial land and also had concerns with regard to the infill area between the site and the town itself. He requested that if this application was approved the land to the north of the site should be increased and that enough space should be left for a vehicular access. The Member suggested that a development of this size should be able to accommodate and support a local shop and a village hall. The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) explained that if the infill piece of land did come forward as a separate application it should not cause any particular problems to the land situated at the north of the site. Additionally, if a vehicular access was installed it would generate a great deal more traffic movement to the site and would well exceed the current traffic numbers for one development. With regard to the latter, Mrs McNab, the Applicant's Agent explained that following lengthy discussions with officers a decision had been taken that a village hall or a shop would not be appropriate.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred, however, the Development Services Manager be authorised to grant permission subject to:

- 1) a Section 106 Agreement requiring:
 - i) the financial contributions towards off-site sports facilities, a local bus service, a footway/cycleway link, the provision of public art and local education and

Action By

library services;

- ii) the provision of the affordable dwellings, the public open spaces and the sustainable construction standards (Code Level 3);
- 2) the existing extant permission not to be implemented; and
- 3) the officers to write to Norfolk County Council on the issue of possible traffic problems.

The Chairman congratulated both the applicants/developers and Mr Moys on such a well designed development.

195/07 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)

- a) Item 1: 3CM/2007/0029/F: Longham: Land at Bittering Quarry: Continued extraction of mineral from land at Longham, ext. of extraction area at Spreadoak for Tarmac Limited Colchester Quarry

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 9 – see Minute No. 192/07 above.

- b) Item 3: 3PL/2007/1142/O: Fransham: The Manor, Main Road: Erection of one dwelling for Mr and Mrs Daisley

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 10 – see Minute No. 193/07.

- c) Item 5: 3PL/2007/1436/H: Swaffham: Land to the east of Brandon Road: Full application for 135 dwellings, access and associated works and outline for residential development and associated works for Gladedale (Anglia) Ltd

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 11 – see Minute No. 194/07.

- d) Item 6: 3PL/2007/1446/F: Dereham: Land bounded by Wrights Walk and Chapel Walk: Erection of 2 storey retail development and two, two bedroom flats and associated service yard for Dencora Dereham Retail Partnership

Approved, as recommended.

Note: Mr J Labouchere abstained from voting on this matter.

- e) Item 7: 3PL/2007/1447/LB: Dereham: Land bounded by Wrights Walk and Chapel Walk: Demolition of existing garden wall for Dencora Dereham Retail Partnership

Approved, as recommended.

Note: Mr J Labouchere abstained from voting on this matter.

Action By

- f) Item 10: 3PL/2007/1579/F: Mattishall: The Paddocks, Mill Road: Standing of mobile home (in connection with equine welfare and security) retrospective for Miss M A Cook

Temporary approval for a period of three years, contrary to the recommendation on the grounds that the accommodation was required by the applicant for the security and welfare of horses on the land and such permission to be personal to the applicant, Miss M A Cook. Although against the guidance in PPS7, Members were informed that no objections had been received from the Parish Council. In support of this decision, Mr Rose the Ward Member for Mattishall, advised that the site was used for endurance trials and was well maintained and that the applicant had the support of everyone living in the vicinity.

- g) Item 11: 3PL/2007/1668/F: Thetford: 3 Minstergate: Converted house to provide 2 no. one bed apartments and new build block to provide 11 no. one bed apartments for Henstead Hall Estates Ltd

Note: Mr Lamb declared a personal interest in this item because of his involvement with the Charles Burrell Museum.

The Planning Officer explained how this application differed from previous approvals and the refusal earlier this year. The Members noted the amendments to the design, but considered that the two important difficulties with the previous application had not been rectified: lack of parking and the proximity to the adjacent Listed Building.

Contrary to the recommendation, the application was refused on the grounds on the unacceptable impact on the adjacent Listed Building and the lack of parking provision.

Notes to the Schedule

The following persons were in attendance to speak on the following items:

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Speaker</u>
Agenda item 8a (Shipdham)	Mr Jordan, Neighbouring Ward Representative, against the application Mr Hill/Mr Malt, Parish Council Mr Bird, Applicant Mr Willeard, NCC Highways
Agenda item 11/Schedule item 5 (Swaffham)	Alison McNab, Applicant's Agent Alex Clarke, Applicant
6 and 7	Mr Cross, Chamber of Trade
Agenda item 8b (Attleborough)	Mr Nuttall, Objector Mr Bell, on behalf of the applicant

10 Miss Cook, Applicant

Written representations taken into account

<u>Reference No.</u>	<u>No. of Representations</u>
3PL/2007/1095/F	5
3PL/2007/1436/H	2
3PL/2007/1579/F	1

196/07 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 13)

This item was noted.

197/07 APPEALS DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 14)

Members were made aware of the amount of Appeals that were now being allowed compared to what the Council was winning earlier in the year. The Committee was reminded to be careful when going against officers' recommendations as the costs to the Council was extortionate.

198/07 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 15)

This item was noted.

The meeting closed at 1.40 pm

Action By

CHAIRMAN